

MTC-00007630

From: Rodney Haas
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern,
 Frankly I cannot believe this lawsuit lasted this long. There is no question that an excessive and unfair settlement will further destroy the software business. Microsoft has been the driving force for bringing the price of both software and hardware down. Microsoft not only has not hurt the consumer, but has radically helped.

You only need to look @ apple as a comparison. Apple has indeed harmed the consumer with unreasonably high prices. Apple has clearly harmed innovation except for the chosen few. Microsoft has in fact had open and published interfaces to their software for years. I have used this interface many times to extend my vertical market applications. This has allowed me to add massive power to my applications without having to charge my clients.

In closing I would highly suggest that you focus your energy on something else. While some of Microsoft's competitors have been hurt, must are far to large to even qualify under the monopoly protections. Companies like Netscape were clearly not hurt selling for more than 4 billion dollars. Many other companies that have gone away, have done so because of bad UI, marketing and faulty feature sets.

Rodney Haas
 rodneyhaas@hotmail.com
 rhaas@directlink.net

MTC-00007631

From: Beckers
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ et al:
 Please help stop the feeding frenzy at Microsoft and consumers' expense. Microsoft delivers fairly sophisticated products at reasonable prices, and do not manufacture hardware other than basic peripherals such as keyboards. We need them creating superior products to help balance our trade deficit. Instead, you might want to investigate "proprietary" software products by companies who really want to prevent the establishment of industry standards and protocols.

Rick Becker
 California, USA

MTC-00007632

From: Richard Paietta
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:57pm
 Subject: The Settlement

Dear Sirs:
 This suit should have never been undertaken in the first place. It was done by the previous administration for the benefit of Microsoft's competition. At no time was the public hurt or at issue in this case. This action has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars for the benefit of a few (e.g. AOL, Sun, Etc). Not only has this cost the American taxpayer in dollars that could have been spent elsewhere it has cause the present

downturn in our economy. DOJ was right in settling the issue and the remaining 9 states that are home to Microsoft's competition should be forced to settle. This was a case of bad law and the legal system showing its worst side. There is no excuse for the Federal Government having to act as the protector of Microsoft's competition. The law was put on the books for the protection of the public. The market place in a free economy determines who stays in business and who does not. This suit has also cost many of us who have invested in Microsoft for their retirement. What do you intend to do to help, since this has cost many large sums of their retirement investments. Settle the case and ask to judge to force a resolution with the hold out states. It is time that DOJ corrected the mistakes of the past administration.

Richard L. Paietta
 PaiettaR@msn.com

MTC-00007633

From: Babafar@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle with Microsoft and end this litigation. The settlement is fair and reasonable to all parties. It will be good for the economy. Thank you.

Marge Ferrari, 135 Westwood Drive,
 Novato, CA 94945

MTC-00007634

From: Maverick775@cs.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:58pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Please settle this case ASAP. I am very tired of disgruntled companies who are not capable of competing on their own trying to use the courts to further their position in the world of tough competition. I thought capitalism is what made us a free enterprise nation, and competition is what enables the best of the best to help build this country on a world wide basis. I still do not understand why the previous administration wanted to punish a remarkable company like Microsoft. Let's get on with life, stop wasting taxpayers money and let the best companies win. That's what it is all about.

Michael D. Arndt

MTC-00007635

From: Jerome Montez
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:59pm
 Subject: Settlement

My opinion on this case is leave private enterprizes alone the government should stay out of it all they manage to do is drive up prices for the consumer

MTC-00007636

From: EthelGee@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Microsoft settlement is appropriate and should be enacted.

Ethel Gardner
 175 e. 74 st.
 New York, N.Y.

MTC-00007637

From: Marx Heller
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to know who determined that the break up of Microsoft would be in the consumers best interest. I would bet it came from a disgruntled competitor like Netscape. Surely it could not have come from the same people that thought that breaking up AT&T was good for the consumer. I feel that to penalize Microsoft for continuing to develop new technology is wrong. It sends a message to others that may want to develop and market a product, that if they get too big or too popular and the competition can no longer provide an equal quality product for a competitive price, that someone well sue them and try to destroy what they have done. If I am successful, the government will take away that success. Enough is enough! Why is it that the courts have recommended a settlement and Microsoft has agreed to it, that their are still those that oppose that settlement. They seem intent on destroying Microsoft. How much do those people give back to the people responsible for their success? How much do they give to charity? How much? I feel that if Microsoft continues to come under assault, that the inevitable result will be less new innovation and new technology and higher prices to pay for it. I am sorry, but my idea of the American Way is not to Pay more for less!

Marx Heller
 Williamstown NJ
 heller@eticomm.net
 I VOTE!!

MTC-00007638

From: Zelia Compton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 10:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please settle now.

MTC-00007639

From: Gus407@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 11:00pm
 Subject: Settlement

In all of this litigation, I have never seen one consumer come forward and actually state that the packages that Microsoft bundled together hurt them. I for one am glad Microsoft put these programs together on my computer. If I would have had to go out and purchase these programs separately, I probably would not have a computer today.

Thank You;
 Gus407@aol.com

MTC-00007640

From: Bruzer703@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/2/02 11:00pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a middle class worker, saving for retirement...with a fair amount of Microsoft stock in my portfolio. Ever since the Reno/Clinton "Justice" Department abused Microsoft through the courts, I have had my retirement portfolio abused also. The settlement has been accepted by DOJ and Microsoft, our nation's economy has already

taken enough hits, let Microsoft and the American economy serve our interests by growth and innovation. We have gotten rid of Reno/Clinton, now let's get rid of the droppings they afflicted us with.

END THIS NOW!!

Sincerely,
Kevin Smith

MTC-00007641

From: Robert Heffner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I am writing to urge settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case now. I have personally benefited enormously in my work from the greater efficiency of Microsoft products, particularly the standardization of the PC platform. Although I am not a lawyer, I believe that this was a dubious case from the beginning, pushed by Microsoft competitors who had been soundly trounced in the marketplace.

Ending this case now, when our country is struggling to regain economic growth, is in the best interest of our nation's international competitive posture, and, hence, very much in the public interest.

Thank you.

Robert H. Heffner

MTC-00007642

From: WEckstine@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to stop harrasing US business. There is no harm to the public by completing the Microsoft settlement now. To the contrary there is more harm to consumers and America to keep up the battle to assist a few of the competors.

MTC-00007643

From: Bmnov20@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:01pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

PLEASE settle this lawsuit with Microsoft with no further litigation. It has gone on long enough for a company that I feel has followed the path that the strength of this country was built on. They started from nothing and built it into a very successful company. If other companies can't compete then they shouldn't be crybabies, but find a different product or become better competitors without running to the fed gov to solve their problems. Bill Linker PS: this is the first time I have tried to make my voice heard but I feel strongly enough about this to respond.

MTC-00007644

From: TweedieRoy@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:02pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

I urge you to proceed and complete the Microsoft settlement during the first quarter of 2002. This long standing settlement need to be resolved NOW. I also urge you to accept Microsoft's offer to supply computer equipment to our school system and NOT cash. The use of additional cash in our

schools will not improve the level of education of our children—computers will. I am suspicious of the motives of our administrators that the cash may be used for their own pet projects and wage increases. I don't trust the integrity of our school administrators. Throwing \$\$\$ at the education system will not improved the education level of our children, it hasn't in the past i.e., lottery etc.

Regards,
Roy Tweedie

MTC-00007645

From: Brownbearman@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

microsoft never did anything wrong...in business you deserve what you invent and earn from that invention!

MTC-00007646

From: larry novak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:03pm
Subject: Enough already, callit quits

Dear Sirs'

Enough of this wasting the tax payers money, so that a few lawyers can make a killing of a bigger settlement. The settlement is fair —end it all.

Thank you
Lawrence Novak

MTC-00007647

From: Candace Hawthorne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Atty. General Ashcroft,

I am writing to commend the DOJ in it's wise settlement with Microsoft. I feel this needs to be wrapped up and completed and quickly as possible for the sake of the technology sector, our economy and Microsoft to restore the status quo. If it is at all possible for the DOJ to intervene with the nine states still pursuing further remedies of Microsoft that would also be supported. Without Microsoft we would not have as a tool in every home the PC, we never would have had the ease of use we have as well. I feel it is a HUGE mistake to a country to go after it's crown jewel. Happy New Year.

Sincerely,
Candace Hawthorne
Metairie, LA 70001

MTC-00007648

From: Rose Rothe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 10:58pm
Subject: Settlement

Enough is enough. Let this case be settled now. This company has done more for the American economy and for all us who are computer folks. If it were not for Microsoft, we would not be where we are now. It takes people who are innovative and visionaries to bring forth products as Microsoft has brought to the world. Again, please put an end to this case without damaging this inovative, visionary company.

Rose and Dietmar Rothe
Cardiff-by-the-Sea, CA
villatucan@sand.net

MTC-00007649

From: Lenk10@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I firmly believe that the DOJ should put the Microsoft litigation behind us. Microsoft has continually produced an excellent product with each new release better than its previous software and generally at lower prices. Microsoft has done this while incurring substantial costs associated with litigation and settlements. As a user I have never been forced to use Microsoft software, I have always had available to me a multiplicity of software to choose from and have selected support software based upon capability and support.

I implore DOJ to let Microsoft get on with its primary business. From a user's point of view they have never been a monopoly as alternatives were always available to me, Microsoft was just a cause which the Janet Reno DOJ used to keep people from asking why some other more pertinent issues were not being investigated.

Sincerely
Dr. L. Kreuter

MTC-00007650

From: pernoid
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:08pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The Microsoft settlement reached by the Court Of Appeals should stand & be the final end of the Microsoft litigation. This will definitely be in the interest of consumers, the industry and the American economy.

Glory Perno

MTC-00007651

From: Borden Nettles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:09pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please move on to productive work and get out of Microsoft business. I have been ashamed of our government in this case because I believe the entire lawsuit was based on political motives rather than the law. I further believe the USDOJ action and the resulting media coverage in this case has in part been responsible for reduced confidence in the stock market. Thank you for recording my opinion. I am
Borden Nettles
Franklin, TN 37067

MTC-00007652

From: Charles H Caplan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's get this over with. Approve it as it stands and let's get on with business.

Charles H Caplan
Bellevue, WA

MTC-00007653

From: JCDMORT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

I want to applaud the Federal Government's settlement of the Microsoft

case and hope that the agreement will be accepted by the Fed and the States. Please use this as one vote to continue on the path that has been proposed and let Microsoft get on with business.

It is my opinion that the competitors of Microsoft have continued stir the pot and to encourage the remaining states that have not settled to ask for more limitations. The continued litigation that these remaining groups are attempting is causing confusion over Windows development for both third party developers and users of Windows. Wasn't the example of the IBM case where billions were wasted in trying to limit the size and power of a wealthy Corporation enough to show that the market place will do in time what will be done without Govt. Intervention?

It seems that this is a case of State Government attempting to squeeze a successful Corporation for funds because the source of their usual funding (Sales Tax) is drying up. What possible good can the States litigation do for the consumers?

The Clinton Administration's insistence of following through with this litigation has cost Technical stockholders a considerable amount in share prices over the life of the litigation. Additionally, the cost of the actual litigation has had to be a very costly drain on Federal Govt and Microsoft's resources. It would seem that this effort would be better spent getting bad guys rather than chasing one of our star Corporations in the Technical world. Now to have the States trying to squeeze more from Microsoft is only depressing the Tech market and innovation even more.

Please curb the Antitrust Division and stop these unnecessary probes of our successful Corporations such as IBM, Microsoft, Intel, AOL, Cisco and AT&T. Govt. should not be creating problems for our leading Tech Corporations that have put America in the leading position in the Information Processing Industry.

MTC-00007654

From: Greg Sprinkle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Subject: Comments on the Proposed Settlement—Microsoft vs USA

For the public record:
As someone intimately familiar with computing in general and the computer industry as a whole, I have witnessed firsthand the adverse effects of Microsoft's monopolistic business practices and their devastating effects on consumers.

In the last year alone, the computing public has lost one of the most promising consumer orientated desktop operating systems to come along in the last ten years, namely BeOS. BeOS had technology that simplified the computing experience for the average consumer, while at the same time had technology that was vastly superior to what

is available under the Windows operating systems. The single most reason that BeOS could not succeed in the market, is the absolute death grip Microsoft has on OEM's and total control of the boot loader process.

As a consumer of computer software and a concerned citizen of the United States, I have a real problem with the proposed settlement. I cannot see how the proposed settlement even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found guilty. The proposed settlement contains no penalties—monetarily or otherwise. None! It does not nothing to provide further competition or halt Microsoft's continuing maintenance of their monopoly of desktop operating systems. Perhaps the most disturbing part of the proposed settlement is the provision for Microsoft to determine who their competition actually is in regards to revealing API's and source code.

While I believe the initial pursuit to break up the company was the best course of action, I would be willing to accept the alternatives being put forth by the nine states who have refused to endorse the proposed settlement. To add, the barest minimum of remedies possible should include the following 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. [Consumers who do not wish to purchase Microsoft products are not forced to do so].

* Prices of Microsoft products through OEM's must mirror those same products in the retail channel so that products can compete on merit and not price alone. [Consumers must have a choice in competing office suite products at similar prices].

* In addition to opening the Windows application program interface [API's], 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. [No consumer or organization must choose Microsoft products based on proprietary file formats or falsely perceived standards].

* Any and all Microsoft networking protocols must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. Furthermore, the controlling body should be a government agency such as the National Bureau of Standards and should apply to the industry as a whole. [All protocols must be available through an "open source" method of development with a small number of comitters to fix bugs and plug security leaks].

* Microsoft must be made to realize that other operating systems have the right to exist and they shall do nothing to erase any or all entries in the master boot record. [Microsoft operating systems shall include utility software to enable dual booting of other operating systems when detected on computer hard drives—not just their own].

The proposed settlement seems to have been made in haste and in light of the attacks of September 11th with little or no thought for the long range implications—for

the economy or national security. Many have accused the DOJ of a "sellout", but my opinion is that they are seeking a quick fix in order to revitalize economic growth.

In a study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, Microsoft's operating systems actually poses a national security risk. Open source advocates have made a compelling case that prove publicly available and open programs, protocols and file formats are much more secure. We are a nation of computers, networks and a vast dependence on technology and as such, are a prime target for cyber terrorism attacks of untold proportions.

I believe we, as a nation, are at a critical junction at the cross roads of the information technology age. In many respects, we are in the same position as that of the early days of the industrial revolution—where we had railroads of different scales, track widths, etc. In the case of the railroads, the problem was one of standardization and it caused loss of productivity and timely delivery. The computer industry desperately needs standardization in the same way; in protocols, file formats and programs. This, I believe, is the single most important part of this whole issue and the fact that Microsoft's sole business plan can be summed up as "control the standard".

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.

Respectfully Submitted,
Greg Sprinkle
3907 Lanyard Ct.
Chester, VA 23831-7379
email: hornsmoker@yahoo.com

MTC-00007655

From: Lavajup@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:12pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

sirs, this suit has been tried to death.the remaining states are arguing for microsfts competitors in their home states not for some imagined u.s. citizens who supposedly are being overcharged for microsoft products.these competitors should compete with their products against microsoft not with their lawyers.let us comply with the decision already in place and get out on with moving business ahead.

sincerely,
george o. mills
lavallette,nj 08735

MTC-00007656

From: James Rhodes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Selltment

It is my firm belief that any more litigation against Microsoft would once more plunge the tec. markets into another freefall just as two years ago when weak insecure corporations turned to the Clinton justice department for help. If the government wants to bring on another down cycle, just keep pounding away at the one company that truly

knows how to innovate and develop solutions to complex problems. Why is it that people who know how to get things done are always being attacked by those who can't? The more I see the law being applied in this country, the less respect I have for it. Lawyers, journalists, politicians—they build nothing yet suck the life out of everything.

MTC-00007657

From: Paul Monson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs;

I have been a computer user for many years. I owned one of the first IBM-PC produced and have continually upgraded. I remember the days when competing Operating Systems were available and I am glad those days are gone. It was a nightmare having software that would work under one operating system but not another. I know monopolies in general are undesirable but in the case of computer operating systems they are much better than the alternative. I also do not have any problem with "bundling" of the internet browser. For many years I used Netscape as my preferred browser even when Internet Explorer was the default browser installed with the Microsoft operating system. I have now switched to Internet Explorer simply because it is now better than Netscape, but I would still be running Netscape if it were superior.

I think it is time to lay-off of Microsoft, I believe that most people feel as I do that in general we are much better off with Microsoft as is rather that broken-up or otherwise handicapped. I have found that most Microsoft products are superior to competing products> Why can the public not be able to use such superior products.

I am not a Microsoft employee but a individual public citizen.

Paul Monson

MTC-00007658

From: Michael Beers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 9:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello, my name is Michael Beers. I'm a hard-working friendly American male. I'll make it short. Settle the Microsoft case now. It is unfortunate in this country that success, when deemed "excessive," is so despised that we have to attempt to destroy it, to make it small again, to make it average. Pay no attention to the 2 billion dollars Mr. Gates gave to charity this year, to the stimulus his company provides our economy, and to the fact that my computer running his software is one of the most important objects in my life. Leave Microsoft alone! Leave business alone! Let the market decide whose products to buy.

Keep your creepy, altruistic hands off.
Thank you. Did I make my point clear?

Michael Beers
Michael Beers
michaelbeers.com
mbeers@idir.net
785-749-3649

MTC-00007659

From: CHARLES E KESSLER

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,

My family nor I have never worked for or had any connection to the Microsoft Co. and I do not own any Microsoft stock. My only connection is that I have a personal computer that uses Microsoft software.

It has always been my opinion that to penalize Microsoft for improving its software for the benefit of its customers is crazy. The freedom to innovate and provide better software should be rewarded not penalized.

The only reason for these lawsuits is to benefit the attorneys and the politicians who support Microsoft's competitors.

Charles E. Kessler
3000 S. Graham St.
Seattle, WA 98108
206-725-3279

MTC-00007660

From: DEENLENUS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Suit

Dear Sirs:

Please end this action and lets move on!
L.C. Foster
Tampa Fl.

MTC-00007661

From: Rick Salvo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I really don't understand why the Government is trying to destroy one of the world's best achievements. You can buy a Microsoft product that is reliable and utilitarian for less than what most attorneys charge for 2 hours of their time. Where is the injustice here? Their products will last a lifetime (even though they will be improved upon constantly). This whole thing is a big waste of time and money. Just look at what breaking up the phone company did. We now pay about 5 times as much for less service and have 2 to 3 bills for what once came in one every month! Even if some companies are considered monopolies maybe that is the most efficient way to do some things. Leave Microsoft alone and see if all the lawyers involved can add some utility to the world in stead of profits in their pockets. Settle the suit and let's get on with life and look for things that need fixing.

Sincerely
Rick Salvo

MTC-00007662

From: TAURUS5164@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:16pm
Subject: microsoftsettlement

I am voting for the settlement as outlined.

MTC-00007663

From: Ruth A. Lucchesi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly:

I fear that Microsoft will emerge from the Justice Department and State anti-trust lawsuits with little or no penalty.

Microsoft's offer to spend money to equip schools with their brand of software is certainly not a penalty for them...it is advertising cost. If they are permitted such an easy fate, all of the creative alternatives to the WINTEL platform will be effectively crushed. The Apple operating systems long used by schools will be drowned by the onslaught of Microsoft technology.

Monopoly power in Microsoft's hands is no different than it was in the hands of Rockefeller and Standard Oil nor Ma Bell. Absolute power (monopoly) corrupts absolutely.

Please consider the fate of other creative methods for computing and insist on a penalty for Microsoft that will break their monopoly. The company should be split into at least two separate and competing companies...one for software and one for an operating system. Judge Green's decision to split Ma Bell made possible the many innovations we have in telecommunications today: cell phones, pagers, portable phones etc. The next generation deserves the same opportunity to have similar computing technology at their disposal.

Please split up Microsoft.

Thank you for your time and attention.
Ruth A. Lucchesi
127 Riverside Drive
Northfield, IL 60093-3238

MTC-00007664

From: 4glh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I just wanted to voice my support of the Microsoft settlement. I do believe that they were unfairly targeted by the government in the first place, but since they agreed to this settlement it should be honored! Then the whiners and complainers form both the other software companies and the Government (who really deserve none of Microsoft's money.. they already pay their taxes) should get out of it and leave them alone. Hopefully they can still succeed even after their unfair and I believe unlawful persecution.

Let their settlement stand.
GL Holmlund

MTC-00007665

From: cliff bristow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is in reference to the Microsoft Settlement...I am sick and tired of the mess that special interest groups are creating and feel that the government could best serve the people of this great nation by dropping everything. Microsoft has consistently given me all that I have paid for and so much that I didn't pay for. If I need an update for a Microsoft product that I use, they have always given me that update at no charge. Yes, they do charge me if I want to upgrade (like to Windows XP), but, it is my choice whether to upgrade or not. Microsoft is not forcing me to do something that I do not want to do and I for one am tired of people trying to tell me they are. I am a strong supporter for Microsoft and believe that they are serving all of my needs.

Sincerely,
Cliff Bristow
Hebrews 11:1
Now faith is the substance of things hoped
for, the evidence of things not seen.
Cliff

MTC-00007666

From: TMB999@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone. Just close out the settlement you already reached with Microsoft and move on. Microsoft is one of the world's greatest companies that has done more for benefiting mankind than almost any other company in the past 10 years. The whole technology revolution of the 1990's would never have happened without Microsoft. Microsoft bashers are just jealous of Bill Gate's success.

CC:TMB999@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00007667

From: HTOPILOWMD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:25pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please finally settle this case as per the terms negotiated by Microsoft and the DOJ and allow Microsoft to get back to work writing software and stimulating the economy rather than remaining an unending source of income for the plaintiff's bar. It's enough, get rid of this case. You are not there to defend Microsoft's competitors from competition.

Harvey W. Topilow, MD

MTC-00007668

From: John Petrocci
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:24pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think that the courts intrusion in the way a corporation manages it business is unwarranted. It became evident the courts were favoring the competitors. I liked the settlement. There are many other companies that could be prosecuted if judged in the same manner that Microsoft was scrutinized.

MTC-00007669

From: WTopper@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the settlement as I fully support Microsoft's freedom to innovate.

William K. Topper
968 E. 125 S.
Ogden, Utah 84404-4006
WTopper@aol.com

MTC-00007670

From: Alan Hagerman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:26pm
Subject: My opposition to the DOJ Suit vs. Microsoft

Gentlemen....While I am by no means an expert, I do believe that Microsoft was not and is not now, a monopoly. I believe that companies who were competitors of Microsoft, got the government to take the

lead to bring Microsoft down or at least, break it up.

I did obtain a Bachelor of Arts degree from Miami Univ, Oxford, Ohio and a CPCU Degree From the Insurance Institute. My major in college was economics. I feel that a great deal of Taxpayer money has been wasted and that the devastation of the stock holdings of Americans (particularly in the computer field) has been great. I am pleased that the US Govt Doj program is ending and I feel that the states who are still holding out should cease and desist their actions too.

I am a retiree, recently retired from the General Insurance business. I have never missed an opportunity to vote and I chair the Conservative Party of Ontario County, New York. Thank you for requesting my opinion.

Sincerely,
Alan Hagerman, Chairman

MTC-00007671

From: Paul Graeber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:26pm
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. 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.

Paul Graeber
Paul and Sherri
paulg@ihot.com

MTC-00007672

From: DMKCPA6959@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:27pm
Subject: RE; microsoft settlement

I HAVE FOLLOWED THE PROCEEDINGS FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS AND I FIRMLY BELIEVE IT HAS FINALLY COME TO A SATISFACTORY AND ACCEPTABLE CONCLUSION. I REFER TO THE LONG AT&T CASE WHICH TOOK MANY YEARS AND RESULTED IN A HUGE EXPENSE TO THE GOVERNMENT AND SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED TELEPHONE USAGE COSTS TO THE CONSUMER. WHAT MAKES IT EVEN MORE LUDICROUS IS THAT THE SPLIT COMPANIES HAVE MANAGED TO ALLY THEMSELVES WITH EACH OTHER. THOSE WHO DESIRE TO EXTEND THE CONTROVERSY ARE DOING IT FOR SELFISH PERSONAL GAIN. LET US AVOID ANOTHER AT&T DEBACLE.

VERY TRULY YOURS—
DAVID KAUFMAN

MTC-00007673

From: MyMomKas@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:
Enough is enough, time for settling this matter once and for all. Put a stop to these delays so that MS can get back to business. They have provided a service for us consumers that has been extremely important in the advancement of computer science. So many Americans can now and do, have computers in their homes. I believe without MS this would not have happened.

Why do we want to punish a company that brought USA to the top of this industry?
Kathleen Laitila

MTC-00007674

From: Erol Fox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:29pm
Subject: please complete the settlement

We've used up enough taxpayer money (my money) to punish the one company that has done more for consumers and computing than any other. Let's put an end to the "don't innovate, litigate" credo of the lesser companies. If they'd higher great engineers to make great products, and get out of the courts, maybe they could compete.

As a registered voter, I'm adding my vote to complete the settlement and get America moving again towards innovation!

MTC-00007675

From: Patty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:
I believe the settlement reached in the Microsoft case is fair. Please make it final and let Microsoft and the American public get on with life.

Thank you.
P. Lea

MTC-00007676

From: Jimmy.Chan@Dictaphone.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
I am writing this regarding to the Microsoft Settlement Case as a consumer, my point of view is the case has been prolonged enough. It is bad for the economy, derail innovation for new technology. Majorly of the public are aware they do have a choice to choose from all vendors of software makers and they are more acknowledgeable regarding what they buy from a decade ago. Also, technology has been advanced so fast, even the laws can't keep up and I understand you want to protect the consumers.

So, let us decide what's best for the consumers and ends all litigation asap when there is a fair settlement presented on the table for all parties already. And get the economy moving on all cylinders again. Thanks for letting me voice my point of view. Good Luck!

Jimmy

MTC-00007677

From: PaulMons@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Come on, lets get this show on the road and finalized. We have wasted far too much time and money for no real purpose. Let's step up to the plate and get it finalized. Microsoft is being more than fair—enough already. Make it happen.

Thanks for your consideration.
Paul E. Monson

MTC-00007678

From: Camerz5@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern, The settlement accepted by Microsoft should be accepted by the Court and Microsoft should be afforded quiet enjoyment to innovate and pursue its business.

The entire case against Microsoft is study of abuse of government power against the private sector—Microsoft drove our high tech economy and dramatically increased productivity in America. We owe the success of the 90's to the catalyst "Microsoft". Bill Gates and his team are the new American heroes of our capitalist system, Microsoft brought low priced products to the service of all. Microsoft succeeded against all competitors world wide—they won the Olympic Gold of Business for America and the American government tried to punished them due to complaints from inefficient high price competitors with friends in Congress.

It is time to end this tragic mistaken case and move on. In addition to settlement the Federal government and especially the States should apologize to Microsoft and its shareholders.

God Bless a Free America
Carl A. Merz
President
Hartford Aviation Group, Inc.

MTC-00007679

From: Richard Lewis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement — Richard Lewis — rlewis0627@earthlink.net — EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

I believe the Microsoft settlement was good and fair and that it should not be overturned by special interests. Litigation is a sorry method of resolving problems, especially since consumers have not suffered from Microsoft's actions.

Richard F. Lewis
22 Tollridge Ct.
San Mateo, CA 94402

MTC-00007680

From: John Buttell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

First of all I do not own any Microsoft stock at this time and am not now nor will I ever be employed by Microsoft. I do use the

products created by the company and have never had a complaint or felt that I my choices were being limited in any way by monopolistic practices. Prices for Microsoft products are fair to me the consumer and services have been more than satisfactory. I have felt from the beginning of the legal action that my government was suing a company on behalf of other competing companies that could not do it on their own. I am not anything more than a casual computer user that has never found a time or place where I had to use a Microsoft product when I did not want to. Just because they were able to come up with the dominant operating system for the personal computer in the right place and the right time they should not be punished continually for it. Please let the market place decide what it wants and stop wasting my tax dollars on litigation against Microsoft. In the Bible God tells us not to sue one another.

Thank you, my name is John
(jbt1@home.com)

MTC-00007681

From: TPCMD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:34pm
Subject: settlement

I think the proposal to have Microsoft donate software to schools is excellent. Please lets get this terrible burden to our economy over with and settle this case. Sun, oracle and there states will never settle so please make them.

Tim Carey, MD

MTC-00007682

From: Purdue
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept of Justice:
Please settle this case as soon as possible. I do not think that delaying the settlement will solve anything further. Personally, I see the nine states that are in a quandary as inhibiting and not expediting legal or just settlement of this case by any further prolongment.

Barbara Purdue
Citizen USA

MTC-00007683

From: charles bolton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:39pm
Subject: The action currently being pursued against Microsoft creates a Business

The action currently being pursued against Microsoft creates a Business climate of uncertainty that prevents them from continuing to innovate and develop new technology that will provide business opportunities and create additional jobs, investment opportunities and other revenue streams. Microsoft has been punished enough by this long drawn out court action, delays, missed opportunities and legal costs. Implement the settlement as decided by the Courts. Continuing to re-open the case on hearsay and speculation is a violation of the equal protection of the laws of the US Constitution and probably a violation of due process.

In these un-settled economic and chaotic world climate we need stability and a level playing field to allow us technology to stay in the lead. Do you think the Chinese and all the other techno wantabees are tying the hands of their premier technology companies. No! Keep it up and you will erode our global technological edge.

There are winners and losers in the market place all the time. I saw my company that had a good product and technology go down the tubes due to the dot.com melt down and we were not a dot.com company. So encourage competition and let people innovate and computer and stop listening to the cry babies.

Cordially
Charles Bolton
Charles@Bolton.Com

MTC-00007684

From: scott juetten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:31pm
Subject: MS Antitrust case that never ends!

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 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.

Respectfully,
Scott & Rochelle Juetten

MTC-00007685

From: ThereHugoAgain@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is respectfully submitted that the Microsoft litigation at bar represents a politically motivated abuse of the American judicial system. The conclusions and findings of the Court appear to be an overly simplistic, almost academic, approach that bears little relevancy to the real world of average consumers such as myself.

It is at best absurd that absolutely no consideration appears to have been given to

the fact that the explosion of the internet is almost exclusively the result of Microsoft's bundling which effectively gave consumers "all" they needed to permit them to wander through the internet. I'd call it one stop shopping-a convenience-not a punishment.

It is equally absurd that no consideration has been given the issue of whether any of the "competitors" who were "excluded" actually offered products that were truly innovative and competitive with Microsoft's products.

Finally, the penultimate absurdity of the litigation is the lack of any proof that consumers would have benefited financially or otherwise had circumstances been as the Court believed they should have been.

If Microsoft is willing to accept the proposed settlement, it should be approved. The Court and the State Attorneys should not do any further harm.

Respectfully yours,
William J. Breuer
22 Nassau Blvd
Garden City, N.Y.

MTC-00007686

From: Jrq007@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

I have been concerned about the Department of Justice lawsuit against Microsoft. I began using Microsoft products in 1981 when I bought my first IBM microcomputer. Nothing in my lifetime has increased my productivity and work enjoyment as much as the microcomputer and Microsoft software. Their creativity and entrepreneurship helped millions of other people and me. I have worked at four universities and most recently as Vice President for Finance and Administration at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. I recently retired but was thinking back to 1981 when I bought six microcomputers and established three residence hall computer labs at Central Michigan University. I think these were the very first residence hall computer labs in the country. Many students benefited from those labs and the Microsoft software we used. From that early beginning I certainly could not have predicted the full impact of either the software or the microcomputer. I have been forever grateful to Bill Gates and all the Microsoft people for providing such productivity enhancements. I am happy to hear that Attorney General John Ashcroft has ended the Department of Justice's three-year antitrust lawsuit against Microsoft with a settlement. I wholeheartedly agree with the Attorney General's decision to get it over with.

The complex agreement is full of provisions that will permanently change the software industry and I personally do not see a one that I would consider positive. Everything about the agreement seems to me to be aimed at reducing creative endeavor. The government even created an ongoing technical oversight committee to review Microsoft software codes, and to test Microsoft compliance to the agreement. Nevertheless, I am glad it is over. What disturbs me is that some government officials and Microsoft competitors aren't satisfied

with the decision and want tighter screws on Microsoft. I ask, "How far should the government go on these issues? Free enterprise needs a break!" My hope is that Microsoft will produce even better software in the future that will help all of us. I am doing some consulting now and my son is a software developer who uses all of Microsoft's development software. I don't want to see anything standing in the way of improved software.

Our tax money should be used to deal with the urgent matters of the day. In my opinion, the federal government doesn't need to take any more action on this issue. Please end the Microsoft lawsuit permanently.

MTC-00007687

From: Barbara Gregory
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to settle this mess, for the good of all. Why prolong it any longer. Prolonging the settlement hurts the economy and really hurts everyone. Those that don't want to settle are the ones that are really greedy. Let's get it over with.

MTC-00007688

From: Jim Gasparich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:
As an avid computer user I feel strongly that the settlement arrived at between Microsoft and the DOJ was fair and in the best interest of consumers like myself. Further litigation is a waste of taxpayer money and will not help consumers but rather competitors and the political careers of ambitious AG's. Please do the world a favor and end this.

Sincerely,
James P Gasparich, M.D.

MTC-00007689

From: Wendall Mayson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DoJ,

Please, it is time for this issue to be put to rest. The entire case revolves around the fact that Microsoft's competitors do not have the will or desire to get out and work hard to develop the technology to compete with Microsoft. They would rather cry and go running to the government. Why not, it is easier and cheaper for them. Microsoft pumps millions of dollars into the US economy. They have for many years and they can for many more if everyone will just leave them alone. In addition, Microsoft develops technology that not only makes the US stronger, but also makes it easier for the average consumer to do what they want to with their personal computer. In addition, Microsoft delivers this technology at a tremendous value.

Thank you!

MTC-00007690

From: SamuelWines
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:45pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that enough resources have been expended to date and that it is time to move ahead. Microsoft is not perfect and certainly should be monitored but is it not time to move to more pressing issues?

Sam Wines

MTC-00007691

From: Perry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:48pm
Subject: MS Settlement

I think the Clinton Administration made a terrible mistake in using the Dept of Justice in trying to break-up Microsoft. MS is the with the recourses and talent to compete with foreign governments in the development of new and sophisticated software. The remaining states have no case and there has no damage to them, therefore, they should give up there in pursuit of MS.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter—

Perry Du Long

MTC-00007692

From: Lovemycat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This has gone on way too long now. PLEASE settle this ridiculous case and lets move on. Microsoft is an incredible company and I can't believe I live in a country that penalizes it's citizen's for being innovative and successful. Its disgraceful the way our government has treated our own company that we should be proud of. I used to live in Mexico and down there the people couldn't believe what the USA was doing. It was really embarrassing to try and explain it.

SETTLE THE CASE!

MTC-00007693

From: Gcademator@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:48pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

A reasonable and fair settlement has been reached. Lets stop seeking to damage the future of one of the few remaining American companies that is truly a leader in global business and quickly ratify the settlement.

K. Cadematori 1/2/02

MTC-00007694

From: Jim/Carol Renfrow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ—

Come on guys...it's settled. Let's get on with getting on. If this case is continued, you are starting to look foolish. Any further consideration by DOJ against Microsoft will further show how a few individuals in your department has a personal vendetta against Microsoft and Bill Gates.

Let American Capitalism and Democracy work....get out of the way.

Jim Renfrow
2400 Columbine Lane
Montrose, CO 81401-5646
renfrowjim@hotmail.com
(970)-249-6511

PS. I'm a 56 year old who has been a registered Democrat all my life and have never voted for a Republican Presidential Candidate.

MTC-00007695

From: Matias Moyano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:49pm
Subject: hello

i want to say, that i dont like the settlement that the DOJ has reached with microsoft, this is not helping the consumers, and of course, not helping the economy at all, microsoft allways had the winner track on all these computer business, i think that we are loosing the economy on the computer market with this settlement, the 9 of the 18 states started this because microsoft's MONOPOLIC tactics, they started this because the POWER AND THE MONEY that microsoft have win in this computer market is not ALLOWING other little companys to start or to reach a good market, because MICROSOFT can buy the competitor... or add a "new free feature" to the next os, and the competitor will be down and dead, and microsoft will not spend more money again, this is not helping the AMERICAN ECONOMY, this is helping MICROSOFT ECONOMY, i was wondering why? i can travel to USA proof that im good for the USA economy and the American Gov. will loan me money to start, so i can grow as a business in the USA, a country that i love, and i will like to live on, but what happens here? with this settlement the only thing that you, DOJ, 9 states of the 18 states are doing is destroying the chance of people like me or any other little company that wants to start something in the computer market, why should i do it? if i will loose against microsoft in one way or another? this settlement is not protecting the AMERICAN ECONOMY and that is the big mistake...

because in the way this is handle, 5 years of restricted stuff for microsoft? what is that? microsoft agreed in other settlement to pay 10 billons, that shows to you how much they care of that 5 years, in the 6th year they can recover all the money they loose, please, dont give them the chance to destroy the american economy, this cant be tolerated!!!! the american economy is not moved by microsoft, is moved by hundres or 1000! of people that wants to start something or a business in that great country! but in the way this is going, microsoft will be able to do whatever they want, that is bad!! very bad!

microsoft can loose 10 billons of dollars but they know that they can recover it once again when the 6th year is reached! or by going back to their tactics! the split of the company was the best to do!!! but if you cant make them do that then go for the proposed by the 9 REBEL STATES the open of the code of IE and other things they had in mind please! do it for ALL THE ECONOMY, not just MICROSOFT ECONOMY this move, and the tactics that microsoft allways used is destroying the little and medium companys around, and in some years, you will have nothing, and who can we blame about that?

MTC-00007696

From: Bob Windom
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/2/02 11:49pm
Subject: My husband and I are owners of small businesses. I am a county commissioner as well.

We fully beli My husband and I are owners of small businesses. I am a county commissioner as well. We fully believe that the Microsoft settlement is just and fair. It serves us well as consumers both in private life, the small business sector, and local government. We, therefore, encourage you to move forward with the settlement.

Robert and Rita Windom
303 Voves Ave.
Libby, MT 59923
406-293-6764

MTC-00007697

From: Jbsailboat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice, I am in favor of the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case. It is time to get this settled so the economy can move forward and recover. Thank you.

James H. Baker

MTC-00007698

From: RMccull955@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement 1/2/02

In the interest of the public, I would like an agreement on the current settlement. A few sour grapes would like to prolong this for there own interest, in the long run this is going to cost us all money and won't accomplish anything. Not all Microsoft products are perfect, but they are generally better than whatever else is around!

Sincerely,
Robb McCullough

MTC-00007699

From: Leslie Veres
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement and see no reason to prolong this case one minute longer than necessary. Please complete the settlement process and apply the Department of Justice resources to more important needs.

Thank you very much.
Leslie L. Veres

MTC-00007700

From: Ann Whalen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:53pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time to settle this case. I am a taxpayer and have paid for this case to go on and on. As a consumer, I have enjoyed an operating system that is innovative, creative and an American product. Let's spend time, money and energy on "fighting" cases that negatively affect the American public.

Thanks, Ann Whalen

MTC-00007701

From: LRobe58516@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs or Madams:
I sincerely hope that the Microsoft Settlement, otherwise known as the Tunney Act, would be implemented as soon as possible. Any other course would constitute yet another blow to our struggling economy.

Sincerely,
C. Lawrence Roberts, M.D.
23720 S.E. 18th St.
Sammamish, Washington 98075-8109

MTC-00007702

From: David Hemler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice is in the best interests of the country and consumers. I fully support the settlement and hope that you will enforce its terms.

David Hemler

MTC-00007703

From: THAKORTaru@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:56pm
Subject: (no subject)

Please settle the case as soon as possible w/o hurting economy and citizen of this country.

MTC-00007704

From: kearypk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I have been asked to comment on the settlement. I think that ANY settlement hurts both the consumer and our country's economy and ability to compete worldwide. However, I agree that this settlement is better than any more litigation and therefore agree with it

Keary Kunz
210 Jennings
Wenatchee, WA 98801

MTC-00007705

From: Scott Cuddihy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe this whole effort is a shame. Large scale damage has been done to our economy by the USDOJ in the name of anti-trust. The consumer has not been harmed by Microsoft, the consumer enjoys more value for its money than any other time in history. This action only benefits AOL-Time Warner, Sun Microsystems and Oracle to name a few.

Please end this tragedy.

Thank you,
Scott Cuddihy

MTC-00007706

From: Timmessmer@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 11:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

TO whom it may concern:

As a consumer, I wish to voice my strong opinion that you settle this case with Microsoft as it is now. The Tunney act is fair and needs to be implemented without any further delay. To delay is to prolong the

stifling effect on development. Do what is right and settle now.

Timothy Messmer
Anacortes, WA

MTC-00007707

From: marvin thurmond
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:00am
Subject: microsoft settlement
To: us doj

To whom it may concern: Please settle the Microsoft case without further litigation. I believe this to be in the interest of the people.

Thanks
marvin c. thurmond
44 camden way
dallas.ga. 30157

MTC-00007708

From: AHWELLNESS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wrote a letter to Microsoft some time ago supporting them in the legal actions. They provided me with this address to continue to show my support...I agree that the settlement seems to be in the consumer's best interests, and I would like the litagatin to cease.

Anne Hazelton MD

MTC-00007709

From: Ronald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I Agree with California an the other eight states, that Microsoft is the one stalling. I agree with California and the other eight states. Microsoft should split into two or three corporations. They are a bullies.

Ron Bush
End User
Ronald J. Bush
bushr1@home.com

MTC-00007710

From: SUE BONK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:04am
Subject: Dept. of Justice Put a sock in it!
Settle this NOW!

MTC-00007711

From: Jasha Levi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:05am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is high time to let Microsoft be and let their competitors compete in the marketplace instead of trying to have the courts do it for them.

Jasha Levi

MTC-00007713

From: David P. Schwartz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:05am
Subject: comments on DOJ v. Microsoft
Gentlemen,

I am a professional computer software developer, and I've been working with and around computers for as long as Bill Gates (we're a year apart in age). While I have not read the proposed settlement in detail, I have read many accounts in the technical press

that seem to be in fair agreement, and I thought I'd register my comments. In a nutshell, I think the proposed settlement is off-point and will have virtually no impact in the market place or to any useful extent with either consumers or end users. It's an attempt to compensate for market forces that were in effect several years ago and that might not be relevant today.

For what it's worth, here's my opinion.

I agree that Microsoft has created a monopoly. The issue before the courts was focused on products and product bundling; however, this is not the culprit. The monopoly that Microsoft has so effectively created really lies in a distribution channel that reaches over 90% of all computer users in the North American hemisphere, and probably a majority of ALL users worldwide. The problem with that sort of monopoly is that the monopoly holder has the absolute right to say what goes into that channel. It's not that the products Microsoft chooses to bundle are good, bad, or indifferent. The problem is that the consumer is LOCKED OUT from EVER GETTING THE OPPORTUNITY TO CHOOSE ANY ALTERNATIVES!

Consider this: what if. . . 90% of telephone service was provided by Qwest? 90% of all grocery stores food distributors were owned by Safeway? 90% of all gasoline pipelines were owned by Mobil Oil? . . . And, the owners were also the producers of 100% of the products that were stocked and sold to their customers—meaning that all the services accessible by telephone (eg., long distance, voice mail, internet access, etc) were ALSO owned by Qwest; that 100% of the products found in a Safeway store were exclusively their in-house private label brands; that all the gasoline and oil available through Mobil gas stations was produced and owned by Mobil Oil. It's kind of scary to think about, isn't it? You'd go to the grocery store looking for Quaker Brand Oatmeal, and you have to settle with some gloppy in-house brand because . . . the price of the Quaker Oats product would be twice the cost of the in-house brand because the "house" would take a few tens of million dollars for the privilege of "bundling" it with their other products. (Look what they wanted to charge AOL just to advertise their internet service in Windows XP!) What other company, distributor, news source, publisher, government, or ANYBODY exists ANYWHERE that has that kind of market penetration AND CONTROL? I cannot think of a single one, other than possibly the US Post Office!

What is the impact on me as a software developer? Well, it's rather difficult for me to gain access to this distribution channel. In fact, it's practically impossible. AOL couldn't get into the XP distribution without practically selling their soul; what chance does a smaller company have? Z-E-R-O. That's the primary impact of this monopoly—when somebody buys a Compaq or Dell computer, the only products they get exposure to are from Microsoft (and a few other Fortune 50 companies that can afford the advertising costs). And that's mainly because of contracts between Microsoft and the OEM manufacturers. Even if those

contract terms are relaxed a bit, there's no way that smaller vendors are going to get to bundle their multimedia players and text editors with those systems!

The first automobiles were available in "any color you want, as long as it's black". That's ok when you're talking about a product market place with a few thousand or tens of thousands of customers. But today tens of millions of computers are sold each year. Nonetheless, as in Ford's time, consumers can get them outfitted with "any operating system you like, as long as it's from Microsoft". That's NOT a choice!

One measure of the settlement should be this: how do consumers choices change as a result? Frankly, I fail to see how this situation will possibly change given the proposed remedies. Assuming the proposed settlement goes through, in a year or three, will the average consumer have any more choices to him as to what software gets bundled and/or installed on his computer? I really don't see how.

AT&T was broken into several smaller pieces in order to separate the local phone access from the long-distance networks. Now the so-called Baby Bells want to get back into long distance markets, and AT&T wants to get back into local access markets. What solution has been put into place? Local carriers can get into long distance when they've opened their local markets to some percentage of competing carriers, and AT&T can get into local markets when it can demonstrate that its opened it's markets to some percentage of competing carriers. That makes sense. The practical impact of that hasn't been very effective in the market place, but at least it's a start.

WHAT I'D LIKE TO SEE:

As part of the settlement agreement, Microsoft should be required to include installation-time access to third-party products with every release of their software. The qualifications should be that anybody can submit anything as long as it meets certain clearly defined and easily measured criteria. That means that if AOL thinks that users might want to get access to AOL at the time they install Windows XP, the only option Microsoft has is to say "send us a link to your web site".

One thing I believe is that Microsoft will claim that virtually ANYTHING is an "integral part" of the operating system if it suits their fancy. Rather than argue about it, I'd say "the proof is in the pudding". If Microsoft is including something in the release of one of their products, then they should allow third parties to submit similar products as well. In other words, if they want to claim that an Internet Browser is part of the OS, then they cannot say that other Browsers should not be include. Conversely, if somebody wants to bundle a word processor and Microsoft says that's not part of the OS, then they can refuse to include it. However, if someone wants to bundle something roughly equivalent to Notepad or Wordpad, which are acknowledged parts of the standard Windows operating environment, then Microsoft could not deny them trying to say that they compete with Word instead.

In order to facilitate this, I'd suggest the establishment of a web site that is used to

promote third-party products that compete with things that Microsoft bundles directly in their products, and require Microsoft to modify their installer so that it connects to this web site at installation time and allows users to select among different tools available on the web site at that time. Some folks might not want to load the Windows Media Player, and might choose to install the WinAmp Media Player instead. Why not? Or, they could choose to load Netscape rather than Internet Explorer as their browser. If Microsoft wants to play games with the API so competitors' products don't work well, then play the same game as the phone companies—they can update their browser as soon as at least one other browser has been tested to be "compatible" with the operating system. Put the onus on Microsoft to provide CLEAR CRITERIA to facilitate successful compatibility testing.

I'd also like to see something in the remedy that addresses the abysmal level of support that's currently available for Microsoft's products, primarily their OEM products. Microsoft says that part of the reason they discount the licenses sold to OEMs is because their contracts require the OEMs to provide support. However, most don't provide any useful level of support, typically pushing it off on their retailers. Very few retailers ever hire the expertise needed to support Microsoft's products well. This is relevant to the monopolistic practices issue because it gives Microsoft a way to dis-own support needs for a very large percentage of its customers. If Microsoft was required to provide even a minimal level of support for their products, they would have to raise their OEM prices enough that the OEMs would in fact be in a position to make a viable choice among different bundling options. Today the OEMs are simply prostitutes for Microsoft products that they bundle with their hardware simply because nobody else can afford to offer them better deals. OEMs cannot afford to support the software that they bundle with their computers, and there's a tacit agreement that retailers and "certified technicians" will take up the slack. The truth is, they don't. But Microsoft gets the benefit of the doubt and is allowed to continue underpricing their products to OEMs using this fraudulent strategy. I think that requiring Microsoft to publish a single, uniform, OEM Price List that only offers volume purchase discounts and that imposes certain specific support requirements would go a long way towards solving this problem. (For example, an OEM can get an additional discount by providing the 800# for their phone support help desk. No support desk, no discount. Conversely, Microsoft would be required to provide the support for those OEMs, hence justifying the higher OEM price.)

Finally, I like the option that several of the States have proposed that forces Microsoft to publish the source code for the core Windows operating system and utilities and require them to license it more openly. This would allow third-parties and even OEMs to use it to compose different configurations, much the way that Linux distributions are really different compositions of mostly the same code bases. It would eliminate most of

the issues that have been keeping the OEMs hamstrung in their abilities to modify the boot-up processes of their machines, or shipping alternative browsers. It would also have a beneficial side-effect in that the OEMs would REALLY be required to support their products!

Thank you for taking the time to read this.
David Schwartz
P.O. Box 34338
Phoenix, AZ 85067

MTC-00007714

From: Richard Tackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:06am
Subject: what I think
waste of taxpayers money over nothing!!!!
I stand with Microsoft on this matter!!!!!!
Rich Tackett
19811 Portal Plaza
Cupertino, Calif. 95014
408 253-7810

MTC-00007715

From: Carl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs
I have been around the computer industry for 40 years and the one thing that stands out in the early days of the computer is that no companies were compatible with software or hardware. Now that one company got it all together and you can buy any hardware or software and be assured that it will run, the Government wants to shut this company down and change the whole industry and set it back to 1970. Microsoft has done it right and the only the disgruntled companies that can not compete want the Government to penalize Microsoft for being successful.

There are a lot of small business that rely on Microsoft and Windows to be the same always. If you do not know how important this is then you must be talking to lawyers and not Computer Developers and Users that were there when using a Computer was not this easy.

Carl Odiam
760 343 3759

MTC-00007716

From: helen bloomquist
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:06am
Subject: Microsoft Litigation
I am in favor of the comprehensive agreement with Microsoft, and vote that the case be settled immediately, without further litigation.

Helen Bloomquist

MTC-00007717

From: Kurt A. Buechler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings,

As a consumer, I am in support of the settlement of the DOJ lawsuit vs. Microsoft now on the table. In my opinion, the settlement is fair and should be enacted ASAP to assist the nation's economic recovery. I own no shares of Microsoft stock and share this opinion as a user of products

and services of Apple, America Online, and Microsoft corporations. I am neither an employee nor beneficiary of Microsoft Corp.

Sincerely,
Kurt A. Buechler
127 Claiborne Cove
Ridgeland, MS 39157
U.S.A.
(601) 853-3638
Kurt A. Buechler
Ridgeland, Mississippi
U.S.A.

MTC-00007718

From: LBGARRISON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let the settlement stand as is and let's get this fiasco over with. I thought this country was about entrepreneurship and better mousetraps, etc, but it seems to be moving closer to mediocrity every day, the result of penalizing anyone who can do something better than others. End it.

MTC-00007719

From: Richard Tackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:08am
Subject: microsoft is a great company and has done nothing wrong!!!!!!
microsoft is a great company and has done nothing wrong!!!!!!
Rich Tackett
19811 Portal Plaza
Cupertino, Calif. 95014 408 253-7810

MTC-00007720

From: Rev. Bill Mounce
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:08am
Subject: Microsoft Judgement
Sirs,

I am an often frustrated but dedicated Windows' user. I have been since Windows 2.1. At times I hate it. But I DO NOT believe Microsoft should be prosecuted for anything. They have been successful because, while they are not perfect, NO ONE has anything better. I feel it is their competitors whining because they are incapable of building anything better that has caused this entire mess at the taxpayer's cost. It is utterly ridiculous. If the other programs were better. . . I would definitely use them. But alas they are not and yet they want Microsoft broken up to cripple the company. The impact on the PC world and business' everywhere would be catastrophic. Let's end this nonsense now and let Microsoft do what they do best. . . build programs for the struggling PC industry. And if anyone else can build a better "mouse-trap", we, the consumers will judge with out money. Thank you.

Bill & Shandy Mounce
Leesville, LA 71446

MTC-00007721

From: Andy West
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings:

I would like to comment on the proposed settlement to the Microsoft anti-trust case. I

have read that certain clauses in section III of the purposed settlement give Microsoft rights unusual for a guilty party. Section III (D), in which Microsoft must disclose information needed for the software of other companies to interoperate with Windows, specifies in its footnotes that only commercial businesses alone receive these disclosures. This in effect bars universities, research laboratories and agencies of the Federal government itself from such information.

Section III (J)(2) gives the right to determine what constitutes a business—for the purpose of licensing APIs, documentation, or protocols—not to the Department of Justice but to Microsoft. This gives Microsoft leave to shut out not just non-commercial entities such as open-source projects, but even federal agencies in the course of their own software projects.

These are the only two clauses I have read about, but these two alone give Microsoft too much power to determine how the keystone of its monopoly may be used. I would like to ask that the settlement be renegotiated on at least these two clauses, if not for the sake of the open-source movement, then for the sake of the agencies and projects of the Federal government itself.

Sincerely,
Mark Andrew West
202 East Washington Street
Fairmount, Indiana 46928
Tel: 765-747-2919 (work)
Email: dysme@dysmey.org

MTC-00007722

From: padam2
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:09am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please use taxdollars to do something usefull. Stop going after microsoft and use your intellect to stimulate the economy rather than forever piling up the fees paid to selfserving legal entrepreneurs. I am retired and will not visit any of the states that continue to oppose a microsoft settlement.

MTC-00007723

From: SCHWEENER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I encourage you to get this settled. The economy won't start a full recovery until this is settled. Get it off the books!

Susan M. Swenson

MTC-00007724

From: CSand385@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:10am
Subject: settlement

it is time that the issue surrounding Microsoft be completed—if the Dept Of Justice has concluded thier tsettlement than the remaining states shoud follow suigt and stop wasting the taxpayers money—the iswsues of monopoly may have some vaility to it—but the benenfit far outweighs the punishment.

Sincerely
Carl Sanders
200 Elm Street
San Mateo. Ca. 94401

MTC-00007725

From: Khozem Poonawala
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:12am
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

Microsoft, or any company for that matter, should have the freedom to innovate. The Microsoft case should be settled, now, once and for all. It is good for America and the american economy.

Khozem Poonawala

MTC-00007726

From: George Aubrey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:21am
Subject: about time

This settlement should go forward and not delay causing more problems for the consumer. This lawsuit has caused enough problems by not allowing Microsoft freely develop their software. When Microsoft begins to gouge the consumer with high prices of their software then lets get them, in the meantime let the consumer call the shots.

MTC-00007727

From: TWOROME@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

I believe that Microsoft deserves fair and unbiased treatment. I am a supporter of Windows and of Microsoft integrating features. When the computer companies started, I could not afford the great features of the Apple and had to stick with a Vic 20. While dating myself a bit, I found Microsoft to be the only company willing to bring computing down to a level I could afford and my family could understand.

Please stop the nonsense. There are bigger fish such as Credit Card Companies that need to be stopped and Oil and Car companies that should be providing better alternatives and more fuel efficient cars. If you have any questions, please feel free to email back.

Thank you,
Tworome@aol.com

MTC-00007728

From: BUCELATO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can accept the ruling of the court BUT I feel that in an open society we can only advance if we provide an environment that supports innovative business strategies. Microsoft started from the bottom and made many investors wealthy, companies successful and our nation a leader in the software development. We need to ask the WHY should we handicap the leadership of current and future companies like Microsoft and allow them to ride on the coat tails by taking legal action.

I, as an INFORMED consumer, knew what I had bought and what the consequences of my decision . . . I assume the responsibility and accountability of my decisions . . . AND others need to do the same. Microsoft would not have grown if through individual research their products were rejected as occurred in many areas of technology.

John Bucelato
301 Willards Way
Yorktown, VA 23693
CC:BUCELATO@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00007729

From: David Watkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:13am
Subject: <no subject>

Dear Sirs: I am anxious to see the case against Microsoft settled in a manner that is fair to all parties, and does not infringe upon Microsoft's freedom to innovate, to make creative use of a free market to aggressively market its widely used and superior products to the world. I feel that a quick and fair settlement to this case is in the best interest of the consumers and the economy of our country. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to express my opinion.

Sincerely,
David Watkins

MTC-00007730

From: Alex Melli
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:15am
Subject: My Opinion

To who it may concern:

Regarding the Anti-Trust case against Microsoft Corp., and the pending penalty phase, I would like to register my opinion. I do not agree with the penalties being assessed. The proposed penalties I've heard, involving Microsoft contributing loads of computers and software to schools is not appropriate for several reasons:

- It is creating future users (i.e. customers) for Microsoft. It's like letting a drug company give a vitamin to schoolchildren, making them dependent on it and creating a future customer.
- This is actually a bonus for Microsoft, giving them more inroads to the education market!
- The penalty is a minor inconvenience at worst. For that corporation, it is the equivalent of a parking ticket.
- The were found GUILTY of a violation, so the price to pay should be a proactive move to repair their damage AND make sure it does not happer further.
- It is difficult to asses the value of any donated computers of software. Software should be assessed by physical cost of the product. So donating a single program does not count as \$300, but the actual cost to the company, probably around \$20.

If Microsoft is to be properly penalized, one factor *should* be an educational donation. The order of money should be in the hundreds of millions (this is supposed to be a penalty, after all), and it should be a flat out cash payment. It should be left to the recipient of the money what to do with it, not the party being "penalized." And why should the guilty part have any say in what their penalty is in the first place? If I think that speeding ticket is too much, do I have any choice? NO. The law dictates my punishment, and I'm bound to that. Just because Microsoft is the biggest player in the game, they are still a player, not the referee.

BOTTOM LINE: Microsoft needs to be PENALIZED for being found GUILTY. And

on a final note, the argument that breaking up Microsoft would have too big of an impact on the entire computer industry (and the economy) should be proof in itself that the company is a monopoly. . .

Sincerely,
Alex Melli
Laguna Beach, California

MTC-00007732

From: Gooddadone@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:16am
Subject: (no subject)

Microsoft is the Ford Motor Company of the computer business. It is a shame to penalize a company for being the forward looking and the brains of the industry. Shame on the justice department, our government penalizing a company for doing what is correct, for inventing their components for their use in order to better serve the public.

Ed Logue gooddadone@juno.com

MTC-00007734

From: A. Bairamian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement. I support DOJ decision to settle the Microsoft lawsuit.

This ill-advised lawsuit—instigated by jealous competitors and presided over by a biased judge—has caused great harm to Microsoft and the entire tech sector.

It is time to end this useless lawsuit, so Microsoft can go back to producing and innovating.

A. Bairamian
Glendale, CA.

MTC-00007735

From: David Demland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:17am
Subject: Microsoft Comments

Dear Mrs. Hesse,
Here are my comments about the Microsoft settlement.

David Demland
3506 E. Glenrosa
Phoenix, AZ 85018
(602) 955-3248
demland@home.com
Renata Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street, NW Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mrs. Hesse,
I would like to introduce myself. My name is David Demland. I have been in software development for almost 15 years. I have work in all aspects of software development during my career. For the past three years I have been a Quality Assurance (QA) manager. I have spent most of my career centered on not only the software that is developed, but the way software is developed. I have worked hard to get developers to understand that we have to have a goal of “no defects”, weather or not we can produce “no defects”. I have done everything from writing code to leading projects and development teams. I say all of this so that it may be clear that I am an expert in the area of software and software development. I wish that all the following comments are taken in that light. The

following comments reflect my feelings about the U.S. Government and Microsoft settlement.

I wish to thank the U.S. Government and the Nine States that have settled this long awaited case for all their due diligence and hard work to finally settle this landmark case. All of us in this industry are in your debt for this work. If for no other reason than that we now know that if a hi-tech company can obtain a monopoly they may break the law all they want to remove competition and nothing will happen. Not long ago I had the hope that free competition and a fair business ethic might return to our industry leader, I now know that will never happen. In July of 1998 there was a great article in the Arizona Republic about John D. Rockefeller and Bill Gates. This article was about a new book called “Titan” by Ron Chernow. This book told about Rockefeller and the author of the article showed how much alike Bill Gates was in respect to business. The only difference is that Rockefeller was not as successful as Gates in getting the government to accept that a monopoly should be allowed to do what it wants with no penalties. Did the author of this article know something at that time that the rest of us missed?

As I have read and followed just about everything that came out from the trial all the way down to this proposed settlement one thing has come to mind over and over again—everything being talked about seems to focus on how Microsoft has conducted its business in the past and how to keep them from doing these practices again in the future. Yet everything points to how fast this industry changes. This leads to a simple question: How will restricting the way Microsoft conducted itself in the 90's apply to today's conduct when the business practices have already changed in the industry as a whole and Microsoft is doing the same thing but in different ways? As a guide I will use the Competitive Impact Statement that describes the way this proposal will work. On page 4 there are two bulleted points that came to my attention right a way, for reference they are the third and fourth bullet points. Both of these points are to ensure that third parties can work with Microsoft products. At this point there are no time lines mention, but the point is clear that this will be done so that third parties have time to get their products to work with Microsoft products. These missing time lines will need to be kept in mind, there will be times I will return to these points again.

I find it interesting that on page 14 it talks about the court findings that: Microsoft threatened to cancel development of its “Office for Macintosh” software, which, as Microsoft recognized, was critical to Apple's business. Microsoft required Apple to make Internet Explorer its default browser and restricted Apple's freedom to feature and promote non-Microsoft browsing software, in order to protect the applications barrier to entry. Yet the current provisions really do not address this behavior. Of course this would mean that Microsoft would have to have a monopoly on office suites was well. Since this has not been an issue in the court it needs to be looked at to understand the company culture. In the industry today, for

the most part, it has been conceded that MS Office is a monopoly in the office suite arena

1. Will Microsoft use this tactic again? This will be certain.

1. Window XP / .NET Microsoft's Expanding Monopoly, <http://www.consumerfed.org/WINXP—anticompetitive—study.pdf> A look at what has become known as the halloween documents will give a very detail insight about this issue
2. In the first halloween document Microsoft implies that a way to beat Unix in general would be “Fold extended functionality into protocols / services and create new protocols”. This look shows that in the same matter that Microsoft blackmailed Apple they would blackmail the whole industry if they could. Many thought that Microsoft would never extend a recognize standard after the halloween documents were published, yet in Windows 2000, W2K, Microsoft did just that. A well known and accepted security standard was added to by Microsoft. This standard is called Kerberos. Once again the use of the Microsoft OS can be used by Microsoft to change the industry just by doing. Where does this behavior help the industry and the consumer except just to push Microsoft's dominance farther? In Wired magazine there was a comment about the change that Microsoft was going through at that time when Steve Ballmer was moved into Bill Gates position of presidency. James Wallace said: 2. These are internal Microsoft documents that was published on the internet. After these papers were published, Microsoft not only admitted that were real, but Microsoft went as far as to say this is the way they do normal business. These can be found at: <http://www.opensource.org/halloween1.html>, <http://www.opensource.org/halloween12.html>, and <http://www.opensource.org/halloween3.html>, Ballmer's promotion “represents a fundamental shift away from workgroup computing into not only enterprise computing but internet computing, which requires a different sensitivity” 3. 3. Why Bill Gates Quit His Job, by James Wallace, Wired December 1998 Could it be that James Wallace saw what Consumer Federation of America just reported in September 2001? Once again I ask: How can Microsoft be held accountable in a 2001 software industry using a 1990's industry model when the industry has changed so much? Are we saying that when an industry changes fast enough a business that breaks the law should be allowed to because they can change the industry before any sanctions are handed out to them?

1. Window XP / .NET Microsoft's Expanding Monopoly, <http://www.consumerfed.org/WINXP—anticompetitive—study.pdf> At the top of page 18 there is a discussion about what Microsoft Middleware is. The way this has been defined it allows Microsoft to tell the industry what the middleware is, not what the market believes. To understand how this effects the industry as a whole I will relate a story of a problem I ran into that cost the business I worked for eight months of work and left many of our customers in a bind. Microsoft create the Microsoft Data Access

Component, MDAC, to allow Windows applications to use different ODBC drivers to access databases. When Office 2000 was released, Microsoft release a new version of MDAC. This version of MDAC was not compatible with previous version. There were many problems with Microsoft including a new service pack release that had the same problems. To make a long story short it took eight months to get the two fixes to allow both of our products to work with this new MDAC. This is a very high price for a small business. Does this sound like a business that is trying to work with well their customers? What does this story mean to this settlement? Well if Microsoft can say what is middleware by themselves, what are companies like the one I work for to do? Are we always going to be expected to keep rewriting our products to match what Microsoft tells us to do just because they have a monopoly on the OS and they do not have to care about us as small businesses?

1. Window XP / .NET Microsoft's Expanding Monopoly, <http://www.consumerfed.org/WINXP—anticompetitive—study.pdf>

2. These are internal Microsoft documents that was published on the internet. After these papers were published, Microsoft not only admitted that were real, but Microsoft went as far as to say this is the way they do normal business. These can be found at: <http://www.opensource.org/halloween1.html>, <http://www.opensource.org/halloween12.html>, and <http://www.opensource.org/halloween3.html>. Wait a minute, this settlement dictates that this will not happen because middleware API's have to be disclosed. Take a moment at look closely at this case. Where in this story did anything deal with an API? In fact just after this Office release became a big enough deal to developers, Microsoft announced that MDAC would become part of OS 2. All these problems were backward compatibility issues and this is just one of the new tools Microsoft can use to control the industry in the new environment that has changed since the 1990's and this settlement does not even address these types of issues. Once again I ask, are hi-tech business allow to break any laws they wish and because the industry changes so fast there is nothing that can be done about it?

2. This was at Microsoft developer days here in Phoenix that later the next year. This problem of Microsoft doing what ever they want to control the industry appears on page 19 as well. In the last paragraph a Microsoft Middleware Product mentions the Microsoft's Java Virtual Machine. Did you know that this no longer exists? Microsoft, after losing to Sun on the Java Virtual Machine, JVM, issues has now created a new language and drop support for JVM. How is this going to effect the industry? Once again because Microsoft is using it's monopoly power to force business to rewrite all their products. It is now clear how Steve Ballmer has lead Microsoft into the internet age the same way as Bill Gates lead Microsoft into the 1990's. Their goal is to keep Microsoft the largest player no matter how it effects the consumer or other businesses. What do you

think John D. Rockefeller would say today after seeing his business penalized and Microsoft left to doing it over and over again? What is the consumer to think? In all this there is another accomplice to the dirty deeds of Microsoft. This is the government. That's right. On page 20, the last three lines, the government has told the country do not start a business in an area that will compete with Microsoft Middleware it can not be allowed. Where do I get this from? It is simple, what was the last start-up company able to sell at least a million copies of their product from the start? I have yet to find one. So what this means is if there is a start-up in one of these areas do not worry Microsoft does not have to tell you anything. So just think, after spending a lot of money you will go out of business anyway. What a way to go. The government has said as long as the current competition can stay alive there will be competition, but once that competition is gone, O well. Once again thank you for looking out for the consumer. As it is stated on page 21 this "is intended to avoid Microsoft's affirmative obligations... being triggered by minor, or even, nonexistent, products that have not established a competitive potential in the market". This is a great thought, if there is no competition, how can you be a monopoly? How is no new competition good for the consumer? I find the commits on page 24 at the bottom of the page rather odd:

Thus, the key to the proper remedy in this case is to end Microsoft's restrictions on potentially threatening middleware, prevent it from hampering similar nascent threats in the future and restore the competitive conditions created by similar middleware threats. How is this going to be achieved if over a million copies are required on page 21? This seems to be a contradiction to me. Am I missing something? As if this has not been technical enough let's talk about how the dual boot is to be done on page 26. At the current time W2K was released with a small problem, it does not look at the BOIS for the hard disk information at boot up time. This basically renders tools like System Commander useless. So how is a consumer, or GEM, going to be able to use these tools if Microsoft bypasses common practices. Where is this address to ensure that there is no subversion to activating other partitions and making these tools and their manufactures useless. One argument is that this is an API that has to be disclosed, but if it takes months for this information to become available there is no way to have fixes in place for these companies that create these tools. This will be looked at close a little later.

On page 27 is one of the best examples of how the government failed to help support the free market competition. Here the industry has been told that if you are not one of the 20 largest OEMs, that Microsoft licenses to, you can be locked out of information. This is great, once again any small company has been told that they should not enter into this industry. Does this mean that the government supports only having large business? If not how will a small business be able to compete under this section? Even on page 20 and 28 the message

seems to be clear the top 20 OEMs are the only ones that count.

On page 32 there are two issues. At the bottom of the page it talks about dual boot systems being allowed. As I have already talked about, how it this going to be handled if Microsoft continues to bypass standard practices on boot up? If tools like System Commander can be rendered useless what is going to keep Microsoft from allowing this same issues on a dual boot system to discourage OEMs from shipping these systems. Would it not have made more since to ensure that Microsoft uses the industry standards to ensure they do not subvert this issue? I think a very important issue has been missed in this area.

The best part of this page is at the end of the first paragraph. I would like to thank you for penalizing all of us in the industry for Microsoft abusing their monopoly power. I find it outrageous that is was agreed that OEMs must use software substitutions that act like the Microsoft software that it is being substituted for. Is it assumed that these OEMs write their own software? If so that is wrong. There are many companies, like the small ones I have worked for, that do this software and you have just told them if it cost tens of thousands of dollars to rewrite their software do it if they want an OEM use your software in place of Microsoft. What did these businesses do wrong to deserve this penalty?

On page 43 it talks about Microsoft putting information on their MSDN for APIs and other important information that has to be shared. I found this amusing because it does not say how this information should be handled on MSDN. In fact this has allowed Microsoft a great way to make more money off of developers. They can put this information on MSDN in a hidden place and when developers call to find it they can be charged to find out where it is. What a penalty for breaking the law.

Now we come to the timeline items. On page 35 the proposal for the releasing of the XP APIs is a great try, but it still gives Microsoft about a year lead time to get a head of all the other developers. I have created, and maintained, this type of documentation at two different businesses in my career and in every case I have had this type of documentation before we got to far into the early stages of testing. Microsoft should already have this as well. It should not take more than two or three months, at most, to polish these API documents to make them public. I find it hard to accept that the definition of this timeline, for documentation, is different for the middleware products. I have a real problem with timeline of the last major beta before release before the first release candidate for the middleware products. In most cases this will be only a couple of months before the final release. This will make it hard for other developers to make changes to work in a timely matter. Especially when there are multimillion lines of code in many products today. Please see above about the MDAC story. The standard that the industry tends to follow for a beta test is best put: The product has completed all of the major features content that has been planned for the final release... During the beta release, the product

will be tested for its functionality, specifically with regard to defects.

1. Michael E. Bays—Software Release Methodology 1999 Prentice-Hall This definition makes it clear that the industry believes that at the time of the beta test all functionality is complete, this means that the APIs are complete as well, otherwise it would be an alpha test and the product is still changing. Does this timeline not allow Microsoft to hold back information for middleware APIs until it is hard for competitors to be ready at the same time as Microsoft? How does this keep Microsoft from locking out software like Netscape? Please see page 12. Pages 36—38 deals with protocols but it misses the fundamental problem with Microsoft and how they can hurt the industry and the consumer. How can protocols be talked about without including industry standards? Microsoft has shown that it will do what ever it takes to keep their monopoly. This has been well proven in the trial court level and upheld in the appellate court level. Yet this fact seems to have been over looked when it comes to the use of industry standard protocols by Microsoft. Microsoft has had proposals internally placed on the table to extend common protocols to help lock out competitors 1.

1. Halloween documents <http://www.opensource.org/halloween1.html>, <http://www.opensource.org/halloween12.html>, and <http://www.opensource.org/halloween3.html>, This issue was thrust into the fore front when W2K was released with Kerberos. Microsoft had extended this common industry standard to try to lock out other Unix computers. Microsoft's extension to this industry standard is also a major part of the European case against Microsoft. It also shows how much power Microsoft has to destroy computer connectivity. Why is it that nothing has been said about Microsoft doing as so many of the smaller businesses, in this industry, must do have to have these standards changed? That is make Microsoft have to go before these bodies to get these standards changed instead of being able to dictate to the whole industry a new standard. If this issue is not addressed Microsoft will be able to use this ability to change standards to continue their predatory monopoly actions even in the new Internet age. Can one company be allowed to dictate to the whole world how business should be ran? Should not Microsoft be forced to use common standards so that all competitors will have a chance?

On page 39 the whole world has been told that Microsoft does not have to disclose protocols if these disclosures would compromise system security. Listed items are anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing, digital rights management, encryption and authentication features. First of all, Microsoft is not the only business that has had find ways to handle anti-piracy, antivirus, software licensing, and digital rights management. Every business that produces software has had these issues and all of them have found a way to make them work. The only difference is that all the other business have not always be able to have both the OS and the application under their control. So

these businesses have turned to common industry standards, and practices, to find a solutions. Why should Microsoft be able to change these standards just because they are the largest software company and control the OS and office suites? As far as encryption and authentication, how does this section protect the industry and consumer from being blackmailed by Microsoft into lower or less secure standards?

How can this type of control and influence be bad for the consumer? Bill Gates once said to the German magazine (FOCUS) that bugs (defects) are unimportant 1. Also Microsoft, itself, has documented that there were 63,000 known defects in Windows 2000, W2K, when it shipped 2. If it is more important to Microsoft to get the product out than to get a properly running product out, how can Microsoft be trusted to do a protocol standard right without other industry leaders giving input?

1. FOCUS Oct 23, 1995—found on-line at <http://www.cantrip.org/nobugs.html>

2. Microsoft, Who Let the Bugs Out? osOpinion.com Oct 23, 2001—found on-line at <http://www.osopinion.com/perl/story/14306.html> Page 40 allows Microsoft to enter into a contract with a developer that limits that developer from promoting other competing software if such limitation are reasonably necessary. The problem here is what does this really mean. For example, if Microsoft is working on a contract with a business that has some existing file converters to bring in other word processing formats into Word for Windows, WinWord, can Microsoft restrict the contracting company from exporting from WinWord so that there is no way to convert out of the Microsoft product? How does this wording work in the internet business model?

On page 45 the second paragraph talks about removing middleware. How is this effected with help files? No matter what browser is installed on a Microsoft computer, when the HTML help system is invoked Internet Explorer, IE, is the only browser used to display the HTML files. This means that no matter what browser is used to surf the internet IE must be present for HTML help to work. How does this section handle this issue? Does this not allow Microsoft to continue this practice?

Also on this same page it is talked about the technical changes to W2K and XP, yet it only gives a timeline for the XP changes. What happens to W2K? There are many consumers that have privacy issues with XP so it is very important that W2K changes must be made and W2K must be maintained.

On page 48 it states that Microsoft can not prompt a user for OEM custom changes for 14 days. Does this mean that Microsoft can then prompt the user all the time until they get so fed up with the prompts they allow Microsoft to change the computer configuration? Why is this even in the document? Is Microsoft saying that if an OEM sets up a computer that users are to stupid to change the factory settings? Why not leave users alone altogether? I give you all a hand for the concept of the TC. This is a great way to ensure that Microsoft abides by the settlement without creating a whole new branch of the government to do the oversight.

I have just one question: Who's stupid idea was it to add the section on page 58 that the TC information can not be used in any proceeding before the Court? Is this a "get out of jail free card" for Microsoft? Are you trying to make it cost the tax payer more money to make sure Microsoft plays by the rules? Is this a loophole that Microsoft can use later so that it can get off the hook after it has failed to follow this settlement? What am I missing? This is something to lead the public to believe that Microsoft is paying a price for breaking the law when it is doing nothing but rewarding Microsoft for do something that no other company has been able to do; break the law and get away with it? This whole section should be removed.

Again on page 60 it looks like there is another loophole that is good for Microsoft and not for the consumer. It says that after the initial five years of this settlement the Plaintiffs may ask for a two year extension. What happens if Microsoft still has problems in the two year extension, nothing? What is the public to think about this? If Microsoft puts up with the TO long enough that everything will go away not matter what? Is this fair for a company that broke the law? On page 62, where there is a list of relief that was looked at but not part of the settlement. In this list there were a couple of items that I find hard to believe were not part of this settlement. I find these two issues to hard to skip over with the weight of what this outcome has on the consumer and the industry as a whole. The first one not ensuring that Microsoft includes non-Microsoft middleware in its distribution of the Windows Operating System. The example here was the Java Virtual Machine, JVM. I go back to what I said before, are we to believe that only Microsoft knows where the direction of the industry should be going? Or should we take it that Microsoft should be allowed to find new ways to maintain it's monopoly at the expense of the consumer? What is it so hard to about Microsoft being require Microsoft follow industry standards like any other business? Is everyone afraid that Microsoft would have to compete with more competition if this is done? After all is it unreasonable for Microsoft to lower the barrier to entry since that was one of the key points of this whole case?

The other item in this list was requiring Microsoft to fully support industry standards. Was this dropped because to force this on Microsoft would also allow other competitors into the market place? Does this point to this whole settlement being nothing more than smoke and mirrors? These two items alone could have great impact on restoring competition to the market. How could these have been overlooked, or removed from the list? Now lets look at some of the other overlooked problems with this settlement. Right now Microsoft seems to have a lot of security problems. This may be misleading in some ways. What I mean is that Microsoft may not be any worst at security than any one else, but because there is no other real competition it makes Microsoft a perfect target

1. This would lead one to believe that for the public's best interest there needs to be a viable option to the Windows OS. This will

never happen as long as Microsoft continues down its current path of total monopolization of the PC OS. This is where this settlement fails the most. I would hope that this is not that hard to see and understand, am I wrong?

1. Good security administration is crucial by Madeline Bennett, IT Week Friday October 19, 2001. On Page 10 of Competitive Impact Statement there is a perfect commit that says that users want to know the OS will have the needed applications before investing in an OS. This is important observation. Where does this settlement help towards that goal? Or is it that this goal is to big of a price to be paid for hurting the consumer and destroying competition with predatory practices? How could the Declaration of Carl Shapiro be overlooked when he said that one of the reasons that Linux failed to be competition to Windows is because of the lack of popular applications like Microsoft Office 1. This alone would allow competition back into this industry. So why not have Microsoft port its office suite to Linux? Would this not help restore true competition without rewarding Microsoft for breaking the law? If Microsoft had to port this suite and was required to support it on the Linux platform for three years would not that do much better over all? Just think, if Microsoft had a product line on Linux, it would be less likely to "expand" industry protocols to lock out an OS that it would be trying to recover their expense for porting to. What would be wrong with this? Or are you saying that the industry and consumer are not important in this matter?

1. Declaration of Carl Shapiro page 3. These types of relief would go very far to really help innovation by allowing true competition back into the market place. This is what this industry, and the consumer, need. Overall the current settlement penalizes other business for Microsoft's conduct and it even rewards Microsoft for breaking the law. This is a shame. I hope that this is reject and a real settlement that benefits the industry and consumers is reached.

In the above commits it should also be clear that this settlement, as currently proposed, will do nothing in keeping Microsoft from using predatory practices with the way the current market is moving. We can not expect reliefs based off of the way the industry worked in the past to apply to the way it does business today when it is a different business world and the current settlement does not take that into account. This must not be overlooked if real relief is to be made for the consumer and for the industry as a whole. There are many ways that this settlement encourages Microsoft to continue its current goals for removing all competitors from the market and that means there was a lot of wasted money to get a court ruling that does not change anything. At what point will it finally be accepted that Microsoft will only learn a lesson if it required to give up some of its monopoly power? When will the industry and the consumer finally be defended?

Thank You,
David Demland

MTC-00007736

From: Robert Corkrum

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:18am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Move on!!!!!!The few attorneys generals holding up this settlement need to understand that everyone but them has moved on.It's a new economy stupid! thanks Bob

MTC-00007737

From: ginih
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:19am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I disagree with the tearing apart of Microsoft. It seems if anyone in the U.S. comes up with a wonderful invention there is always someone who is jealous of them. They want a part of it & so they sue. Look at A.T.T. the little companys wanted a part of them. So they sued every time they started to go bankrupt. They also use the Bell Co. lines at very little cost. Do you think we could go into McDonalds & rent their grills for very little money? I don't think sooooo. It's time to tell the sue happy people to crawl back in their holes. If they can't come up with good ideas of their own, don't let them sue & steal from the Co.'s that are contributing to the economy. Let Microsoft alone, they are the creative Company.

MTC-00007738

From: Charlotte Kenworthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello, It is my opioion that the Microsoft settlement is a fair and just settlement. It is time to move on and put this whole ordeal behind us. Competitors and special interest groups have carried this far enough...let's abide by given settlement. Charlotte Kenworthy

MTC-00007739

From: CANDA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think it is time for the government to leave Microsoft alone. Why not go after the drug manufacturers and their deals made with insurance companies. The under the counter deals are not in the best interest of the consumers and should be covered by anti trust laws. Microsoft is o.k. and even though I do not use their internet services, they continue to give me excellent service. I agree with Ted Kennedy when he said the case against Microsoft sounded like "sour apples". I will continue to use the products of Microsoft even if they are more expensive because their products are more user friendly. Thank you,

Carolyn
Hinton

MTC-00007740

From: Brent Kopp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement as proposed should be accepted by both parties. True, MS is a tough and ruthless competitor. That will force anyone attempting to break their dominant

position to develop a new software or computing method that will be a significant improvement in order to impress the using public. The "market" is a rough and tumble setting, the higher the reward the greater the energy and risk taking and the more likely chance of really better, as opposed to merely different, products that will benefit the using community.

Their are times when the MS programs drive me crazy with their uncorrected programming errors, syntax mistakes and just sloppy lines of code. But I trust the competitive market more than a government agency to bring me relief. Also, in my opinion the former lawyers in the anti trust division gave too much credence to the complainers(Netscape etc..) who perhaps influenced this entire affair thru their campaign contributions and their political allies. It has been sordid from the start, so let's get it put to bed.

Brent Kopp
saguaroSpouting@earthlink.net
EarthLink: It's your Internet.

MTC-00007741

From: bevnels@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:22am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In my opinnion, government should get out of the way of free enterprise and let it do the job it does so well!! Microsoft has—and is—providing a good product at a fair price. Consumers are not unsatisfied!

The ones unsatisfied are those who don't have the ability to compete.

Nels

MTC-00007742

From: Clyde w. Butler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi ! I would like to see the Microsoft case settled and let them have the right to innovate ! Thank you !!!!

Clyed W. Butler
cwmjb@defnet.com

MTC-00007743

From: HDMcBRIDE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

the government should settle, Micorsoft has been great for the economy of the Northwest and has enabled business that use computers more competative.

H.D. McBride

MTC-00007744

From: William C. Caccamise Sr. , M.D.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has revolutionized the computer field and the practical use of the Internet by millions of people. It is the Jewel of the American capitalistic system. I have always felt that Mr. Gates should be given the highest civilian award offered by our government. The aggressive attack on Microsoft by the Clinton Administration was a disservice to the computer world and society itself.

I know that my entire family including my grandchildren, my children, my wife, and myself—all avid computer users—are indebted to Microsoft for making the computer world and The Informational Age available to us in such a practicable manner. We hope that the DOJ will allow Microsoft to proceed freely in its unending goal of ever improving our access to the world of computers, software, and the Internet.

Thank you Microsoft—and Mr. Gates—for making the retirement years of this 78 year old physician years filled with excitement and learning.

Sincerely,
William Charles Caccamise Sr, MD
12 South Pittsford Hill Lane
Pittsford, New York
wccaccamise@hotmail.com
Telephone : 1-585-381-3855
FAX: 1-585-385-1355

MTC-00007745

From: ann.reid@thomsonlearning.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to let the settlement regarding Microsoft go through for all states. It is of no benefit to anyone to delay this process any further. One of the many great American ideals is the free market economy in which the best companies can survive. Because a company is more innovative than its competitors is no reason to prevent it from continuing its business.

MTC-00007746

From: Supern1987@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:25am
Subject: (no subject)

Tell these renegade states to knock it off and get back to the nations business!

MTC-00007747

From: Muelgroup@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer user, I feel that the settlement is more than fair. Consumers world wide have been benefitted by innovation created by competition. I firmly believe that Microsoft competitors are misusing the court system to gain what they could not attain in the market place.

Edward J. Mueller
15000 Village Greem Drive # 40
Mill Creek, Wa 98012

MTC-00007748

From: BCStephenson@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case as soon as possible: the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable.

Regards,
Brad Stephenson
San Marcos, CA

MTC-00007749

From: morales
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 12:29am

Subject: Bill is God.

Microsoft rules! Resistance is futile. You will be assimilated.

morales
3024 west 25
cleveland, oh, 44113

morales@nccw.net

Victories are temporary, however failure is forever.

MTC-00007750

From: Bob Rasmussen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

May it please the court, I appreciate as a consumer, the opportunity, and right to comment on the settlement agreement between the Microsoft Corporation, and the United States Department of Justice. My comments come as a consumer, specific to the issues that relate to my purchase, use, and experience with the many software products available today, which include those developed and sold by Microsoft.

In the roughly three years that this case has been under trial, I have read much of the available information on the trial, as well as the many, many statements given by competitors of Microsoft, and their concern with Microsoft's behavior, both before and during the trial. Never in my recollection of watching the business world have I observed such a concerted effort by numerous companies to malign and destroy the image, perception, and products, of a successful company. And what amazes me even more is that to a large degree, these companies employ many of the very same tactics used by Microsoft yet without any apparent threat of reproof. America Online (heretofore referred to as AOL) is a company that for every intent and purpose, has today the vast majority of Internet users as customers for their service. Effectively, they are presently as we speak, a monopoly in that industry. Yet to read any news publication today, the most that fact will bring is a limp assertion that yes, AOL is the predominant Internet Service Provider (heretofore referred to as ISP), with roughly 30 million subscribers, and it is left at that. No one is investigating AOL, no Congressional Hearings are scheduled, and in fact, great care is taken to ensure that their product and service in this industry is insulated from competition.

During their recent merger with Time Warner, Inc., the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) had the opportunity in their review of the merger, to require AOL to make their instant messenger service compatible with other similar services. As a consumer, I can instantly relate to the importance and advantage of such a requirement. The FCC however did not capitalize on that opportunity, and as a result, the media giant continues to lock out users of other ISP services from communicating with AOL subscribers.

In comparison, when I review and observe the Microsoft case, as well as comments associated, I see that products where I as a consumer realize a benefit, are under constant scrutiny, not only from the government, but even more so from

competitors. For example, the various versions of the Windows operating system have for years offered a form of a media player, which is presently under dispute by many competitors, as that application or device resides within the latest version of the Windows product, Windows XP. For years that was not a concern, but now another company exists, RealNetworks, which offers for free a download player called RealPlayer. Suddenly a benefit that I had as a consumer with the purchase of an operating system is threatened because another company wants to limit what is contained within the operating system. Regardless of the fact that any consumer can download for free the RealPlayer, RealNetworks Inc., for one, among others, protests the inclusion of Microsoft's Media Player within the operating system because it competes directly with what RealNetworks would like to give away for free. The bottom line? As a consumer, I see the potential of a very robust and "application capable" operating system, one that offers me great flexibility and performance, being required to reduce it's service and functionality to me so that others can improve their opportunity to compete. Yet the fact is, this product offered by RealNetworks is an easy download, and is often loaded onto machines alongside of Microsoft's Media Player anyway. Twenty years ago, there might have been a case to consider here. Consumers were still getting their feet wet in determining the right hardware and software to purchase, and many were easily confused, and possibly misled in the process. Today however consumers are quite prepared to make well informed decisions about their hardware and software purchases. With a plethora of information available, through various forms of communication (media, print, Internet, classes, service companies, etc) the consumer has more than enough information available to help them in their purchasing decisions. And frankly, that is supposed to be what all of this is about:

The consumer, and the protection of their purchasing power and decisions. In fact, everyone from Senator Orrin Hatch, to Ann Bingham (head of Antitrust Division, original investigation, 1995) to Judge Penfield Jackson has stated all along that the it was the consumer they were representing in their fight against Microsoft. However the ramifications of their actions has been anything but positive for consumers. I have today countless choices of software I can run on my PC, simply because of the operating system standard provided by Microsoft. I do not use Microsoft software exclusively, nor do any of the people I see regularly who work with computers. As a consumer, I feel I am quite well informed about what products exist in the marketplace, and I am quite confident I can make intelligent choices about the products I wish to purchase. However I believe that of ALL the interests represented in the courtroom, in the media, and in print, the consumer's interests have been the least heard or considered. Companies like Sun Microsystems, Oracle, AOL, Novell, Apple, & IBM are not nearly so interested in what works well for me as a consumer, as they are interested in gaining

market share for their own respective companies. If this settlement is derailed, through the lobbying of companies like this, it will prove once and for all that competition, and consumer choice in the marketplace, no longer determine or direct the outcome of products and services, as they have for the last several hundred years.

Market share, and competitive advantage cannot and should not be awarded in a courtroom. The measures within this settlement agreement are sufficient to ensure that Microsoft cannot take unfair advantage of, or punish any company in the future. At the same time however it preserves Microsoft's right and ability to continue to provide the best product possible, which is for me, the consumer, the best and only appropriate outcome.

The additional measures sought by the nine rouge states go well beyond what is necessary, and actually threaten the intellectual property of one of the country's most successful businesses (and this frankly, threatens us all). No other company in this country (or the world for that matter), has been required to dismantle it's showcase product, to it's own demise and destruction, simply to appease the wishes of less successful competitors. To do so now, would unfairly serve only those companies, and would destroy much of the gain realized by consumers through Microsoft's achievements in product integration. If this court truly values the purchasing power of millions of consumers, who are today quite savvy about what kinds of software they need and want, it will allow this settlement to stand, and repel the imperious demands of the nine states that remain as extreme and overreaching. Thank you for your time and attention to review my comments.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Rasmussen
rasm47@nidlink.com

MTC-00007751

From: Gary Sanford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:34am
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 overwhelmingly agree that the settlement is good for the industry and the American economy. I further believe prolonged litigation would only stifle innovation and just benefit a handful of well financed competitors. Sincerely,

Gary A. Sanford
17708 10th Ave N.E.
Shoreline, Wa 98155-3706

MTC-00007752

From: Alfred Holzheu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
Wake up and smell the coffee. We can buy the most incredible engineering marvel of our

day (NT) or even Windows for the price of a video game. In what possible way has the public ever been harmed. This insanity (the whole government case against MS) could only be created and promulgated by entirely clueless lawyers, who have no conception of what it takes to create an operating systems or what life was like prior to MS. I doubt that they are angels, but no successful company ever is. The bottom line is what they have done to and for the general public and even mankind as a whole. I can't imagine any possible scenario that trivializes what MS has accomplished into something somehow detrimental to the public, the USA or mankind as a whole. Instead of taxing the public (and a tax it is, since MS must tack on the price of fighting the case to their products and we pay taxes to pay for the num-nuts who are prosecuting this case) with this ridiculous lawsuit, we should be cheering them on. About the only "remedy" that I can even possibly see is the requirement for MS to keep an open book regarding the various Window API's so that their well-earned and deserved defacto monopoly in the operating system area does not preclude others from creating useable and robust third party apps. Even this is a bit of a fool's errand, as the question as to exactly what an operating systems is, is in constant flux. I don't wish to pay lawyers forever chasing an accelerating train. There used to be a Hotel under construction in my town that we jokingly call the "Old carpenters rest home" because of the length of time it took to build it. I fear this lawsuit will become the same.

Whenever a lawyer in the government's employ runs out of meaningful work to do, they can bill a few hours to the "Never ending case". Lets give this up, and stop penalizing MS and ultimately us by this frivolous lawsuit.

Sincerely
Alfred Holzheu
alfred@syv.com

MTC-00007753

From: Don
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:38am
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

I would not still be a Microsoft stock holder if I thought they were not a good American company. I think, the settlement should end as soon as possible.

MTC-00007754

From: Kimberly Helms
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:38am
Subject: Microsoft Decision

To whom it may concern:
Please don't see my address and figure I'm an MS employee, so she doesn't count.

I am proud to be a Microsoft employee. I am a single mom who is able to send my child to private school and be involved in her school and activities. That's because Microsoft cares about people, and especially families and children. Last year, they donated hundred's of dollars, probably more than \$1,000, worth of software to my daughter's school so they could learn on the latest, most innovative products. My

daughter is 6, so her friends and she especially enjoy the Magic School Bus titles. I am very active in my community and church and let everyone know I work at Microsoft. As I said, I am very proud of that. Microsoft makes such a difference in our community, and the business world. We strive everyday to make someone's life better. We don't want to hurt others. We want to be the best. That's what I teach my daughter, to do the best she can at everything she does. What if her friends' parents started telling me to tell her to not work so hard, so they could catch up? Would that be fair to my daughter? No, and I imagine you would never tell that to your children.

That's what you would be teaching by holding Microsoft back from being the best. "If the competition gets better than you, we'll just hold them back until you can catch up". That's not the ideals this country was founded on. "Be your best" was told to me everyday by my Granny who helped raise me. The anti-trust and anti-competition laws were developed in times for businesses that had great, expensive barriers to entry. Partly due to Microsoft in some places, any person with a brain can go to a public library and learn to use a computer. Anyone could do what we do. Because we have passion for what we do, we do it well. So don't punish or hold us back because we have passion and drive. Let us continue to develop great software and great people, without having to wait on the competition to catch up.

Thank you,
Kimberly S. Helms

MTC-00007755

From: charles jenner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:39am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ,

Having lived through the debacle of the AT&T trial and the IBM trial, it seems to me that the case against Microsoft is weak, fostered by competing firms whose products were not of equal value and whose sales and marketing personnel were weak. In short, the competition to Microsoft did not have what it takes to succeed. Were it not for Senator Orin Hatch, I doubt that the case would have been launched. I discussed the merits of the Microsoft case with an attorney employed by a dot com company. I reflected upon the fact that each allegation against Microsoft is something I experienced in 35 years of employment in financial services. His reply was "Microsoft got big doing it, therefore the case. If Microsoft had not become successful, no case." That seems to me to be unequal protection or administration of the law.

The case should be closed promptly.

Sincerely yours,
Charles R. Jenner

MTC-00007756

From: DAVID DOLBEE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:39am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Enough already—this boondoggle should never have begun, it's long past time for it to END. For all the "sins and crimes" Microsoft has been accused of, not nearly

enough has been said and credited about their contribution to our society, our economy, and the future. If there's free time to investigate shady situations, start with "representatives" who give themselves a raise at midnight! In the context of the September 11th attack and all its consequences, while "normal life and activities" need to continue, we have no time, money or energy to continue pouring into this PERsecution ... and had we been putting the time, energy, and money into coordinating with Gates/Microsoft in our defense, is it possible September 11th might have been avoided???

MTC-00007757

From: MooseK9@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:41am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Justice Department, Please wrap up the current settlement with Microsoft. As a tax payer I request that you stop wasting the governments money on this lawsuit against one of this countries best companies. Only the attorneys, Microsoft's competitors, and a few liberal politicians are profiting from prolonging this suit. Thank You. Gordon J Kinzler

CC:dick@durbin.senate.gov@inetgw,RFC-822=SenatorFitzg...

MTC-00007758

From: OYZONE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:43am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Gentlemen, I feel that further litigation in this case is uncalled for, and the settlement seems fair to all involved. The settlement will certainly help the schools train the students in the use of computers. The settlement also puts Microsoft in the position of giving many of their innovations to the use of their competitors, which may tend to stifle further innovations. Also the cost of further litigation will be a burden on the taxpayers and Microsoft. I further feel that Judge Penfield Jackson had his mind set against Microsoft from the beginning of the trial, and there should have been an unbiased Judge appointed to take over the case.

I am Clarence J. Muth, 125 N.55th Street, Mesa, AZ. 85205.

MTC-00007759

From: JRLowrance@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:43am
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement
To The Dept. of Justice.

I personally think that the settlement between The U.S. Govt. and Microsoft should go forward because it seems like a fair agreement. The rights of the software company to protect its intellectual property, and the protection from monopolies for consumers seems to be balanced. To break up the company would not be in the best interest of either parties.

Thank You

John R. Lowrance
8855 Whispering Oaks
Redding Calif. 96002

MTC-00007760

From: RRB5331@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is the first time in 60 years as a citizen I have written to the government about an issue. I feel strongly enough about this one to write. Please settle the above case and stop trying to split this company up. You should have better issues to address than to ruin American Private companies. No wonder they go to foreign lands to do their business. The courts are the ruin of almost everything.

Roger Baird
Portland, Or.

MTC-00007761

From: SANEE TABASSI
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:46am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello:

I would like to express my opinion on the Microsoft settlement. First of all I think suing a comp that brought so much money and has created so many jobs for this country is totally out of line. You can not single hand out Microsoft for being the best in what they do, there are so many comp in this country that have monopoly (Las Vegas area could be a great example, casinos, convenient stores, shopping centers, all owned by one persons or one corporation). I believe Microsoft offer is great and the government should except that, and let them move forward in this really bad and unstable economy. Thank you so much for your time.

MTC-00007762

From: GLARP
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:48am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am CEO of the Gay and Lesbian Association of Retiring Persons Inc. devoted to creating senior housing that is gay and lesbian (LGBT) friendly. As an individual I wholeheartedly endorse the Microsoft Settlement—we need to get on and build America, not waste time with more litigation. It is crucial that this settlement be endorsed and passed.

Veronica St.Claire, 310-478-2245, Los Angeles, CA

MTC-00007763

From: mary-johne hickman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:49am
Subject: MICROSOFT 01-03-2002

To Whom It May Concern:
LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONG—I'M SICK OF YOUR CONTINUAL HARRASSMENT OF THIS FINE COMPANY—SCOTT MCNEALY MAKES ME SICK ALSO. END THIS ENDLESS PURSUIT TO DESTROY WHAT AMERICA MEANS—FREEDOM TO INNOVATE-LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE,
MARY-JOHNE HICKMAN

MTC-00007764

From: Ragnar de Sharengard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:49am
Subject: Settlement

First, I don't own Microsoft stock and don't work at Microsoft or any other company for that matter, so I don't speak from a selfish motif. I find the US obsession with anti trust insane and is again going too far, all under the disguise of "what is best for the consumer". I remember the Government going after IBM in the '70s and vaguely remember a decade long fight. What were the big benefits to the consumer? It is easier to understand regulation of utilities as their products can be considered necessities in a modern society. Who is forced to use computers in first place and who is forced to choose Microsoft operating systems? Why don't they use UNIX or Linux or whatever is available instead? Why not use IBM's OS/2? If they can't compete whose fault is it?

To me it smacks of socialism the way the State Governors and the Clinton Government go after Microsoft. They should be happy that Microsoft doesn't pull up stakes and move to another country. My native country is Sweden, where socialistic labor laws went hand in hand with general jealousy and equal income through repressive taxation (and still do). The net result has been that many good companies have either been driven to bankruptcy or have moved abroad.

I think Microsoft's and the Bush Government's proposed settlement should be accepted and the company then shielded from new ridiculous law suits.

Ragnar de Sharengard
18325 129th Ave NE
Bothell, WA 98011
Phone: 425-483-0862
ragnarde@sprynet.com

MTC-00007765

From: Jim Olson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hasn't this gone on long enough?

Wouldn't it be in the best interest to get this behind us. I think that it would be a boost in the stock market and the economy to have this settled.

Settle Now for the best of all of us.

Sincerely,
James Olson

MTC-00007766

From: NTPOCKETS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:53am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please bring this suit to a conclusion and let competition settle the score. I am pro Microsoft because I'm tired of buying products that aren't compatible, poorly configured, expensive and from companies attempting to be just as aggressive as MSFT has been accused of being but with a poor product line.

This lawsuit is stifling the software industry, hurting me as a consumer as few companies are developing and innovating compatible products until a settlement is reached.

I made a choice in operating systems by rejecting Apple's offerings, Linux' offerings and I still use programs that aren't compatible with current MSFT programs because they work better for me! BUT,

Microsoft produces a product that evolves, improves and is affordable when it does change.

When other companies get their act together and make something better...guess who'll be curious enough to check it out...me again.

PLEASE, GOVERNMENT, LET ME MAKE MY OWN DECISIONS...IT'S MY MONEY AND I HAVE SPENT IT...AS HAVE OTHERS ON A BETTER PRODUCT AND MICROSOFT HAPPENS TO BE THE BENEFICIARY...ISN'T THAT WHAT IT'S SUPPOSED TO BE ABOUT?

Sincerely,
Staton Lorenz
President
Half Mile Cycle Race Corp

MTC-00007767

From: Wilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:54am
Subject: Microsoft Sellment
Sirs:

I feel that this judgement or whatever has cost the tax payers enough and should be settled quickly. I believe that Microsoft has bowed over trying to settle this law suit for the benefit to the electronic industry and to the economy of our country.

MTC-00007768

From: ROB FLORY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please accept this settlement. It is good for the consumer, and
OUR COUNTRY!!!

MTC-00007769

From: WILLIAM KLINE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:56am
Subject: Settlement
Let's stop punishing Microsoft and get this thing overwith. Think of all the good things Microsoft could do in the way of research to benefit all of us if they weren't having to spend all these millions of dollars fighting a few disgruntled businesses who are afraid of competition, which is after all the American way of capitalism.

Sincerely, William A. Kline
Klinehaven@webtv.net or
wmakline@yahoo.com

MTC-00007770

From: ROD HALES
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:57am
Subject: microsoft settlement
We are sick and tired of the crybabies who want the last pound of flesh from Microsoft.....the feds settled their case and so did several states...tell the last few states fall in line and lets get it done once and for all...over and out.. Thank you... Rod and Barbara Hales.. Sherwood, Oregon 97140

MTC-00007771

From: Benjamin12148@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To those in power:

The entire system of "Antitrust" law is an abomination, and should be repealed and eliminated forever. "Antitrust" amounts to nothing more than punishing production because it is production. If you want a detailed argument for this position, read Chairman Alan Greenspan's article, "Antitrust", in the book, —Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal—. (Rand, Ayn, editor. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1967, p. 63–71.)

Because "Antitrust" is in principle a moral and economic equivalent of poison, we should have as little of it as possible. Microsoft has done nothing wrong, and is a paragon of production. So be as lenient on Bill Gates and his associates as you have the courage and integrity to be. If you have a choice between punishing Microsoft and losing your job, think of another line of work. It will be better for the world, for America, and for your own souls.

Sincerely,
Ben Steinhart, M.A.
8699 Kenberton Dr.
Oak Park, MI, 48237-1732
(248) 544-7245 home (248) 435-5353 work

MTC-00007772

From: EVLANDFJL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!
Sirs:

It is my belief that prolonging litigation is not in the "best interest" of our economy or concerned citizens. I will concur the agreement you reached tentatively is in the "best interest" of all consumers...so stop procrastinating and allowing these special interest groups to intervene. Get the show on the road and settle this case! This is absolutely ridiculous and very costly to everyone by allowing such utter nonsense to continue this long. Please allow Microsoft the freedom to innovate! Thank you for your time and consideration in allowing me the opportunity to voice my opinion regarding this settlement.

Sincerely,
Frances Leonardini

MTC-00007773

From: Jan Rhees
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:59am
Subject: microsoft settlement
From all indications, this appears to be a fair, and adequate settlement, and I encourage you to validate the settlement decision and move on. Let this be the end of it.

Thank you,
Jan Rhees

MTC-00007774

From: Bob Powers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Folks,
I've watched the onslaught against Microsoft for "years" now. Remember when Microsoft "bundled" Internet Explorer with windows??? At this same time Netscape was SELLING its Navigator Navigator for \$50.00 to every individual who wanted to surf the

internet. Now AOL (owns Netscape) YES, gives away FREE Netscape Navigator to anyone who wants to download it to their computer!!!!!! Has the U.S. Government ever figured out how many million \$50.00 bills have been saved by ALL computer users. Yes, Microsoft inovated and forced COMPETITION and AOL was forced to give away the \$50.00 Netscape Navigator for free. Hasn't the American consumer saved BILLIONS of American dollars as a result.

If the American consumer has suffered as some have suggested please tell me how much money I would have saved if both Microsoft and AOL charged me \$50.00 for each new version of Netscape Navigator or Internet Explorer?????!

Let competition FORCE down prices and let a company like Microsoft (Large enough to compete internationally) bring revenues to the United States from around the world. Our deficit is already to large and Microsoft has NOT added ONE CENT to the United States excessive deficit spending! Why not show the American consumer how much money Microsoft cost them or saved them! Most people are not stupid and what ever you do REMEMBER politicians and government officials WILL be remembered at the polls...

From Just ONE concerned citizen
Robert H. Powers

MTC-00007775

From: kerryduwaldt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:02am
Subject: In Favor of settlement in the Microsoft case

Speaking as both a shareholder of Microsoft and as a long time user of many of their products, I am strongly in favor of a swift settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case. I feel that competitors of this great company have brought this suit against Microsoft just because they have not been able to produce products that are as good as Microsoft's products. These disgruntled companies have been wasting their energy on trying to break up Microsoft when they should have been trying to improve their products in an effort to compete with Microsoft. I think it is very sad that so much time and money has been wasted in this no win case. This anti-trust suit is bad for consumers. Microsoft should be spending their time producing better and better products for us, the consumers and not spending their time in court because of a few mediocre companies.

MTC-00007776

From: Tim Sedlack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm very disappointed to see special interest groups (read: Microsoft's chief competitors) having such influence on the court. I feel it's wrong to stifle competition, even for the industry leader. Microsoft is in the position it's in because it provides (usually) reasonably priced highly functional software that adheres to most standards. I critically evaluate software for purchase and choose based on price/functionality. Microsoft is a consistent winner, but not the only one. Why

are you letting thier competitors sway you? Can we expect to see the same rules applied to AOL—the largest software/service company in the world? Where are the lawsuits against them? After having recieved seeming thousands of offers “Free hours” on AOL, I can say that they are more of a thorn in my side than Microsoft.

Tim Sedlack
timsed@hotmail.com

MTC-00007777

From: G. S. Rana
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the MS settlement reached by DOJ. The 3 member overseeing board makes the settlement tough, and frankly much more than I would have expected MS to face.

Thanks

MTC-00007778

From: coinman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel this has gone on long enough. I say let the settlement stand as it is now. Get it over with and lets move on.

Ray Harcourt Jr.
669 Stable Gate Ln
Florence, Ky. 41042

MTC-00007779

From: Patnich44@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I believe that enough is enough. The Microsoft case has drug on for years now and it is time to settle it and be done with it. The settlement is fair to all sides. Lets not waste more money and time litigating this issue.

Sincerely,
Patricia Nicholoff
Edmonds, WA.

MTC-00007780

From: Ricky Loynd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am strongly in favor of this settlement. It is more than sufficient to redress the affects of any of Microsoft's alleged anticompetitive behavior.

Ricky Loynd

MTC-00007781

From: Karl Van Blankenburg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,
Please go forward with the settlement in the case with Microsoft. It would be beneficial for the public/consumers and be best for allowing the justice system to focus on other matters of more pressing nature.

Best Regards,
Karl Van Blankenburg

MTC-00007782

From: AlbertoCSerrano@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:18am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Microsoft:

It is time to end this litigation that in my estimation does not benefit the consumers and helps mostly attorneys. God knows the US has more of them than most countries, a dubious honor in my estimation.

Prolonging this suit can only help line the pockets of litiginous lawyers, ultimately at the cost of consumers who supposedly should be the beneficiaries!

Hang in there!
Alberto C Serrano, MD

MTC-00007783

From: Evinrude2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. The federal government and nine states have 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. The end.

Jerry Harris
5059 Newmans-Cardington Road East
Cardington, Ohio 43315-9609

MTC-00007784

From: Donald Foster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement is in the best interest of the public. Microsoft should be allowed to continue their creative strategy and continue to produce effecetive products which gives pleasure to the public and empowers the average citizen to produce work efficiently.

Respectfully submitted.
Donald H. Foster
dfoster@socal.rr.com

MTC-00007785

From: BESTEFAR99@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:21am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This suit was suspect to begin with, so lets get on with the business of developing better products and let the market place decide which is the best.

C. H. Schmoll

MTC-00007786

From: Jarim4@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing this to voice my opinion. Please settlement the litigation as soon as possible. I believe that the Microsoft Corporation has offered a just settlement, we need the responsibility of our court system to take charge and dismiss any other suits by small interest groups as the majority have voiced its opinion for the good of the majority. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Anthony Rim

MTC-00007787

From: Jim Beebe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:23am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Dear DOJ,

I just want to say that I think the work of Microsoft has been of great benefit to the economy of this country and they should not be penalized for making products that do well in the marketplace. If they had not continued to innovate and improve their products this computer would not be half as easy to use. I am starting to use their new operating system XP and it is a huge improvement. Imagine if all we had was the old DOS system. I am not and never have been an employee of MS, just a satisfied customer that wants to see them continue to do what they do so well.

Sincerely,
James L. Beebe
P.O. Box 65472
Port Ludlow, WA 98365

MTC-00007788

From: Needham, James P
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 12:49am
Subject: Time to Move On

As a observer of the Microsoft anti-trust litigation, I must tell you that as a consumer, I have never been harmed by Microsoft. The continuous actions of a few State AGs seems to be more about them getting good press to push their own personal political agenda that to look out for consumers. Our Country is in a recession, we need companies like Microsoft to innovate so we can increase productivity and the value of American products. I am certainly not an expert but it would seem to me that the current anti-trust laws were enacted to address the smoke stack industries in a non-global marketplace. What seems obvious to the average person on the stress apparent escapes the politicians and the high priced political appointees. If the Netscape's of the world cannot compete let them get the hell out of the way. It seems that the government and the some of the states want to decrease competition and innovation by restricting Microsoft. How stupid.

CC: Dennis Hastert (E-mail), Don Nichols (E-mail), Georg...

MTC-00007789

From: gtech
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone and worry about your own problems, which there are many.
Craig

MTC-00007790

From: JHanker702@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:31am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my APPROVAL for the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I believe it is good for consumers, good for the competition and good for our economy.

Further delays or additional litigation will damage both the technology industry and our free enterprise system.

Sincerely,
John Hankerson
2641 262nd Place SE
Sammamish, WA 98075

MTC-00007791

From: BOBJAZLOVR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:31am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

MICROSOFT became a "monopoly" by offering consumers a product that simply beat the pants off their competition (IBM, Apple, Sun, Linux to name a few) To this day none of these companies have ever developed a mass market operating software system to come close to MSFT. Microsoft then proceeded to improve its basic operating system to make it easier for the msft customer to access the internet and have the added capability of having the browser interact with its OP systems in a simple, easy manner to learn and operate. So far the consumer is not complaining, not about the bundling, not about the price, not about the fact that computer hardware mfrs and retailers have all this great stuff preloaded on their machines so all the consumer has to do is plug in the computer, follow a few simple instructions and they are off to do a lot of very productive, or non productive work, as they can choose to do! If you read the latest numbers, the number of people ordering merchandise of all sorts on the internet has been booming, recession or no recession. So far MSFT has offered a superior product, offers it at reasonable price, and has made it possible for people of all ages to learn to use the internet to satisfy new workplace requirements and support new internet businesses. So what's wrong with this picture? Consumers are not injured in any way. They are free to buy Apple computers, if they like, they can buy a machine and have linux loaded as the operating system, if they like, or java, or unix or IBM's O/S, if they like, except that they don't!! MSFT doesn't make the computers, or any components, all they do is supply software that is designed to function as easily and smoothly as possible with the latest bells and whistles that the hardware makes possible. Their complaining competitors, some of which are much larger than MSFT, are free to do better, but they haven't. Have you seen any new browser products being offered by these crybaby's to compete with Explorer...??? The MSFT software, a miniscule and continually declining % of the price of the newest computers, whose prices keep going south even as the capabilities of the machines are ten fold from a few years ago!

Having done all this, no harm except to non competitive competitors, seems evident to me and that is no different from the situation in any number of other industries.

Go to any department store and you will see the same brands featured in every major store. Why is that not being investigated? Tobacco companies offer discounts to gain shelf space, so do companies like P&G, How about those sales of coca cola and pepsi that never occur at the same time. One week

Pepsi, next week Coke. Hello, does this look like normal competition? You don't see gas stations alternating promotions with the guy across the street, they match prices a dozen times a day!!

MSFT has not done anything any other company would not do to grow and survive competitive challenges. Are they hardnose? Yes! So what's new? I recall Netscape excess claiming they were going to develop a browser that would "surround" the MSFT operating system and make it subservient to the Netscape browser?? Sun has been screaming JAVA for years, but where's the Sun Java O/S to go head to head with MSFT? Same with Linux, where's the beef? So, let MSFT get on with what it does best...software that keeps adding, improving without wasting our taxes chasing a great company that leads not only the US, but any company in the world in it's field!!! Are we upset we have one standard VCR format? Aren't we trying to standardize digital?, broadband, telecom systems to broaden efficient use and make it easier for consumers? MSFT has done that with out any GOvt help. Tell the states to look for some other patsy to try and extort money from and leave MSFT alone. Do no harm to consumers is the litmus test for anti trust,,there is none here. You want to protect choice? Consumers have already chosen ...with their pocket books...let it go!!

Thank you...a citizen who thinks the DOJ has better things to do with our taxes!!!

Robert Conti

MTC-00007792

From: LYN GILMER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My view is that the Microsoft Operating System provides a very large value to computer consumers. I have been using PC's since they appeared and "microcomputers" prior to that. Software was very expensive back then. Feature for feature, today's software is a real bargain. Consumers have not been harmed by Microsoft, instead have benefited from the many useful products given as part of the package. Also, remember the thousands of developers who can write software for a Microsoft Operating System knowing that tens of millions of people are their potential customers. They could not afford to develop code for many OS's only one. If they have a good product they will make money and pay taxes. I am a great fan of the Microsoft brand. They are an example of how great a company can grow in our free enterprise system.

Thanks!

Tom Gilmer

MTC-00007793

From: mstat
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:33am
Subject: microsoft settlement

I just want to go on record as opposing this golddigging settlement attempt to fleece microsoft. I sit here at my Compaq computer with Windows XP, using my Microsoft Internet Explorer to access this website and type this response. To me, Microsoft is part of America...a great part. They are family to

me. I am upset at the effort to discard competition, innovation, and the assumption of entrepreneurial risk in my country, all for the unscrupulous receipt of ill-gotten monetary gains. LEAVE THEM ALONE! Microsoft is as American as apple pie and a great success story. They have (partially) shaped the way I live and communicate. This shameful attempt to extort money is dispicable.

Sincerely,
mstat
Mark D. Statler MD

MTC-00007794

From: Sharon Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is fair as it stands now. This has been going on long enough. End it and lets all get back to business.

Sincerely, Sharon Wood

MTC-00007795

From: KULINA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Here is my opinion: the DOJ should discontinue wasting the government's (my taxes) monies on prosecuting or mediating a settlement. I, as a consumer of computer products, never felt harmed by Microsoft. The nine states not settling are fishing for money and the courts should dismiss any actions filed by them. I think the DOJ should be held in contempt for "restraint of trade". One man's opinion....

Marty Kulina
206. 972.9704

MTC-00007796

From: Bruce (038) Leslie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,
Enough is Enough... Settle the case!!... It is an embarrassment to the rest of the free world to continue to allow states whose interest/allegiance/financial backing is with competitor companies like SUN, Oracle, etc—drag this court battle on further....

My wife and I are software engineers and we both feel that Microsoft software is the most user-friendly and supportable product line available... Unfortunately, companies like SUN didn't take the time/energy/funding to make the UNIX operating system easy to use for the common user... It is their own problem that they didn't have superior enough products to compete with Microsoft's products... Microsoft did not force people to use their products... People use them because they are good, easy to use, readily available, etc... And Microsoft products (operating system, applications, etc) are fairly priced...

It is unfortunate we have to hear from whiney company executives from SUN, Oracle, etc—keep droning on and on about Microsoft's unfair business practises... We need to put an end to this sorry part of US high-tech history, and let companies like Microsoft get on with their business...

regards,
Bruce and Leslie Pleshko

Aiea, Hawaii
808-484-5077

MTC-00007797

From: Joe Masters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

I support this settlement. Let's move on.
Joe Masters
434 Floral Way
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
joe.masters@techie.com

MTC-00007798

From: Alihatami@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

a quick settlement is the best for the consumer, industry, Microsoft and Microsoft competitors. If Microsoft competitors had spent half of the money and other resources (which they are spending to drag the case against Microsoft) to develop a new product, they would have possibly come up with a product to compete with Microsoft. please understand the situation and close the case ASAP.

Ali Hatami

MTC-00007799

From: Stephen.Schaefer@emis-intl.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is a travesty. There is nothing here to prevent Microsoft's continued use of its monopoly position to destroy any software innovation they do not own. Microsoft must be deprived of the means to maintain that monopoly. A number of possible means to that end are possible, including: publishing all their source code; or making all their operating system interfaces and protocols public on the same basis that internet protocols are made public, i.e., with complete documentation and reference implementations made freely available, for any lawful use whatsoever, including, but not limited to, the construction of a competing operating system. A company that truly benefits the public with their systems will thrive in such a competitive environment, just as Cisco Systems does. Microsoft's egregious and perpetual contempt for the public welfare leaves them no claim to anything other than a competitive environment, if indeed they deserve to continue to exist as a public company.

Stephen P. Schaefer
Computer Systems Administrator
Masters of Science in Computer Science,
UNC—Chapel Hill 1993

MTC-00007800

From: William HAYES
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:58am
Subject: I have voted time and again for Microsoft by buying their software. The only people I know that are

I have voted time and again for Microsoft by buying their software. The only people I know that are objecting to the way Microsoft does business is people who want to pirate their software from me and the ones that think that they should be allowed open access to hack into it easier. As a result of the foresight and vision brought by Microsoft, the price of home computers has come down to the point that every household can afford them and every child can learn to program them and use them if they have the ability and want to use them. Many advancements have been recognized and supported by Microsoft by developing software to support it.

Microsoft is a major source of the balance of payments with other countries. Microsoft has given the US the a technological lead that should help keep the US on sound financial footing, but that financial lead could be overturned by an AT&T type of mistake that will only lead to higher costs and unsettling lack of leadership in home computers.

William C. Hayes

MTC-00007801

From: GDomain4603@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice January 2, 2002
Dear Sirs/Madams,

I have the opinion that the Microsoft people were, and are, innocent of the manufacture and propagation of their software-items which are, by very definition, not harmful.

Sincerely from Geoffrey Doman
13900 Cohasset Street
Van Nuys, CA
91405-2501

MTC-00007802

From: Philip R. Palumbo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I believe the Tunney Act should be adopted for the parties involved. I think that given the circumstances, it is fair and equitable to both sides. It is more important than ever, for the litigation to stop and the productivity to move forward. Competition is good for everyone involved. Microsoft began as a startup company and had to endure all kinds of competition to get it where it is today. They provided a need for a product and consumers voted with their pocketbooks. They did not try to legally "remove" or render helpless their then competitors.

Please move forward with this issue.

Kindly,
Philip Palumbo
prp@palumboent.com

MTC-00007803

From: PILOTGGG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies & Gentlemen:

After a tough recession, with many people out of work, it is HIGH TIME to get this country moving again ! Expedite the fair settlement of the Microsoft case !

Pilot GGG@AOL.com (Gunter Gigas)

MTC-00007804

From: Steve (038) Robin Lee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 8:33pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It's definitely time to settle the Microsoft case. I felt that the suit was frivolous to begin with and the fact that it has dragged on for so long trying to cripple a company that has done so much just completely angers me. I think the message this suit sends is 'that if you are great at what you do and make a product better than your competitor then we are going to make you pay.' I really hope everyone involved can settle this case and move forward.

Sincerely,
Robin L. Lee

MTC-00007805

From: bcathcart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Give it a rest already. Stop the litigation. Without Microsoft all of those pencil neck attorneys would still be writing their briefs on a legal pad.

Bill Cathcart

MTC-00007806

From: zeta54@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Do America a favor-settle this case by terminating DOJ action against Microsoft! This litigation has destroyed huge valuations in the tech stock market, financially injuring lots of shareholders(direct and in mutual funds) and pension funds. It may also be responsible for terminating the great bull market and causing the start of the economic downturn, thanks to Billy Clinton and his juvenile delinquent administration.

No, I'm not a Microsoft employee or direct stockholder. I am a user of their products. Are they the best? Probably not. Are they the PC standard? Don't you know it!

Bill Drake
Bothell, WA

MTC-00007807

From: Fred B. McCarty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft established the de facto standards for the software industry that caused the phenomenal growth and success that astounds the world and enriches our country. Microsoft is the goose that lays golden eggs. LET MICROSOFT ALONE! Microsoft continually strives to improve the quality and value of its products. The people who complain about Microsoft's leadership are whiners who seek to rely on politics and lawyers instead of technical excellence and fair prices. Most of the businesses that now oppose Microsoft would never have achieved their present status and success without the standardization established by Microsoft and its unrelenting pressure to improve software and explore new technology.

When our government tries to cripple a successful business, to punish technical innovation, to create chaos where there is order, to stifle legitimate competition, it is the beginning of the end of our prosperity! Don't meddle with a miracle! Go and sin no more!

Fred B. McCarty, P.E.

MTC-00007808

From: Chris Blount
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Sirs,

I believe it is time to finish the anti-trust case against Microsoft. I believe the proposed settlement as accepted by Microsoft is fair and should thus terminate this matter once and for all.

I have yet to find even one person in Alaska who can honestly say he or she has been harmed by Microsoft; to the contrary Microsoft technologies have been extremely advantageous for bush Alaska.

D.O.J. should not let itself be degraded and used by inferior competitors or manipulated by Congressmen from competitor's districts and states to fight in the market place.

Please accept the settlement now and end this matter for good.

Sincerely yours,
Chris T. Blount
PO Box 503
Nome, AK 99762

MTC-00007809

From: Steve Black
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

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 their planned demise of Microsoft's commercial viability, which are as meaningless as the civil action allegations. In the civil action complaints, the authors excel at presenting misleading information.

2. There is a near-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 the compatibility issues of networking multiple PC operating systems. As it is, having to maintain separate server and desktop PC operating systems is more than enough headache and there are strong financial forces to compel the integration 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 networked hard drives. Every

computer should be able to connect to these shared drives. 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 sizeable 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. Microsoft's Internet Explorer was offered to consumers who wanted to update their browsing capability, but did not want to update their operating system; otherwise there is no reason to make it a separate program since it is conceptually integral to an operating system and control of the directly attached and networked computer hardware.

4. Alternative operating systems have done poorly in the marketplace for reasons of commonality, cost of training and lack of return of investment for businesses. Consumers are an integral part of companies and gain most of their computer knowledge on the job and therefore share the same beliefs which they pass on to their lesser experienced friends. The Apple monopoly could have been wildly successful, except they chose to maintain high prices and monopolize their hardware designs. The only high business 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 nonsense. This is as absurd as saying that no new products of any kind can be invented because everything has already been invented. There are no barriers to marketing any other software products as thousands of large and small companies have done, provided they have a viable marketing concept and consumers consider the product to have value.

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 misuse of marketing propaganda, proves nothing, and has no basis in fact. Do you believe everything you hear in commercial TV advertisements?

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 success of JAVA is only dependent on its authors making it a safe and viable product. JAVA's technical competence and business acumen are 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 email, numerous web sites offer to install JAVA on Internet users computers on a daily basis. Linux, Unix, Beos and several

other operating systems are available, but do not provide the features and benefits of Windows and will not even be considered by businesses for desktop computers for these reasons.

7. This civil 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 in thousands of industries due to Microsoft innovation is the real benefit of a free market. This is why Sun is losing billions due to the demise of their hardware empire and why they are in such a panic to get revenge by destroying Microsoft. They are misusing the legal system to compensate for their business failings. I am not now, nor have I ever been a Microsoft employee or employed by any organization working for Microsoft. I am a mechanical engineer, consumer and computer hobbyist. For a few years, I did struggled with the issues of providing computer services to fellow engineers and I learned to dislike a number of large, arrogant, 3-letter-named computer/software companies. Their adversarial attitudes and ludicrous prices will remain etched in the minds of an entire generation that today prepare the budgets in many corporations.

Steven Black
1916 Camas Court SE
Renton, WA 98055

MTC-00007810

From: Don Holtzinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department Of Justice.

I'm very proud of the way you and Microsoft have worked to find a solution to the Anti-Trust case, and I think the solution promotes competition while letting the industry move forward with standards that will ensure another 20 years of continued technology growth. This settlement is tough, but I believe it's reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Please don't let this lawsuit get sidetracked by special interest groups or Attorney's Generals who are trying to keep their names in the public spotlight.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Don Holtzinger
17605 NE 101st Court
Redmond, WA 98052

MTC-00007811

From: RGA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department—

The settlement that you have negotiated with Microsoft is in the best interest of all

involved. I urge you to fulfill your promises in that settlement and defend it in Court, in Congress, and in the press.

It is obvious that the critics are either competitors who cannot compete in the market without outside assistance, or people like Sen. Hatch whose influential constituents are apparently those same competitors.

This is no place for the tainted political process to interfere with entrepreneurial success and risk-taking.

Gordon Appleman

MTC-00007812

From: Don Holt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department Of Justice:

I'm very proud of the way you and Microsoft have worked to find a solution to the Anti-Trust case, and I think the solution promotes competition while letting the industry move forward with standards that will ensure another 20 years of continued technology growth. This settlement is tough, but I believe it's reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Please don't let this lawsuit get sidetracked by special interest groups or Attorney's Generals who are trying to keep their names in the public spotlight.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Donnie Barren

MTC-00007813

From: Histone6@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I think the entire persecution of Microsoft was unnecessary, uncalled for and a waste of tax payers money. The settlement is another form of government extortion. I do not feel one bit safer, one bit freer, one bit more capable of making purchasing decisions with the Federal government having filed this suit and all the attendant cost to us via taxes and the revenue lost to the government with Microsoft being able to deduct their legal expenses.

Do not waste another minute of time or expense on this issue. This entire issue was a display of blatant class envy. The foremost users of class envy where the communists. Are there any correlations here?

Allow Microsoft the ability to do charitable works with school systems they select.

Thank You,
HJH

MTC-00007814

From: Theresa Hancock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:

I would like to voice my opinion that the Microsoft case be settled without further litigation. I think further litigation is not in the best interest of the consumer, economy, or the industry. As a consumer, I do not feel damaged by Microsoft, but quite the opposite, and think that further litigation is

only politically motivated and costly to the American taxpayer and economy.

Thank you,
Theresa Hancock
103 Patrick Ct.
Sunnyside, WA 98944
509-837-8550

MTC-00007815

From: Ken (038) Michelle Walters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please complete the settlement on the Microsoft case. Please include my voice with those wanting you to accept the proposed settlement.

Thank you
Ken Walters
4506 226th ST SW
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

MTC-00007816

From: Brenda Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:41am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please accept the Microsoft settlement. Our state and our country need to put this to rest and Microsoft has done everything to come to a fair agreement.

Thank you,
Brenda Wagner
4245 230th Way SE
Sammamish WA 98075

MTC-00007817

From: markthome
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam:

I hope that the settlement reached between Microsoft, the federal government and several states will be allowed to stand. Lets end this thing in one more effort to get the economy moving again! I am 77 years of age and do not remember a circumstance before where a few competitors of a company, along with a few quisle-like congressional representatives, have been able to derail our system of competition with so little basis. Please do whatever you can to ensure that deserving contributors get their due, and that those who want to compete by deriding the deserving get exactly what I feel they have earned. Nothing.

Sincerely,
Mark Thome, Bellevue, Washington

MTC-00007818

From: Cym98gz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge:

I feel Microsoft have done too much to settle this antitrust case. Their products are so good and easy to use. I think it is time to let the company continue to do their business.

Microsoft consumer
1-3-02

MTC-00007819

From: Daniel Wahl
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 2:45am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Department of Justice ought to be morally condemned for even charging Microsoft with the alleged crime of coercing its very satisfied customers (of which I am one out of many). I am writing this using my hotmail account, a free service given to everyone by Microsoft. I am on the internet via Explorer, thanks to Microsoft. Hell, I can even navigate myself around on the computer thanks to this company. Because of this (and more) are you actually asking me whether I think the punishment for Microsoft is too soft? Hell no it's not too soft! They shouldn't be punished at all. And, despite mumbling that the company's prosecution was a "victory for consumers everywhere" Janet Reno knew this. So does Ashcroft.

What they both know, but fail to admit, is that Microsoft has gained its market dominance, not by using fraud or force, but by consistently offering better (more popular) services and products for a cheaper price than their competitors. Is it for their achievements that this company has been damned? If the new Department of —Justice— wants to prove it has a right to actually bear that name, it should "ettle" with Microsoft by first apologizing, then paying restitution for any money that the firm has lost as a result of this immoral trial.

—Daniel Wahl, Kannapolis, NC

MTC-00007820

From: Elizabeth R. Baecher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:47am
Subject: Settlement

Had government applied the same zeal regarding US security as they had harassing Microsoft, New York City undoubtedly would still have its skyline intact and thousands of lives would not have been uselessly lost.

Please feel free to pass these comments on.
Elizabeth R. Baecher
Mount Kisco, New York

MTC-00007821

From: John Grubb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The best thing that can happen for the whole country and the economy is to settle the case against Microsoft. The technology industry moves so quickly that the government should be more concerned about companies like AOL, than Microsoft. AOL is a perfect example of a company positioned to take control of the digital media business from end to end. Focus on the future, not the past! Many say it is a coincidence that the stock market dived sharply when it was announced the first time that negotiations between Microsoft and the plaintiffs had been broken off. I however think there was a direct correlation, and the longer this thing drags on, the worse it is for everyone.

The states that are not part of the current settlement happen to have major Microsoft competitors headquartered in their states, what a coincidence. These companies need to innovate and stop litigating. I find it hard to understand why everyone is up in arms

over Microsoft, when government backed monopolies like Airbus Industries in Europe exist to compete unfairly against Boeing. The US is not able to trade freely with many other nations on this planet, yet we waste our time attacking our own companies. I can only imagine how many countries would love to have a Microsoft. Yet, instead of enjoying such a successful company, our country seeks to destroy it. What a huge waste of resources.

Yes, my tax dollars and many other hard working American's tax dollars. Where does it stop? Please do not forget that Microsoft commoditized the personal computer industry. If we had three or four major PC OS vendors, then software would cost more, and do less. Having a common standard to write to is very good for the consumer. What if we had four different standards for electricity. A company who makes blenders would have to make four flavors to accommodate the different standards. Of course they would have to pass the cost of the extra tools to make the four flavors along to the consumer.

As for integrating into the OS useful tools and utilities like a browser or media player, I think it is good. Even though Netscape has failed to technically innovate in a long time, Microsoft's browser gets better and better even though it does not have to. When I bought my first PC I spent hundreds of dollars on utilities, that often did not work well with my DOS OS. When I called for support I was told it was an OS problem, call IBM. I would rather integrate than have to spend more money to buy the extras I need from a third party.

Some food for thought, a good spreadsheet, word processor and graphics package in the mid-1980's cost about \$500 each, for a grand total of \$1,500. None of them worked together and the menu systems were different on each. Sharing data between them was far from easy. Today you can buy the same three packages from Microsoft for about \$500 for all three, and they work very well together. Sounds pretty good to me.

As a market leader, Microsoft does not have to innovate at the rate it does. That is what happened to so many other software vendors—they viewed success as a destination. Microsoft views success as a journey, one that they are always shooting for.

In closing I will admit Microsoft is no saint. They are a fierce competitor. Yet I believe an America with Microsoft is better than one without. If we are not careful the next Microsoft may end up being in a foreign country where we do not benefit nearly as much as having it in our own backyard.

Please get this issue behind us and move on. . .

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
John Grubb

8116 Pecan Ridge Drive
North Richland Hills, TX 76180

MTC-00007822

From: Susan Griffin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:55am
Subject: microsoft settlement
Regarding legal settlement Microsoft/DOJ

I believe that the lawsuit was very unnecessary, considering other very large companies who have of late become conglomerates. Time Warner to name a high profile situation. Then we have the oil companies, and the supermarkets and the pharmaceutical companies, etc. There are others as well. I feel this was a rather selective law suit and I certainly feel Microsoft has been reasonable and responsive enough. For heavens sake settle this!. It is the American way to compete and create, therefore excell. I am astounded that this even has occured, and yes I am aware of the circumstances and this is my opinion. wonder what

DOJ would do to Henry Ford today??

Susan Griffin
19407 Turtle Ridge Lane
Northridge, CA. 91326

MTC-00007823

From: Terry Elder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement between DOJ and Microsoft. I use Microsoft products because they are good. I chose them. I was not coerced in any way. When I began using a computer, I did not use Microsoft products, but after Windows 3.1 came out, I moved and gradually used more and more Microsoft products. I certainly don't want to see them broken up. As far as I am concerned, Microsoft is a great success story and should not be hounded. There are a few zealots who can't compete, so they use taxpayer money to try to destroy Microsoft with the law. Some of Microsoft's business practices probably do need to be modified, and so I agree with the settlement.

Franklin Terry Elder
8168 Erin Street
Juneau, AK 99801

MTC-00007824

From: Joe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ

In my opinion, and the opinion of everyone I know, Microsoft should have never been sued. They provide amazing software that has made my life immensely more successful and rich. Now that a settlement has been worked out, I feel it should be accepted as written and the matter should be put behind us.

Thanks,
Joseph M. Shikany, Seattle WA

MTC-00007825

From: BETTYBOBS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not prolong a settlement of the Microsoft case. It is in the best interests of Microsoft shareholders to end the case as soon as possible.

MTC-00007826

From: Mike Eddy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:11am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has done good more for individuals and the US economy than any other company in this decade. Penalizing them will only hurt customers and benefit some select competitors. Leave Microsoft alone.

Mike Eddy

MTC-00007827

From: Vlad Mayzel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi there,

Leave them alone! They (Microsoft) do a great job and do much more good than harm to me, the consumer. Actually, what harm? Constantly pushing the industry to the progress? If other suckers can not do any better job, they manipulate the government forcing it to dig dirt pretending that it is on behalf of the consumers, but in reality to make the government to fight for them instead of improving their own technology. Of course it is easier and *free* but at taxpayer's and consumer's expense.

If government really wants to help the consumers—fine, HELP any of Microsoft's competitors to make their technology BETTER and help them RISE to the Microsoft's level, but do not DESTROY Microsoft's success forcing it to FALL to the competitor's level, otherwise you will get the same kind of results as communists used to get using the same approach!

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,
Vlad Mayzel.
Smart Technologies,
President.

MTC-00007828

From: Dbjroberts@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:34am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:
I AM 69 YEARS OLD AND I AM GREATFUL TO MICROSOFT FOR THEIR SOFTWARE. THEY HAVE MADE IT EASY TO USE AND LEARN ABOUT MY COMPUTER. I HAVE OWNED A COMPUTER FOR ONLY TWO YEARS. PLEASE SETTLE THE LAWSUIT SO MICROSOFT CAN GO AHEAD WITH NEW IDEAS. I WANT TO CONTINUE TO ENJOY MY COMPUTER. DON'T MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR US SENIORS.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION,
BETTY J. ROBERTS
DBJROBERTS@AOL.COM

MTC-00007829

From: Bob Long
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:29am
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-00007831

From: John Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

As a consumer I have used computers for sixteen years now. I have a computer network setup between my shop, my home, our patio area and another house on the property. I harbor no doubt that I am not the usual consumer in this respect. I have been very happy however to be able to do this networking without having to purchase additional software, or to have found the process technically intimidating. I have found the inclusion of such items as networking, CD playing, mpeg viewing, Internet browsing, e-mail, picture viewing and such to be innovation at its best. I have purchased programs written by others that allow greater graphics capabilities, engineering capabilities and so forth. Essentially these programs run flawlessly for me in the MS Windows environment.

I have in older versions of MS Windows purchased upgrades, one for instance was from Real Networks in Seattle, I think they are a part of this case also, they offered a free downloadable upgrade. What a dirty trick, as soon as I had it they wanted me to buy the full functional upgrade, and their newly installed software kept activating my firewall software with its attempts to report back to Real Networks what features I was making use of in their program without my knowledge. This is pretty much akin to planting a Trojan horse program and I think the practice stinks. I used their uninstall routine and it removed most but not all of their code, I still trap messages with it uninstalled trying to "phone home." I have not had that problem with Microsoft; in fact Microsoft's collection of personal information is entirely upfront and with clear explanations.

Across the same years I worked for Diebold Inc. and spent a great deal of time using the IBM operating system OS2. In those years IBM clearly attempted to capture a larger portion of the desktop PC software market and they had promotions to that end. Diebold used OS2 as the OS on many computer systems, and nearly all of their ATM machines. Diebold regarded me during my employment with them up until my retirement last year at age 51 as a Fast Track Engineer. I got to solve the problems our field technicians were stumped on. We had plenty of problems; Windows was not nearly as cumbersome, or intolerant as OS2. To amplify the difference further between OS2 and Windows, IBM and Diebold were business partners; we had special access to IBM engineers to resolve problems. During this time I purchased OS2 for a computer at home and attempted to install it, even with "inside" help, the IBM engineers could not make it operate on the hardware I wanted to install it on. I had in fact purchased a new 486 system just to play with OS2 on, finally

they told me all we can recommend is that you buy some new hardware that is on our supported list. That was it, I still have a box full of OS2 sitting here, and anytime someone wines about Windows I offer it to him or her.

Clearly, most persons have never had to put up with anything like what I described above, but I want you to consider with the time and talent that IBM has, why couldn't they displace Microsoft. I will suggest that the market place chose the best software, and I will further suggest that in comparison to what is available the only choice for me will be Windows. Diebold Inc, was in the process of dropping OS2 for Windows at the time of my retirement. The reasons for this boiled down to IBM's failure to put innovations into their operating system fast enough for the market place. We were connecting ATMs into TCP/IP networks and VPNs, as a result of telnet sessions our customers are downloading streaming video and audio to our newer products. All of this is just a colossal pain because support for these advanced features is just too rudimentary in OS2, even though it comes from the granddad of computer giants.

The enormity of gain to productivity and to our economy during the nineties was clearly connected to the computer industry. It is also clearly evident that the axe that cut the juggler was the U.S. vs. Microsoft, assisted by Judge Jackson. I can't help but feel that more innuendo and misconceptions were furthered during that time than at any other.

Microsoft may have business practices that need attention, but if the government restricts them in writing software innovation will collapse. If the support utilities that are included in Windows currently had to be purchased separately and worse yet, from other companies, I would not have networked, I probably would not have bought at least three of the computers that I currently have, and a lot of other consumers would have held back as well. I get a lot for my money with Microsoft products and it sounds like to me the government would like to see that value stopped. Upgrading software over the years has often meant buying new programs. Microsoft up until now has retained backwards compatibility with software wrote twenty years ago. Apple Computer with most upgrades of their operating system trash any legacy software.

I would like to comment on Sun Microsystems, Scott McNeally has publicly stated he intends to litigate against Microsoft forever. I always thought threats belonged more to the terrorist than to a business, and might even be against the law. But you see, I can see why Scott gets so red faced all the time. With the improvements in Windows NT the electrical engineering software vendors were no longer locked into compiling their code for the Unix operating system. Scott built boxes that ran their own version of Unix up until this time (there are eight versions of Unix, not one is compatible with the other) and when the software tool people saw the possibilities in Windows NT and then Compaq and HP started selling NT boxes for \$6,000 suddenly Scott's \$30,000 Unix boxes were not in so much demand.

Just imagine what that did for his blood pressure, its no wonder he gets so red faced when talking about Microsoft.

Then there is Oracle's Larry no doubt would like to keep Microsoft out of the data base arena as well. Microsoft in practice takes a product that is way to complex, and costly, and builds a version that anyone can use, without factory engineers help, and makes it immensely popular by turning it into a commodity product at Staples and Wal-Mart. Lastly as I mentioned just before, there are eight versions of Unix no less. Software transportability between them is close to zilch. If the Unix people can do that to consumers it seems strange that Microsoft should have to bear a burden in maintaining compatibility for all these other leaches.

Yours truly,

John H. Johnston
Drawer 149
Boulder, MT 59632
Fax 406-225-3946
Phone 406-225-9137

MTC-00007833

From: Didier Maignan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The uncertainty is no good for Technology. The settlement is fair. Please consider the impact on the Worldwide economy, and accept the agreement already accepted by the 9 states and the federal government.

Didier Maignan
Chairman of "interprojet"
France

MTC-00007834

From: Thomas Arthur Sweeney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case should have never been prosecuted to begin with. It is not the business of government tell a legally operating business what it can and cannot do. It is necessary for the Justice Department to get out of the way, tell the states that "object" to the settlement to get over it, because it is done. If these states have so much time on their hand, that they can afford this case, then perhaps they are meccas we all should move to, because they have no crime!!!!!!!!!!!!

www.geocities.com/thomasweeney/

MTC-00007835

From: Richard Poorman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ: Give the public a break! Stop spending our tax money and settle this stupid extended legal action.

I have felt, from day one, that Microsoft have conducting some undesirable sale practices. But, where was our government watch dogs. I'll tell you, they were sleeping at the switch. The public used to be protected from product loss leaders which are used to get high profit items in front of the unsuspecting consumer. This is about all Microsoft was doing. When their competition was taking a licking, they complained to Big Uncle. Now, Big Uncle wants to show off his

power and destroy Microsoft. Get real, Microsoft is a fine company, has brought great prosperity to America. Give them a minor fine and get on down the road to a strong economy. Microsoft lead us in the past to great things and will again. I bought 300 shares of Microsoft in the middle of this mess because I had confidence that Big Uncle would do the right thing. Tell me you will. Give Microsoft a minor fine, turn they loose to doing great things for the consumer again. Please stop this crazy loss leader practice that is going full force today. The dumb public is getting kicked in the ass. Banks give away credit cards at low interest rates, just to hook the public later. Auto companies sell with zero interest just to hook us later when we pay for the over priced cars. My stores have these give away items to get me in the store so they can soak me on some items that are hard to check. There are laws again this practice but Big Uncle just lets it go on. Stop this practice of selling products at one price to some consumers and another price to others.

Get our economy going again!
Richard Poorman
2395 Pine Lake Trail
Arab, AL 35016

MTC-00007836

From: DonmesswithTX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

In reference to Microsoft and the litigation, I feel that Microsoft has been very cooperative, not to mention that there is no other competitor that even comes close to the Microsoft products!

Any further litigation is unjust!

Sincerely,

Lindsey Ford

Southern Critters Sales and Marketing LLC

MTC-00007837

From: OCP2332@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:12am
Subject: lawsuit

i use microsoft and feel they have done nothing wrong. i can use any system and change at any time....to penalize a company for advancements is the wrong message to send to start ups.

MTC-00007838

From: Ray Vardon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:42am
Subject: Settle

Let Microsoft conduct its business fairly and without the federal govt. involvement!!
Happy Trails!! (:) Anne

MTC-00007839

From: Adam Gates
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To anyone who anyone who may read this, There is an extremely gross misunderstanding as to how Microsoft works. It would be much more effective for a high level government official to DROP all legal action and just ask Microsoft to create a more

competitive environment. This is the TRUTH!!! Simple and quick. A judgment like this would turn the economy around in a day. Microsoft would take the responsibility seriously and would take a commanding role in turning things around. Microsoft WILL succeed in whatever direction they are pointed in so point them at the common good.

Adam Gates
972-742-5465
ahgates@hotmail.com or
ahgates@yahoo.com

Please feel free to contact me with any questions on my comments.

MTC-00007840

From: Ricardo Villar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ.

It's about time the government (DOJ) stops harassing Microsoft. Isn't it enough the harassment they have from their competition? It's a tough world out there, when you don't have the privileges of being a public servant. Microsoft is responsible for thousand of jobs in the States and worldwide. Microsoft made computing accessible to everyone, at a time when Motorola, Apple, Netscape and others were selling their products to a select group of people who could afford their prices and conditions. How can you criticize Microsoft for their policies, when the government policies are, some times, even dirtier and deadly?

Stop this case at once and dedicate all your efforts in protecting the States from the internal and external enemies, not from people who want to make America big.

Ricardo Villar

MTC-00007841

From: Stanley Shoeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:58am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's finally get this case behind us. The proposed terms are reasonable.

MTC-00007842

From: Risto Raitio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:02am
Subject: Justice and free market economy or
Microsoft socialism (very briefly!)

Helsinki, January 3, 2002

Dear Justice Officer,

I am a (retired) theoretical physicist who has worked with computers for 30 years, the last ten years in an international software company. I've learned American way of life as a visiting scientist at Stanford University in 1974-76.

May I call your attention to the following points: first quoting Mr. Ganesh Prasad of Sidney, Australia

—"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."

—"Microsoft's monopoly profits are the direct result of these and other illegally anti-competitive tactics."

—"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."

Microsoft speaks often of their innovations. Most educated people consider Microsoft rather an implementor of other companies' innovations. For example, the graphical user interface and the spreadsheet software Excel. Another example, Microsoft realised the importance of the Internet quite late. Microsoft's unstable operating systems (all of them before Windows 2000), proprietary software and binary file formats have caused high and unnecessary expenses for Microsoft software user organisations. Of course, Microsoft claims the opposite. But I'm not against Microsoft, I'm only against illegal business methods. In fact, a decent kind of Microsoft is needed! The bottom line is whether the United States Justice system wants to maintain the free market economy or open the door to centrally controlled sectors of economy, which are known to fail ultimately.

Sincerely,

Risto Raitio, PhD

Espoo, Finland

MTC-00007843

From: Larry Ownbey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:20am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hi, how are ya?

The simple fact is that free enterprise is what made USA the great nation that it is or should I say was? Let me ask a simple question; because Midas makes mufflers does that mean that Ford cannot make mufflers? Because Netscape makes a browser should Microsoft be disallowed? Smaller software companies have made a choice to make programs that rely on Microsoft's operating system. As far as I know there is no rule or law that says that they cannot develop their own operating system and programs to run under them.

Netscape chose to make a browser that runs under Microsoft's operating system. Why in the name of hell should that mean that Microsoft cannot include the browser that they make as a part of their operating system. Nowhere in that effort did Microsoft in any way do anything that would prevent anybody from getting and using any browser they choose. If the other guy wants to compete they need to "make a better whistle". If they cannot "make a better whistle" then maybe they should consider another line of work!

Microsoft has done some great things for this country and it's people, I really don't think they should be punished for it. If you ask me the whole litigation was just done to make a bunch of nearly worthless lawyers rich at the consumer's expense. For every

good thing that anybody find in what lawyers do I can guarantee there are at least 25 bad things. Their sole existence is based on the ill fate and sufferings of others. Lawyers will destroy this country.

Thank you,
Larry Ownbey

MTC-00007844

From: K Orum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 3, 2002
United States Dept of Justice
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in behalf of Microsoft. I don't think there is any reason to break up a company that has supplied us with good products and good service since personal computing began. I have never felt "victimized" or limited by any of the Microsoft applications. I see AOL/Time Warner and your old friend AT&T as much bigger problems/threats to the public. I am a subscriber of both of these services and feel victimized by their underhanded billing methods and misrepresented services.

I am a shareholder of all three so I don't give this opinion carelessly or unfairly.

Sincerely,
Karen E. Orum

MTC-00007845

From: tom holzman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I am quite pleased the case with Microsoft has been settled. In my opinion it should never have been brought to begin with. Microsoft's competitors in the marketplace were simply using government intervention as an attempt to block Microsoft's superior marketing skills and products. I am neither connected with Microsoft nor am I connected with any other software or hardware company. I use Microsoft operating system software on PC's as well as Apple operating system software on their machines. I am simply a home consumer who feels this whole episode is simply another example of politically motivated government waste excess. As a consumer I feel the whole prosecution of the government case against Microsoft has been a huge waste of time and money. The consumer has never had more inexpensive choices for home computing than under the current/previous market environment. Please go away and leave these people alone to innovate and develop new useful products for consumers! If you want to do something really useful for me as a consumer you should investigate why I can't get connected to the internet at high speeds because the last two miles of wire to my house is under monopoly control by Ameritech/SBC. This behemoth is clearly blocking other companies from selling me true high-speed DSL access.

This is corruption on a huge scale!
Regards,
holzmant@telocity.com

MTC-00007846

From: Ralph Baur

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,
the proposed settlement is reasonable and fair. I totally agree that the settlement is good for the customers, the industry and moreover it means an important signal to the worlds economy. In my opinion the settlement is of public interest and I respectfully ask the district court to honor this in its fourthcoming decision.

Best Regards,
R. Baur

MTC-00007847

From: Chris Boonham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I just wanted to take the opportunity to record my opinion.

I believe that the settlement between Microsoft and the federal government/nine states, is tough on Microsoft, but is fair to the Consumers and the IT industry as a whole. It is in the interests of the everyone, including the US economy, for this settlement to proceed swiftly to it's final conclusion.

Thank you.
Chris Boonham

MTC-00007848

From: DivalLibraE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please, do not this situation continue. I believe an end should be put to this, and that the present settlement agreement be let stand with a guarantee that this settlement stand. Continuing to prolong action against Microsoft will not be in the public/consumers interest. This entire action has hurt our economy, industry and the American citizen. In my opinion, the continuation of this case over so many months was caused mainly by our pre-Bush government and politicians.

I think that when the public learns that Microsoft if no longer in litigation, the response of business and citizens will react with a positive response.

Thank you.....LillianEibert

MTC-00007849

From: JACK PURSER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:08am
Subject: Settlement

If you don't leave our corporations alone they will be forced out to overseas countries and more of our jobs will be sent over there, LEAVE THEM ALONE!

Jack E. Purser Sr.
A Voter
Jack Purser Sr.

MTC-00007850

From: MadRGO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe strongly that it is time to settle the Microsoft lawsuit and move on. The country is in a recession and it is not prudent

to stifle innovation on one of our home-grown businesses. Microsoft is a business that creates jobs and is a good citizen. The settlement is fair and the nine states should be made to accept that. Their interests are merely self-serving.

Madison McCall
Dorothy McCall, Charlottesville, Virginia

MTC-00007851

From: cauvel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would just like to add my voice to the many people asking you to stop this useless waste of public money and resources. The continuation of this legal battle can have no benefit to anyone in the public sector. You are suing a company for bundling its products, and saying you are doing it for the benefit of the people. Can I please have someone explain to me how it is going to benefit me to have to pay for each separate piece of my operating system for my computer? So, for one price I have recieved everything I need to operate my computer and to go online, it works perfectly together, I dont have conflicts to deal with in case I buy the wrong thing, and most importantly I GOT IT ALL FOR ONE PRICE! I think that this case to begin with was baseless harrassment from the government, and with everything I have read about it, I still believe that is true. I think that we need to go ahead and settle this and move on. And in closing, I would just like to mention... AOL/TIME WARNER. Lets apply the same rules to all corporations, regardless of who the major stockholders are.

MTC-00007852

From: RANDVIC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:22am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

End your legal attacks on Microsoft. Accept Microsoft's offer. The government legal attacks on Microsoft are simply yet again attempts to penelize those who are successful, while at the same time rewarding those who are not. That is backwards.

MTC-00007853

From: DEBROTA—DAVID—
J@LILLY.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs—

I support the Tunney Act. I also support reducing the period of copyright protection of computer software (for everyone, not just Microsoft), with an option for extension if the copyright holder places source code into escrow. We simply must encourage both innovation and reuse.

David DeBrotta

MTC-00007854

From: Ron Graves
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:24am
Subject: microsoft case

To whom it may concern:
I strongly object to the protracted suits against Microsoft. As a user I feel that

Microsoft has given me the best possible platform on which to run my computer. All other solutions (Linux) appear like solutions looking around for a problem—try to install it as opposed to Windows. As a former computer programmer, I can appreciate the complexity and work that went in to Windows development. Finally, as a shareholder I feel that I and the other shareholders have been punished enough with the devaluation of the shares since this case first got major publicity. Enough is enough and the state Attorneys General should stop as well. Let's get on with the business of making Windows better and not having a company look over its shoulders all the time.

Ron Graves

MTC-00007855

From: Lois Tilles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice Representative,
I believe the settlement that has been proposed for Microsoft is fair and equitable. I support it going forward. Also, I think it would further endanger our weakened economy to spend precious time, energy and focus on reopening issues that have already been fairly settled.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Lois Tilles
ltilles@pacbell.net

MTC-00007856

From: Dan Cannon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is clear to me that Microsoft is a innovative company and the envy of most of their competitors. Many of the entities opposed to the proposed settlement are either Microsoft competitors, have a financial stake in the outcome, or simply do not like any successful corporation. Our country has already spent way too many resources on this lawsuit which in my opinion is actually hurting the consumer and our nation's economy by stifling innovation. If Microsoft ever truly harms the consumer, the market will speak. I urge the DoJ to accept the proposed settlement and allow (and even encourage) technical innovation to once again flourish.

Dan Cannon
drcannon@hotmail.com

MTC-00007857

From: Edward W. Hackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please set this case aside. The settlement reached with the government should be good enough. Let Microsoft get back to the business of writing computer computer programs.

MTC-00007858

From: Rex Plent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:42am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I'm a Microsoft share holder and I believe that Microsoft has been good for this country and the world! I believe that the company was unfairly attacked and that this whole affair should be put to rest. Microsoft has been good to me and their products are great. Let's get on with it! The world has more important things to be concerned about.
redrex@msn.com

MTC-00007859

From: NicSca@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to end this injustice perpetrated by a few competitors who simply cry foul because they can't defeat Microsoft on the playing field using the normal rules of the game. I am one American who truly believes that Microsoft did not violate any laws of this great country. Being a fiercely competitive and relentlessly intimidating player in the great economic arena of today's world is correct, necessary, and JUSTIFIED!

Microsoft broke no laws. Let us end this travesty now!

CC:NicSca@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00007860

From: hterhoeve@gmstl.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:49am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Comments regarding proposed settlement.
Proposed settlement is too severe to Microsoft.

MTC-00007861

From: Marge Seybert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Show me an American made television set.
Shanley J. Seybert

MTC-00007862

From: CTerry@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time for the gov't to move on and stop hindering the productivity and creativity of the software company that single-handedly stopped the madness of the duplicity of operating systems (software companies had to re-write the old code just to make it available on the different systems instead of innovating), stopped the madness of the duplicity of office software products that all worked differently, wouldn't talk to each other and made computers hard to work with and limited people to working effectively from product to product. Oh...by the way, do you remember the price of Lotus 123, which didn't have a new upgrade (1a to 2 and 2.1) for 3 years... \$395. We now get in MS Office Excel, Word, Powerpoint, Outlook and Access for less! Quit it. They have innovated, made the product available to everyone all for a significantly less price. Go chase some terrorists!

Charles W. Terry
13201 Dodie Dr.
Darnestown, MD 20878

MTC-00007863

From: vze27x6e@verizon.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:00am
Subject: Microsoft

Please settle this suit as soon as possible. It is an unjust suit to begin with. Microsoft is only guilty of being successful. The states attorneys general and the other companies that are suing are only being opportunistic. Microsoft is a great company and good for our nation.

MTC-00007864

From: Snowman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sir/Madam

I beleave that Microsoft and the American public have and are tired of this action. I also beleave that Microsoft is one of the fuee companys that has a direct influence on our economy, if this sort of action is continued the recovery of our economy will be delayed.

Thank you for your time in this grave acct of misdirected justice.

Glenn Eugene; Frantz

Copyright Notice: All rights reserved re common-law copyright of trade-name/trade-mark,

GLENN

EUGENE FRANTZ(C)-as well as any and all derivatives and variations in the spelling of said trade-name/trade-mark-Copyright(C) 1969 by Glenn Eugene; Frantz. Said trade-name/trade-mark,

GLENN EUGENE FRANTZ(C), may neither be used, nor reproduced, neither in whole nor in part, nor in any manner whatsoever, without the prior, express, written consent and acknowledgement of Glenn Eugene; Frantz as signified by the red-ink signature of Glenn Eugene; Frantz, hereinafter "Secured Party."

Secured Party neither grants, nor implies, nor otherwise gives consent for any unauthorized use of GLENN EUGENE FRANTZ(C), and all such unauthorized use is strictly prohibited.

Unauthorized User(s):

(1) grants Secured Party a security interest in, and a distress warrant and lien against, User's property and interest in property in the sum certain amount of \$500,000.00 per each trade-name/trade-mark used, per each occurrence of use, plus triple damages, plus costs for each such use, as well as for each and every use of any and all derivatives and variations in the spelling of GLENN EUGENE FRANTZ(C);

(2) authenticates a Security Agreement wherein User is debtor and Glenn Eugene; Frantz is Secured Party and User pledges all of User's property and interest in property as collateral for securing User's contractual obligation;

(3) authenticates a UCC Financing Statement wherein User is debtor and Glenn Eugene; Frantz is Secured Party;

(4) consents and agrees that said Financing Statement is a continuing financing statement, authorizing Secured Party's filing of any continuation statement necessary for maintaining Secured Party's perfected security interest in all of User's property and

rights in property pledged as collateral in the aforementioned Security Agreement, until User's contractual obligation theretofore incurred has been fully satisfied;

(5) authorizes the filing of the aforementioned UCC Financing Statement and Security Agreement in the UCC filing office by Secured Party;

(6) consents and agrees that any and all such filings referenced in paragraph "(5)" above are not, and may not be considered, bogus, and that User will not claim that any such filing is bogus; and

(7) waives all defenses.

Record Owner: Glenn Eugene; Frantz, Autograph Common Law Copyright(C) 1969.

MTC-00007865

From: Bob Sammons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Uncle Sam,
Please settle this Microsoft fiasco ASAP. September 11th has been a drop in the bucket compared to what this government debacle has done to the economy.

Thanks,
Bob Sammons
2000 Sammons Davis Ct
Arlington, Texas 76015

MTC-00007866

From: D. G. Cragar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Get this settled without further litigation.
D. G. CRAGAR
P.O. BOX 142
ADONA, AR 72001-0142

MTC-00007867

From: Jamesjmorgan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To DOJ:

It seems appropriate that the DOJ finalize the settlement agreement at this time.

I found it hard to comprehend the concept that Microsoft stifled competition when they actually were an incubator and catalyst for the most concentrated intellectual development in history. Sour grapes has cost all of us too much time and money. Get on with the settlement and let's get back to more important issues.

Sincerely,
James J. Morgan
Paradise Valley, AZ.

MTC-00007868

From: rufuswon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I approve of the proposed settlement and wish to see it implemented.
Jeff Ballard

MTC-00007869

From: James R. Wright Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly believe your proposed settlement of the Microsoft antitrust action is fair and equitable. Your proposal will continue to allow research and development of new products and technologies by the best and brightest in the industry.

I also believe any further restrictions would significantly inhibit future advances in technical development areas if large vendors like Microsoft is restricted, just so it will be perceived "fair" for other developers to enter the market. Regardless of the software developers size if their products are actually good they will find a place in the market. After all didn't Microsoft succeed in a market dominated by IBM when it first started?

I don't remember the Justice Department going after IBM to level the playing field for Microsoft.

The unique thing about private enterprise is consumers do have brains and they will do what's best for themselves regardless of what is perceived a "politically correct."

I hope you will stick with your original decision and allow the consumers like me determine what is good and what is bad in the market place, not the courts. Let's put an end to this type of corporate harassments once and for all!

James R. Wright Sr.
313 East Appleby Avenue
Cambridge, Maryland 21613

MTC-00007870

From: Colleen Chapman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:28am
Subject: Memory !!!

Hello—

This whole damn thing with Microsoft is stupid ! Way back when computers were just getting started into home desktops Apple came out with their OS and wouldn't license or allow anyone to use their system. Monopoly ?? Several other systems were developed for the IBM clones, Microsofts DOS among them. Why did Microsoft become the system in use ?? For the reasons of 1 that it was reasonably user friendly and 2 mainly it was available to the whole market. In days gone by when a person developed something that the buying public wanted he could make a profit and build a business. Now that common sense has taken a back seat to Lawyerize if a person is successful he gets sued. Pure male bovine fecal material.

I'm a retired Los Angeles City fireman and have seen bureaucracy in action big time. The whole message of this deal and the other many "do gooder" issues will do nothing but stifle any incentive of the people that have ambitions other than being a happy hamburger flipper.

Cordially and sincerely. Howard L Chapman

MTC-00007871

From: BAADBBBOY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:31am
Subject: Tunney Act

To Whom It May Concern:
Please, enough already with hassling Microsoft and Bill Gates! Bill Gates has done

a lot of good for our country with his company Microsoft! Stop the nonsense and leave the good company and Bill Gates along already! Just because a few of our government elected officials are against Microsoft and Bill Gates because of the brilliant man he is and because he has founded one of the best companies in the world gives our government NO right to continue to harass him!

I say to our government ENOUGH ALREADY! Spend our tax dollars on more important issues in this country, like coming up with a way STOP THE TERRORIST THAT THEY ALLOW INTO THE USA!

Sincerely,
Mary Chance
20515 East Country Club Drive
Apt. #2243
Aventura, Fla
33180
305-937-1507

MTC-00007872

From: Robert Brady
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:37am
Subject: microsoft settlement

i think it was crazy to go after microsoft in the first place. look at what the market has done because of it !. get off their back, please

MTC-00007873

From: STAN HELENIK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:43am
Subject: pro-microsoft

i am a canadian doing extensive work in the states.i find too much critical emphasis as of late on microsoft by the nine states..it seems to me that sun,aol and others are lobbying still..i am very happy with my new XP operating system as well as the previous others..let the american dream persevere and let microsoft alone. stan h.

MTC-00007874

From: NaplesMac@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:45am
Subject: Subj: Microsoft settlement

To whom this email concerns;
I do believe that the settlement that has already been agreed upon between Microsoft and the US Government/States, I believe it to be fair for all parties concerned. Most of all this settlement is in the best interest of the American public and the country as a whole. I am in favor of the courts settling this case to allow our country to get on with the recovery that is so badly needed. I see no further litigation's needed. It is time that we as a country get this case behind us and to go on with the more important issues facing the nation and the economy.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read my comments dealing with the Microsoft lawsuit.

Mr. William MacKenzie

MTC-00007875

From: STAN HELENIK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:47am
Subject: microsoft settlement
From: STAN HELENIK
<hetstan@oxford.net>

To: <Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>
 Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2002 7:43 AM
 Subject: pro-microsoft

i am a canadian doing extensive work in the states.i find too much critical emphasis as of late on microsoft by the nine states..it seems to me that sun,aol and others are lobbying still..i am very happy with my new XP operating system as well as the previous others..let the american dream persevere and let microsoft alone. stan h.

p.s. BILL GATES,IN MY OPINION IS AN EXTRAORDINARY PHILANTHROPIST AND MODEL AMERICAN.

MTC-00007876

From: Pajoarnold@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:48am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

Get done with this! This is way too long and too expensive to continue. Had Microsoft been issuing product at an exorbitant rate then you have cause to worry. Microsoft is and has been attacked because they got there first! I thought that this was the way it worked in the US, at least it did for my forty years in business.

John Arnold
 Little River, SC 29566

MTC-00007877

From: Alkay99@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:56am
 Subject: Settlement

It's time to end this ridiculous lawsuit against one of America's finest corporations.

From what I read in the media, Microsoft's offer is more than fair. This corporation has made the U.S. the leader in computer sciences, has added to the security of the country, and has done nothing to be ashamed of.

Time to end this persecution of a fine corporation!

Al Kay, Orlando, FL

MTC-00007878

From: Ed Schone
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:58am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

I am a Microsoft consumer and I use both IBM compatible and Macintosh computers. I use Microsoft software on both types of computers. Why—because it provides the most advanced features at prices I can afford. Even on the Macintosh, where there is very little Microsoft software available compared to the IBM compatible world, when I had the choice, I've bought Microsoft (or downloaded free) over the other vendors. You guys have done enough. Just let agreed decision carry on and let Microsoft continue to develop innovative software products.

Ed Schone
 eschone@hotmail.com
 704.573.4177

MTC-00007879

From: Harvey Waxman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:58am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

What good does it do to protest? Microsoft owns the operating system world. Why else would a cumbersome, complex, frustrating and, generally acknowledged to be, inferior operating system prevail? Could it be that Mr. Gates had the vision to understand that once his DOS was installed on the vast majority of computers in homes, courtesy of his arrangement with IBM, he could do anything he wanted without the benefit of competition?

There is no competition because of stupid and naive decisions made by Apple computer. But the fact is that there is no competition.

Harvey Waxman D.M.D.
 73 Wright Lane
 Wickford, RI 02852-5846

MTC-00007880

From: JOHN BASHAM
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:58am
 Subject: Re: Settlement

I am writing to you to urge you to approve the settlement with Microsoft. I am a user of Microsoft products and have felt all through this court case that I have purchased a good product at a fair price. Jack Basham "One of the penalties for refusing to participate in politics is that you end up being governed by your inferiors."

Plato

MTC-00007881

From: James MacLaughlin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:01am
 Subject: SETTLEMENT

Please do not punish Microsoft beyond the current negotiated settlement. Business is about competition which include strategies and tactics that may not seem fair to people who are not in business.

This entirely DEMOCRAT suit has damaged our economy. Don't make it any worse.

Thank you,
 James A MacLaughlin
 1633 Eton Way
 Crofton, MD 21114

MTC-00007882

From: Vern Scoggins
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:00am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to thank you for settling with Microsoft. Please don't let all those whiney competitors dictate what they think is right for the consumer and the economy when they are really only concerned about themselves. Your settlement with Microsoft IS the right thing for consumers and the economy.

Sincerely,
 Vernon A. Scoggins
 13937 Dovehunt Place
 Charlotte, NC 28273

MTC-00007883

From: Ruth Pennock
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:02am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please settle this case. Thank you.

MTC-00007884

From: BRIAN HOLLAND
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:03am
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Sirs,
 After years of debate, argument, charge and counter charge, conflict, and inflammatory unsubstantiated claims of wrong doing, a settlement has been achieved between the government and Microsoft. It is my opinion that the energy and resources, both human and capital, that have been exhausted during this period went way beyond what was required to protect consumers from the abuses of market domination.

The settlement achieved is fair. The competitive model of commerce in the most advanced and admired economy in the world has been preserved. Free market competition incents innovation and growth, and ultimately advances the quality of life for all.

I urge you to accept this settlement and reaffirm the character of commerce in the U.S.

Sincerely,
 L. Brian Holland
 PO Box 353
 13091 Kibler Road
 Greensboro, MD 21639

MTC-00007885

From: bill shaw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:07am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this ridiculous case ASAP!!!!

MTC-00007886

From: Alice Allen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:06am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that it is essential to our country and our economy that the Microsoft case be settled for once and all; I hope the most recent settlement will be quickly approved and initiated.

Alice Allen

MTC-00007887

From: KEN NELSON
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why punish a company that has competed fairly on a head to head basis?

Why punish a company that has kept prices "LOW" not high?

Why punish a company that has done so very much for the high tech industry, this country and the world?

Why punish a company for doing such a good job?

Doesn't punishing a company for doing well send the wrong message to our children, friends and family?

Thank you.
 Ken Nelson

MTC-00007888

From: Robert P. Blaisdell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:12am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice (DOJ)
 Representative, Marzen Group LLC is a small

business that integrates software and provides secure solutions for Department of Defense (DOD), as well as our commercial customers. Our Corporate headquarters is located in New Hampshire and we also have a location in Alabama. Our expertise includes supporting and securing both the Windows-based and UNIX platforms, software development, and providing turnkey hardware/software solutions to our various customers. Our customer's requirements are split on a platform basis as follows: 85% demand for Windows and 15% for UNIX/Linux.

(By the way, it has been our experience that the UNIX space within DOD is controlled by Sun Microsoft Systems Solaris at about 92%. Within our commercial UNIX space, it has been our experience that the market share for Sun Microsoft Systems appears to be the same. We have also seen that the DOD router space is controlled by CISCO to the tune of about 96%. If market share is the key indicator there are lots of other antitrust targets depending how you define the market space.)

We have followed the case against Microsoft and have reviewed the DOJ settlement. We agree with Microsoft that the settlement is fair and preserves the ability of our company to continue compete in the software integration and security marketplace, while preserving Microsoft's right to be innovative with their products. Since the case began, the software industry has continued to become more competitive place, and we believe this will continue especially during these economic down turn. The fact there are ten times more software developers choosing to use the Microsoft economic model and tools, should not be worrisome to DOJ. This means that many third party companies, like my company, are betting their futures using the development platform framework provided by Microsoft, will work correctly with that framework. It means many jobs for our citizens and it allows customers to obtain the best software solutions made in the world. If each software company had to develop our own framework, much like the current state of UNIX/Linux, the cost and time to market of products that are needed would be significantly higher. In some cases this would force us to scrap the project, thus leaving our customers with inferior solutions.

The United States is known for its innovative capabilities within the software arena. Microsoft is an important partner in this space as well as other companies like Oracle, Sun and Red Hat. Microsoft has significantly invested in Standards Groups, which benefits all software developers, regardless of their O/S affiliation. Microsoft's large scale support of the open standards committees (IETF, UPNP, W3, to name just a few) has helped them to become even a better corporate citizen within the software industry. The restrictions placed on Microsoft by your agreement will also allow us to move past the period of uncertainty which has plagued many companies for several years. As a company president, I can tell you that waiting for this legal case to be settled, has had a significantly impacted our strategic planning model for the past couple

of years. With the case settled, it will allow companies like ours, to forge ahead with strategic plan, certain that we they are based on a development framework that is understood and will be stable for the foreseeable future.

The settlement DOJ proposed, and that was accepted by Microsoft, is fair and we believe it is in the best interest of the citizens of the US. I urge DOJ to stay the course with the settlement as proposed, to remove the cloud of uncertainty over software integration and third party development plans and to move forward. Let get on with the business of providing innovative solutions to our citizens!

Bob Blaisdell—President
M'rzeen Group LLC
35 Pine Street Ext.
Millyard Technology Park
Nashua, NH 03060-3213
Corporate: 603.889.9522 Mobile:
603.860.8200
Fax 603.889.9567 rpb@marzen.com
www.marzen.com
CC:mailbox@gregg.senate.gov@inetgw,
opinion@smith.sena. . .

MTC-00007889

From: Punto Info
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:15am
Subject: Domini Prestigiosi
ACQUISTA un di questi 5 autorevoli domini:
AFFARI.INFO IMPRESA.INFO
SPONSOR.INFO SPOT.INFO
LESBO.INFO
E avrai da subito un grande numero di visitatori, senza contare il prestigio che la tua azienda ne trarrebbe.
Per informazioni: <http://www.toprete.com/domain.htm>

MTC-00007890

From: Jmmenoud@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:19am
Subject: Microsoft
The settlement reached with the 9 states is a big step in the right direction. I find it ridiculous that American companies fight each others while foreign companies competing in the same field try to fill the gap. Microsoft is a pioneer and it is a shame that other companies which could not catch up attempt to penalize Microsoft. Who are these people who do not accept the rules of free market ? and what are the benefits for US companies to continue this legal war ? Abroad people are laughing when they see the millions of dollars spent on this purely legal fees. ... What is the finality ? Certain CEO of losing companies should swallow their ego and accept the ruling. ...

I expect the DOJ do bring an end to this case against one of the biggest pride of the USA.

Jean-Michel Menoud

MTC-00007891

From: njcolonna
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:20am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
TIME TO PUT AN END TO THIS ISSUE.
PLEASE STOP NOW AND LET'S MOVE ON

TO BETTER THING TO DO. WE HAVE REVISITED THIS MANY TIMES BEFORE.

I AM CONFIDENT YOU RESPECTS THE VIEWS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS LIKE MYSELF WHO WISH FOR OUR JUSTICE SYSTEM TO ACT WITH CARE ! PLEASE CEASE ANY FURTHER ACTIONS WITH GOING FORTH WITH A CASE SETTLEMENT REVIEW.

SINCERELY, NORM COLONNA 440 237 4581

MTC-00007892

From: LotusInn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:28am
Subject: We support the efforts of Microsoft and its effect on our success as a company and personally. We t

We support the efforts of Microsoft and its effect on our success as a company and personally. We think that Microsoft has had a tremendous benefit on our nation by enhancing people's productivity.

This keeps inflation down. We see no need for this unnecessary litigation. We realize that Microsoft's software and innovation has made our life better.

MTC-00007893

From: philip.lindsey@na.biomerieux.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:
Please let it be known as part of the Public Record that I am in favor of a full settlement of this case in favor of Microsoft. We have better things to do in this country than to penalize a successful organization that is a backbone of our economy. Please stop this madness.

Philip M. Lindsey, C.P.M.
bioMérieux, Inc.
Hazelwood, MO

MTC-00007894

From: Mark E Fogg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:30am
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sir:
It is now time to settle the Microsoft case. Microsoft is one of the leading companies in the tech field. You must realize that the companies fighting Microsoft have a vested interest in causing the company trouble. The states attorney generals still holding out are more interested in enhancing their political careers than anything else. Settlement of this case with the current solution is the best option.

Mark E. Fogg

MTC-00007895

From: Michele Acerra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:31am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT.
Ladies or Gentlemen.

I understand that the D.O.J. is accepting comments on the "Microsoft proposed settlement".

My opinion is that the proposed settlement is fair and that should be enforced. I believe that all the States should accept it and in fact

I believe that they should not have entered in the litigation since this was, if any, a federal offense and was already prosecuted by the D.O.J. Although undoubtedly there were abuses by Microsoft of their technological and commercial position, I believe that it is time to move on and that freedom of innovation has to be respected and protected.

Sincerely,
Michele Acerra

MTC-00007896

From: Robert Dreyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:22am
Subject: Microsoft.

It seems that so called lidigation into the Microsoft law suit has become no more than an extortion on the part of a bunch of greedy people who use the excuse of "were only thinking about whats best for the people". I don't think any of the Attorney generals whether they be Federal of state have any other reason for the suit except its a place to shake a Co. down for the money All these law suits are just for the money be it greedy lawyers or state and federal offices. Get off microsofts back and let them go on about there business. It seems if a Co. has some smart people and is innovative we can't have that, we have to bring them down to our level. Thats the way people in government work any body with brain doesn't stand a chance there is no room in government for a thinker.

Sam Spade

MTC-00007897

From: Joseph Maccaro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:35am
Subject: complete the agreement

Sirs:

We urge the DOJ to end the Microsoft case and implement the recent government-Microsoft agreement. It is time to direct DOJ energy to other critical matters.

Mr & Mrs J. Maccaro
154-61 22 Ave
Whitestone NY 11357

MTC-00007898

From: Kenney, George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:38am
Subject: Opposition to Microsoft Settlement

I strongly oppose the Microsoft settlement because the parties harmed by the business practices are not compensated by the proposed settlement.

1) Low income school district are not the customers who purchased Microsoft products. The proposal to only provide relief to low-income schools, as opposed to all schools is a Robin Hood feel good approach to the problem. As a consumer who has been required to purchase Microsoft products, both stand alone and pre-loaded by the manufacturers of the PC's I have purchased, my children do not go to low income schools and therefore will derive no benefit from the settlement.

2) Competitors of Microsoft will be further harmed by being excluded from selling products to the schools which will be flooded with Microsoft products as a result

of the settlement. The damage to these competitors will actually increase as a result of this settlement.

I would like to see this settlement be rejected for the reasons mentioned above.

sincerely,
George Kenney
1304 Sequoia Rd
Naperville, IL 60540
Phone: + 630 541 8628
Fax: + 630 541 8204
george.kenney@ca.com
<mailto:george.kenney@ca.com>

MTC-00007899

From: Donna (038) Gary
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:41am
Subject: microsoft settlement

To the DOJ. It is my opinion that you should end the battle with Microsoft and go forward with the settlement.

Personally I believe the suit was wrong from the get go. We need more innovative companies like Microsoft. They make a good product,market it well, and make money doing it. This gives people jobs that provide the income to help stimulate the economy. When Microsoft raises their prices to help pay the settlement who gets hurt? Us the people your "protecting" that's who. Open and free competition is what drives a market, not the courts.

Thank you for taking the time to read my views.

Gary Chierici

MTC-00007900

From: Daviduk, Matthew
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 8:41am
Subject: Comment

If not for Microsoft, where would we be today? The settlement is fair. For the goodness of the technology world and the consumers out there, let it be settled.

Is there going to be the same lawsuits against companies like AOL?

The software industry would self-destruct if Microsoft goes away. . . . But if I were Bill Gates, I would say "Fine, you don't appreciate my contributions. . . . then Good Bye"

MTC-00007901

From: Julsxn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:42am
Subject: Settlement

I think that it is a bunch of c—— for a company having to share with others who have been sitting on their duff what they have achieved with their efforts. If I were Bill Gates I'd tell them to go U know where.

MTC-00007902

From: Arnold(u)Agre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I as Microsoft investor and user have been concerned about antitrust suit against Microsoft for some time. While Microsoft has become more or less the standard for their operating system and personal computer software, they earned it by providing

innovative products. I believe I as a consumer have benefited from what Microsoft has done over the years.

The Department of Justice has spent millions of tax payer dollars over the years prosecuting a case that I as a consumer feel was unnecessary to begin with. Microsoft has spent millions of dollars defending themselves. This money could have been used for more R&D or made Microsoft more profitable which would have enhanced the value of the stock in my portfolio. I think it ridiculous to punish a company because they have been successful.

The uncertainty caused my this litigation needs to stop. Microsoft has agreed to a settlement that I think goes far beyond what was required. I think it is in the public interest that the case be settled with the terms that have been agreed to by the DOJ and Microsoft.

Arnold Agre
8762 Gray Fox Dr.
Evergreen, Co 80439

MTC-00007903

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: Chu4021748@aol.com
To: piu@doj.ca.gov ;

attorney.general@po.state.ct.us ;
ag@oag.state.fl.us ;
consumer@ag.state.ia.us ;
GENERAL@ksag.org ;
webmaster@ago.state.ma.us ;
attorney.general@state.mn.us ;
uag@att.state.ut.us ; consumer@wvnet.edu ;
timb001@attglobal.net

Sent: Monday, December 17, 2001 3:11 PM
Subject: Don't Settle with Microsoft

Watching MS behavior for years I do not favor a settlement as they have destroyed what once was a very competitive marketplace. The unethical behavior they have shown should not be rewarded with a slap on the wrist.

Charlie May

MTC-00007904

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: "Dan Van Fleet"

<danvanf@erinet.com>
To: <piu@doj.ca.gov>;
<attorney.general@po.state.ct.us>;
<ag@oag.state.fl.us>;
<consumer@ag.state.ia.us>;
<GENERAL@ksag.org>;
<webmaster@ago.state.ma.us>;
<attorney.general@state.mn.us>;
<uag@att.state.ut.us>;
<consumer@wvnet.edu>;
<timb001@attglobal.net> Sent:
Wednesday, December 19, 2001 11:01 AM

Subject: Don't Settle with Microsoft
Hi,

I'm from Ohio, one of the states that wimped out on the Microsoft case. I stand and applaud you all for not stopping without a real fix. I use OS/2, Linux. Of course I'm forced to use Microsoft products in many

instances. I have noted that not only is OS/2 superior to all versions of Windows including XP, I believe that Microsoft used unfair monopolistic tactics to quash OS/2. (The psudo 32 bit extensions that Word required, which broke OS/2 in the early 90's would be one of them)

I was very happy with Judge Jackson's understanding of the industry, it was the FIRST time in history that I thought a Judge had a clue about the IT industry. Depressingly, he let Microsoft get the best of him, (his temper had to have been raised due to the lies MS told in his court, which were proven to be lies in his court) and he spouted off when he shouldn't have.

Anyway, Keep up the good work, stand your ground. BTW, I've also contacted Betty Montgomery (AG-Ohio) to express my displeasure with their actions.

Dan Van Fleet
Springfield, Ohio
danvanf@erinet.com

Standard disclaimer: My E-mail address is for communications for and between myself and the address list of this original e-mail only. It is not for sale, rent, trade, barter, or any other purpose. You have not right to give, sell, trade, or otherwise transmit it, without my consent.

MTC-00007905

From: David Storm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is crime to continue to let the Microsoft competitors that can't compete in the marketplace to continue to hound Microsoft in the courts. What has started as an argument over whether Microsoft could enhance their product by incorporating a browser, has degenerated into "we don't like them because they are so successful, or so competitive, and therefore we must hamstring them".

I think it is fairly clear that Microsoft has sparked the current technological revolution. Remember it was just 8-10 years ago that we felt our technological economy would be surpassed by the Japanese. What has happened?. Obviously, without government inference in the marketplace, good old American ingenuity came through again. I believe I am getting a better product for less money because of Microsoft.

Settle the case without killing Microsoft. As a consumer I don't want to have another ATT-like breakup.

David Storm

MTC-00007906

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: "John Losse" <jn—jdlosse@juno.com>
To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 24, 2001 5:43 PM
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-00007907

From: RFWeg@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

PLEASE settle the Microsoft litigation as negotiated. This has gone on long enough. It is time to put this behind us and move on. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

MTC-00007908

From: david schofield
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:53am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir:
I urge you to go through with and approve the settlement approved by the DOJ and Microsoft.

The operating system is so inexpensive relative to what you get, it is hard for me to relate to the statement that Microsoft charged too much.

Please end this nonsense.
David Schofield
7675 Classic Way
Atlanta, Georgia 30350
CC:dscho@mindspring.com@inetgw

MTC-00007909

From: Richard A. Beers, MD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:54am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Dear US Department of Justice
Representative:

I find the Microsoft settlement to be a good one that is fair to all concerned parties. I would urge the DOJ to proceed with the settlement and NOT to pursue further litigation. Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,
Rich Beers
Richard A. Beers, MD
Associate Professor, Department of
Anesthesiology
SUNY Upstate Medical University
Syracuse, NY 13210
phone 315-464-4720
email <beersr@mail.upstate.edu>

MTC-00007910

From: Larry Rehg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to stop the litigation against Microsoft and get on with the important things in our country, like getting rid of those forces that want to topple our way of life and government. It's obvious to me that those who want to prolong this debacle are just looking for a big "pay check" and don't give a darn about the rest of the citizens.

We know you're powerful, so you don't need to prove it by continuing this maddening attack on private industry.

Larry M. Rehg
Plano, Texas

MTC-00007911

From: Balloonz2u@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

When we had nothing better to do, it was fashionable to blame Microsoft for the world's ills. We have lived through Sept.11th, so with thanks to G-d, let's get on with living and once again smile when we read the rising stock market prices. Settle the damn case!!!

MTC-00007912

From: Gale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam—
I am writing you to let you know my opinion about the Microsoft pending settlement. The courts need to do whatever possible to see that this settlement goes through. Microsoft has done some things that may have hurt competition, but the consumers have done nothing but benefit from their products and practices. Consumers are being hurt so much more by all the litigation that is going on. What Microsoft has done for the consumer is force all software companies to make their products compatible with each other, make them easier to use and offer more features. The monopolistic practices may have hurt competition in the long run, but us consumers are much better off right now. The only people really standing to benefit from further litigation and/or a more stringent ruling against Microsoft is Microsoft's competitors. If this is truly a case to protect consumers, then protect us by allowing this settlement to go through and forcing other states not signing it to settle quickly. If competitors' products are as good as what Microsoft produces, let the capitalistic marketplace benefit these companies. Having the government assist them in gaining market share will not benefit consumers.

Thank you,
Gale Dahlager
Co-Owner (and bookkeeper) of Razor Rock Racing
(bicycle component manufacturer)

MTC-00007913

From: George Dziuk Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:
I would strongly urge you to settle this matter on terms favorable to Microsoft. Without companies like MS, the future of this country's ability to compete and lead in important economic areas will be severely restricted.

I grant anyone the argument that there are warts all over Microsoft but they pale in comparison to the great good that MS brought to the computer industry years ago when a standard operating system didn't exist and those, like myself, who were into the infant personal computer craze wondered how anyone outside a big company could ever use one? It was too hard to buy a CPM based machine like I did then watch things go over to DOS and then wonder if Apple was going to really be "it" after all.

DOS did make it and the rest is history. Without Bill Gates imposing the industry standards, regardless of whether anyone agrees with how he did it, this country would still be doing things with pen and paper on ledger sheets.

George L. Dziuk Jr.

MTC-00007914

From: Cdsau@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe in more litigation. The settlement is good and fair for all. Thanks,
Carlos Diaz

MTC-00007915

From: John Kerr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It appears that the settlement allows for benefits to organizations that would not normally receive benefits. Additionally the heightened awareness of the issue should preclude these actions in the future there by putting the issue to rest. Now is not the time to further weaken our economy by adapting the rules to favor a few.

I think the Government would be better served by applying its resources to areas where help is truly needed such as airport and border security and the rights of individuals trying to access our Country.

Regards,
John Kerr

MTC-00007916

From: JFAshbaugh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to complete this settlement and get on with other business. In my mind most of the allegations were unfounded to begin with, and the government was overzealous in it's pursuit of Microsoft.

James F. Ashbaugh

MTC-00007917

From: Raymond Le Blanc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:03am
Subject: Settlement

I want to suggest that the DOJ accept the settlement terms as proposed by Microsoft as being fair and equitable to the consumer public.

With warmest regards,
Ray Le Blanc

MTC-00007918

From: RSaliba@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam:

Can we please put this matter behind all of us so we can get on with better things? As a consumer, Microsoft has revolutionized my personal and business life. I never felt they cheated me on the prices of their products. Moreover, it appears these anti-trust actions were brought not for the benefit of the consumer but for the benefit of

the competitors and a bunch of attorneys who wanted to advance their careers.

Even the class-action suit is a sham. How can an agreement to drop the suit in exchange for the company making a contribution to charities be of benefit to the class of plaintiffs the suit was originally designed to benefit? As a stockholder of many years, the Company has been very good to me, and I have no apologies. That's what our enterprise system is all about.

Robert G. Saliba

MTC-00007919

From: jack engel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:07am
Subject: settlement

Dear DOJ,

The settlement with Microsoft is more than fair to the public. Please don't let the special interest groups and wanna-be Microsoft competitors get in the way of progress, and innovation. Microsoft has done far more good for this country than any other firm I can think of.

John A. Engel, Jr.
Susan C. Engel
small shareholders
Jack Engel
82 South Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
203 966-7576

MTC-00007920

From: lee.morrow@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

May I add my voice as you consider the settlement of the Microsoft case. The suite brought against Microsoft and subsequent judgment was the beginning of the recession we find ourselves in at present. Please settle this matter as presented by Microsoft so it serves to lead us out of the recession and on the road to recovery. Our Congress is dragging it's feet. The Department of Justice can make a major contribution in moving our economy forward by rendering a timely decision.

Lee Morrow

MTC-00007921

From: vera reitmeier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:17am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
WILL YOU PLEASE SETTLE THIS CASE
ASAP!! IT IS COSTING US MONEY AND
THE ECONOMY NEEDS A BOOST!!
SINCERELY, V. REITMEIER

MTC-00007922

From: AHenrij@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:11am
Subject: I like my Microsoft Stuff

I see no problem with Microsoft and its operations. It is easy, quick and convenient.

Don't mess with Microsoft !!!
Axel Henri

MTC-00007923

From: Tom Collison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:11am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the judgement imposed on Microsoft as it now stands, is fair. In my opinion, further litigation delays implementation of the present agreement. Microsoft is an aggressive but innovative company whose developments have driven the entire industry rapidly forward.

Thank You,
Tom Collison.

MTC-00007924

From: Loumak@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:11am
Subject: (no subject)

i feel that microsoft has done nothing wrong and this whole affair is a sham.

MTC-00007925

From: anthony vorias
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:13am
Subject: Settlement

Dear Sirs

I'm In favor of settling the Microsoft case as soon as possible for the following reasons:

1. What we have is a solid American company that should continue to do world wide business and not be ham-strung by spending millions on non productive defense of their case. Put that revenue and effort to positive future use.
2. The products provided are productive and are at a fair price.
3. Settlement was to provide computers & software to schools. Lets do it but modify the deal. 50% of the settlement products will be Microsoft's and the other 50% in Dollar value will be paid of by Microsoft for other manufacturers products and software. i.e. they can buy Microsoft, Apple, Linus etc, etc. etc WHATEVER THE SCHOOLS CHOOSE!!! [Microsoft will pay up to 50% of the settlement fee] Let's get these kids working with the technology of the future!! T. Vorias

MTC-00007926

From: Robert Sori
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to comment on the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I use Windows, and several of the other products that have abused the legal process to try to defeat Microsoft in the courtroom.

Windows is a great operating program that comes with several basic programs, The ability to surf the net, write a note, listen to an music file.

Do you really think the consumer benefits from getting nothing in the package, and having to buy add-ons from day one.

If I use my computer for graphics, the included "Paint" program is inadequate. But it's inclusion is just fine if my kids want to play with it. The same is true for "notepad" it is simple a basic way to type a note, not some conspiracy to destroy Wordperfect. And as for "Internet Explorer" has anyone installed Netscape, why can Netscape assume after installation that it is the default program for surfing the internet, and that is fine. Isn't this an unfair practice?

You can not include every program that exists in the Windows package, and

excluding one over another is bound to effect the company not selected.

The Government should not be in the business of siding with one company over another. And like the supposed cigarette settlement, This trial will only enrich some small group of lawyers. I have several checks for .75 or .60 cents, my portion of a multi million dollar credit card company trial, The Lawyer who though up the lawsuit gets 20 to 30 percent of the total, while the supposedly injured parties get literally pennies. This is your great profession at work, this is how your efforts help the injured.

But I doubt any effort will be made to insure that settlement money is fairly distributed, and Lawyers don't walk away with millions while the litigants get pennies.

What's next?

Why don't you DOJ people starts to look at the buggy whip conspiracy, how Detroit industrialist, worked to create the automobile, and destroyed the leather industry giants. Or how electricity destroyed the candles makers, get real people, move on.

Robert Sori
7716 Robinglen Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89131

MTC-00007927

From: Garron (038) Anita Riechers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:57am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Enough is enough. The settlement reached is equitable for all parties. As a consumer, I am satisfied. Call it a done deal and move on to something meaningful.

Garron Riechers DDS

MTC-00007928

From: Jim/Carol Renfrow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:21am
Subject: Fw: Microsoft Settlement
From: Jim/Carol Renfrow
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2002 9:23 PM
To: Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ—

Come on guys...it's settled. Let's get on with getting on. If this case is continued, you are starting to look foolish. Any further consideration by DOJ against Microsoft will further show how a few individuals in your department has a personal vendetta against Microsoft and Bill Gates.

Let American Capitalism and Democracy work....get out of the way.

Jim Renfrow
2400 Columbine Lane
Montrose, CO 81401-5646
renfrowjim@hotmail.com
(970)-249-6511

PS. I'm a 56 year old who has been a registered Democrat all my life and have never voted for a Republican Presidential Candidate.

MTC-00007929

From: Moondog123@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:27am
Subject: Comment on Microsoft settlement
Believe that it is the public and the government's best interest that the above be

expedited ASAP with minimal restrictions on Microsoft's ability to compete in marketplace. DOJ should remember and learn from similar efforts in the eighties to restrict IBM which came close to wiping out that company. Legal efforts at restricting operations in this area are usually doomed to failure because of its nature.

J. Kahn
Redding, CT

MTC-00007930

From: John Koval
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:27am
Subject: Microsoft

The government needs to get out of the free business environment. Microsoft is what every American is working for, the American dream! Stop the wining competitors of Microsoft and tell them to put their wasted efforts into their business and compete in the free business world. The handcuffs should be taken off Microsoft. Stop wasting the tax payers money. Tell Sun, Oracle and the rest of them to compete on the business platform or choose another business to pursue. I have strong competitors in my business field and I am wondering if the DOJ is going to fight my battles. Shame on the politicians using this issue for additional press time for their own personal gains. It is time to put an end to this nonsense!

John Koval

MTC-00007931

From: Cyril Paciullo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally think that Microsoft do excellent software and competitors should be ashamed to give so much efforts in the destruction of this company. Without Windows, most of these competitors wouldn't even exist. I agree that Microsoft, due to business reasons, made some hard choices in some of its designs but companies such as Netscape chosed to take their time to any Microsoft and not to try to improve their software.

Cyril Paciullo.

MTC-00007932

From: Marjorie M. Ford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft very well maybe a powerful company and top in computer stuff, but let me tell you what happened in my home some years ago. My son was having trouble with his microsoft windows program and wanted to change so we went to a local computer store and bought OS (I don't remember what version it was) he wiped the computer clean, reformatted the hard drive and install OS— What a mess we ended up with, the computer kept freezing up and when it didn't there wasn't anything you could do that was compatible with anything else, so OS got the boot and Microsoft windows was reinstalled, there isn't enough competition out there that is useable for the computer dummies like me to use anything but Microsoft Windows. I realize there are those that say if there was anything else available they wouldn't use

Microsoft, seems to me like those that want to cut down Microsoft just are not thinking beyond the end of their nose, they want to make demands that could very well be unreasonable, and they do have the money to go with another system so why don't they just do it and in so doing would help build a network of competition for Microsoft, why should us commoners have to suffer at some nerds expense? I just don't understand why if someone doesn't like a product instead of saying one company is all wrong they just don't find another brand to use and keep their big fat mouths shut! Why don't they go buy Macs' and use that system? Personally I don't like Navigator, I found it to be not! user friendly like windows is and it got uninstalled from my computer in nothing flat!

The settlement that the DOJ agreed to should be the final thing and these other AG's should be told to deal with it and quit acting like they are "God's gift to the earth and know what everyone wants" they don't! they just want money to spend on some pet project that won't get financed without the Microsoft money.

Thanks for listening to me vent.
luckyme3990@hotmail.com

MTC-00007933

From: Gerald Weston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:32am
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

Its time that this thing was ended. It should never have started. This is nothing more than an example of how "bought and paid for" senators (i.e. Orin Hatch) are brought into the competitive arena to give a competitive advantage to companies that cannot succeed on their own. Market forces will find the proper balance if everybody leaves them alone. Microsoft does not have any sort of the competitive edge that IBM did with the mag-card typewriter.

MTC-00007934

From: MSINGEBORG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

IT IS TIME TO SETTLE THIS ANTITRUST CASE AND THE SETTLEMENT SEEMS FAIR. IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST TO END THIS CASE AND MOVE FORWARD INTO A POSITIVE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT.

INGEBORG TESSNER

MTC-00007935

From: Joseph Wages
To: DOJ Microsoft
Date: 1/3/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Tunney settlement brings this matter to a close as fairly as can be expected after all the effort that went into the trial Anti-trust laws are for the benefit of the consumer not competitors. This settlement should be approved so we can get on with the business of technology.

Joseph E. Wages
1813 Cliffside Drive
Pfaftown NC 27040

MTC-00007936

From: William Oneil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir: I'm glad you settled the Microsoft case. Its been a major drag on the economy, in my opinion one of the main causes of the recession we're in. I'm also glad you did not require Microsoft to leave a lot of programs out of windows. Its already hard enough to use, without having a bunch of restrictions on including programs that will make users lives easier.

Bill O'Neil
bill711@home.com

MTC-00007937

From: VJCapece4@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel Microsoft as a company has gone through enough. Now it is time for the Government and States to settle this case and let Bill Gates get back to business. 911 proved to the world that as a people we can come together regardless of our differences and get the job done, now is the time to do so in this case. Lets think of all the contributions Microsoft has made to the economy and the computing industry and let these guys and gals get back to work and make the USA even stronger.

MTC-00007938

From: visionmt@mail.msy.bell.south.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:36am
Subject: microsoft settlement

TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE:
It is time for the Microsoft vs. DOJ litigation to end. In the best interest of our free enterprise system, and therefore America, the settlement in the Microsoft case must be accepted. What if Microsoft existed in another country? How dissimilar would our economic independence be if we were in a position in software capabilities as we are in our energy situation to the "Oil Cartel?" How much of a joke would it be if we tried to "rein in" a "software cartel" from another country?

It's time to end this silliness!
Cordially yours,
Kenneth R. Parker

MTC-00007939

From: Wagner, Joyce, CIV, 164 CEGS, DE
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 9:37am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

What a shame the government has spent so much time and money to go after a company that has an operating system that just "can't be beat". If there is a better option from any other company, let "them" come up with a marketing strategy and present it to the public just as Microsoft has done.

Bill Gates started this company with nothing—free enterprise at it's finest! Let all the other Bill Gates comes forward if they have something better to offer—until then, the government needs to get out of the business of running Microsoft's business and wasting taxpayers money.

I wonder how many of these people who are so against Microsoft have uninstalled the Windows system from their computer and installed another operating system—

Joyce B. Wagner
thewagnerclan@aol.com

MTC-00007940

From: R Thomsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:39am
Subject: microsoft settlement

PLEASE be done with this stupid and harassing suit against Microsoft. This country is based on initiative and free enterprise. Because one firm is able to supply what the public wants is no excuse for the competition to run to the Govt. and cry unfair. Let them instead improve their products and compete. A settlement has been reached, let it be so.

Roy A. Thomsen

MTC-00007941

From: Dorothy MacDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle this. I am for the settlement agreement.

Dorothy MacDonald

MTC-00007942

From: Joe Giunta
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

An agreement has been reached that exceeds what the Appellate court had mandated. It is time for the federal and state governments to resolve this conflict that has actually harmed many more people than it ever intended to help.

MTC-00007943

From: JCOCKMAN12@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:40am
Subject: (no subject)

I am in favor of the settlement.

MTC-00007944

From: liles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:43am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

I would certainly support the earliest settlement of the case against Microsoft. In the light of current economic conditions the advantages that Microsoft had in the past have largely evaporated. Let's get back to business!! Microsoft is a very valuable asset in our economy and the continued uncertainty in the markets need a settlement very important.

Jerry B Liles
1009 East Sixth
Alice, Texas 78332

MTC-00007945

From: Marcia3838@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: I am completely in agreement with a swift and immediate settlement of this case. Marcia Lichti

MTC-00007946

From: dan heines
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:45am

Dear DOJ—I understand that you are interested in comment from the public re Microsoft. I say, enough is enough. Let them go back providing great products. You and the various States get off their back. I hope you have more important and productive things to do.

Yours truly,
Dan K. Heines

MTC-00007947

From: BDS4530@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:47am
Subject: Mocosoft Settlement

Absolutely this settlement should be made!!! It should never have even been brought in the first place. This country is great because of innovative people like Bill Gates. I can't believe that our justice system allowed it to go on this long. When we attack our own is it any wonder that fools like Ben Laden and his followers think they can?

MTC-00007948

From: Henry Harriss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:46am

Subject: microsoft settlement

All charges and suits against Microsoft should be immediately dropped. Such a fragrant and evil interference with the free economic system and against free enterprise is having terrible consequences for Microsoft, the consumers, the industry, the shareholders and this country. Let the market rule. Otherwise, our country suffers except for a few greedy lawyers and state attorney generals.

H. Harriss

MTC-00007949

From: Jonas Poblador
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a software developer and consumer, I strongly agree that the currently settlement is fair. The CONTRACTS issue has been resolved and I with that, it would be nice if the same rule will apply to every other industry and sector.

The right to innovate and add new features in product is an all American right. This bundling or packaging marketing scheme is currently well and alive across all sectors of American business. The bundling of CD/stereos & air-conditioning in the car industry worked well for everybody. I also do not believe that the govt should protect companies like SUN, ORACLE and AOL. These companies are big enough to compete. They should come up with new ideas in order to survive. SUN, ORACLE and AOL has been the leader in thier respective market for a number of years—they should be inovative to stay ahead. They should also be more realistic in thier pricing to keep thier leadership. The Govt should just let the market dectate thier faith. We should avoid the protectionism mentally that is adopted by our EUROPEAN freinds because they only

work in the short term. I feel that the current DOJ team is fair and more up to date on current issues than the previous team.

regards,
Jonas Poblador

MTC-00007950

From: Jerry C. Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement 1/2/02

Dear Sir:

I have recently purchased a home computer with Microsoft Windows XP Home Edition operating system preinstalled.

First, I found that as part of the user's agreement, I had to agree to allow Microsoft to upgrade the operating system and install supplemental software while I worked on the internet. By using this approach to maintaining the operating system, I will not be able to apply fixes and upgrades myself if I decide not to use the internet. In addition, I do not want Microsoft determining how I use the internet. Finally, no one has been able to explain what types of supplemental software Microsoft plans to install.

Secondly, I found that other Microsoft programs that came pre-installed on this computer also set up communication links with other remote computers, which I can only assume are Microsoft computers. I have no idea what types of information is being transmitted while these links are open.

Thirdly, I found that I was not provided with an original copy of the operating system on a CD for me to use to restore the system if I have problems or to restore files if they become corrupted. Instead I am required to provide space on my hard drive for a backup copy of the operating system that they can use to restore my operating system if I have any problems. This is a poor strategy to system recovery, because I cannot do normal system maintenance myself. And, if I have a hard drive failure, I have to buy a new hard drive with an operating system already installed, where I should have the option of replacing the hard drive myself and using the CD to restore the operating system.

I believe that Microsoft is using unfair business practices by depriving me of my right to maintain my own computer if I so desire, and by transmitting information from my computer where I have no idea what the information is. I also believe that Microsoft is infringing on my right to use the internet and my computer as I wish..

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Jerry Johnson

MTC-00007951

From: KSHAH36633@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:47am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I do not understand all liality about this subject. This case is going on for more than 4 years. I am sure by this time our justice dept. must have heard from both side all sorts of argument & evidence, and collected lots of evidence of their own. Enough is enough. It is time to stop appeals after appeals & make final decision once & for all, but fare to all parties.

MTC-00007952

From: Gary Masterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madame:

I have been working in the computing industry since my graduation from college in 1972, practically 30 years. From my vantage point, Microsoft Corporation has been a primary player in revolutionizing the way computing is done. They have been the catalyst for producing less costly operating systems and software so that today virtually any home owner can own and operate a computer. This would have been financially impossible not too many years ago.

For the community of users who have come to rely on Microsoft, the case that the justice department has brought against them is a true misuse of justice. Microsoft has made things better for the business community, better for the home owner, improved the quality of programs available, provided software and support at reasonable prices (unheard of low prices compared to where the industry was 20 years ago), and spawned many, many other businesses. It is an outrage that the US Government would use our tax dollars to prosecute a company that has done so much. I urge that this case be settled in the most expeditious manner possible. Thank you.

Gary Masterson
Director of Marine Simulation
Buffalo Computer Graphics
3741 Lake Shore Road
Blasdell, NY 14219
Phone: 716-822-8668
Fax: 716-822-2730
email:
gmasterson@buffalocomputergraphics.com

MTC-00007953

From: Ventura, Albert Arthur (Al)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 9:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom it may concern

Please be advised that I feel as do many of my co workers do that the suit against Microsoft should be finished by forcing the remaining 9 States that have not settled to come to some type of agreement with Microsoft. The US taxpayer has had enough time wasted on this suit and wants it over with. Also it is my opinion that the US Judicial System should show more restraint of actions against Microsoft in the future because its certainly starting to look like their singling out one corporation even though that corporation has done so much to provide increased productivity applications not only for the United States Corporations but for Corporations around the World.

Thank You
Albert Ventura
Lucent Technologies
Technical Support Services
3G-UMTS Data Provisioning

MTC-00007954

From: Kris Ruckman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to offer my thoughts on the microsoft settlement. I work for one of the big 5 consulting firms where I help my clients utilize many of microsoft's products as well as products of their competitors (sun microsystems, oracle, etc.). My experience with microsoft's product suite is that they develop world class software. Their software is consistently well developed and integrated and offers my clients a very good solution.

Their products have increased in functionality and usability while consistently being competitively priced, a compelling combination for any business. Microsoft has consistently beaten the competition in delivering software that is useful, price competitive and well integrated. Sun, Oracle and others have good products, but their claim Microsoft that has some monopoly on the market or somehow forces companies to use their products is completely wrong. My clients choose Microsoft products because they routinely beat the competition in functionality, integration and price. In the ultra-competitive software industry, a monopoly simply does not exist.

While I do not agree with the majority of the rulings in the settlement, namely that microsoft operated as a monopoly and stifled competition, it is now time to settle this case. Microsoft needs to get back to the business of developing world-class software that meets the needs of companies. I encourage everyone to settle this quickly and fairly so we can all get back to business.

Regards,
Kris Ruckman

MTC-00007955

From: Yomamasana@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:54am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As an American citizen and registered voter, I beg you to accept the settlement against Microsoft. For the benefit of our economy and our future, let's move forward as a nation healing it's wounds. Thank you.

Ana Crafton
701 Garlyn Ct
Saint Louis, MO 63123

MTC-00007956

From: J. Drew Dials
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

As a technology professional, I've been following the Microsoft/DOJ case from the beginning. It is my opinion that these remaining unsettled states do not have the consumers best interest in mind at all. These states are being influenced by the companies within them that are unable to compete with Microsoft solely on a product comparison basis. As a software developer, I have enjoyed the benefits that Microsoft has built into their development platforms and technologies for a few years now. These technologies and accompanying support, documentation, user communities, etc. are what make Microsoft stand above the rest. These features are what enable Microsoft to win business on many fronts. These features are what draws the consumer to the

Microsoft platform. And these features are what these other "unsettled" companies refuse to compete with. Now, instead of making a comparable product or even better product that the consumer would readily embrace, they are attempting to use government to fight their battles for them. If these companies were making these high quality products to compete with the Microsoft platform, then this case would not even exist and we would not have spent millions of taxpayers dollars in an attempt to stunt Microsoft's growth. And this is for the consumer? I think it would be a crime and a shame for this government to play favorites to a few companies because they can't compete in this highly competitive economy and I hope the DOJ feels the same.

Thank you,
Jon Drew Dials

MTC-00007957

From: mppanter@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is time for this to be over! The tax payers have spent enough chasing a vendetta type lawsuit with the chance to put some money in your pockets. Admit it States Attorneys!

Bill Gates simply has a superior product and is much smarter than you!

M.P.Panter

MTC-00007958

From: Tim Schuele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The US Government has wasted enough time and money pursuing Microsoft. I wholly support the settlement. This matter should be put to rest as soon as possible.

Thank you
Tim Schuele

MTC-00007959

From: MKuechmann@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion Microsoft is being punished for its innovations and vision for the future. I am not a computer genius. I only perform simple tasks on the computer by using Windows and Microsoft Word and Excell. That is it. Vey simplistic tasks.

So, Justice Department give these people compliments. Their competitors have not been able to develop software as easy to use as Microsoft.

Regards,
Maria Kuechmann

MTC-00007960

From: loiso@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
RE: Tunney Act

I believe that the settlement reached between Microsoft and the government to be a fair settlement for all concerned. Please settle this action quickly to allow Microsoft to continue doing its job with its greatest

creativity for its users and profit to its shareholders.

Thank you for your consideration, Lois Ogburn, Microsoft shareholder

MTC-00007961

From: neh—teh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The microsoft case shold be settled with no further litigation. The settlement is more than fair to all parties involved. Continued litigation will only benefit an extremely few wealthy corporations. Let this great American economy get on with innovation which can only benefit the economies of the world.

MTC-00007962

From: Robert Krance
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Regarding the Dept of Justice settlement and the appeal put forth by a number of states to further punish and limit the company, I wish to say that these efforts to control Microsoft will nothing to help the individual end user.

I have been using computers to perform my occupation and personal responsibilities for the past 20 years. I am not literate in computer technology but consider myself reasonably competent in using software for word-processing, spreadsheet, and database applications. I remember beginning with DOS and working with WordPerfect, Lotus, Quattro, etc. Attempting to integrate operating systems and software, no matter whose, was always a frustrating and non-productive process. I never want to return to that situation again.

Frankly, I still spend too much of my time trying to make hardware, software and operating systems compliant with each other. Innovation is a dirty concept when it means frustration, wasted time, and in the end a soup of diverse components that don't work together on my machine much less work with other users. This is what we face if the states persist in their attempt to punish and ultimately limit Microsoft. I would mush prefer seeing Microsoft being held accountable for compatibility issues with their operating system and the multiple software and hardware applications that require it.

It seems to me that in real dollars the cost of computing has come down exponentially in the twenty years I have been doing this. We must owe something to Microsoft, Intel, IBM and a number of others. Left to its own elitist approach (disguised as an advocate for the common man, remember the Ridley Scott commercial during the Super Bowl), Macintosh would cost thousands of dollars more today. In my first attempts at computing, I bought DOS and an IBM-based system, simply because it cost half as much as Macintosh. Back then DOS and the Intel-IBM configuration were not equal to Macintosh, but the cost of the latter was prohibitive for many of us.

Oracle and Sun are doing just fine, thank you. They've never approached the individual end user to provide a product. If

allowed to foul up the current computing environment, these companies will price millions of us out of computing, just as Macintosh did. The Internet would remain a perk for academics and industry. Please don't kill the goose. Make Microsoft even more responsive to end users.

Robert Krance
13 Clear Springs Court
Sugar Land, TX
77479
rkrance@airmail.net

MTC-00007963

From: Mustangdrv@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We support the settlement as set forth by the government and other states. Further litigation will not have a positive effect on the general public; it will merely fatten the purses of the attorneys involved.

The fact is that the majority of folks who purchase new computers (including ourselves) prefer the Microsoft operating system. If Microsoft 98 had not been preloaded on our computer, we would have purchased and installed it.

Let the settlement stand.
Connie & Roger Larson
PO Box 648
Auburn, WA 98071

MTC-00007964

From: James E Bauer, MD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the suggested settlement is fair to all parties, and I also believe that our country has suffered and will continue to suffer until the settlement is effected. Let us not punish success in the marketplace.

Microsoft has led the way in making America the technology capital of the world. Let's get on with the future!

MTC-00007965

From: John Folino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:06am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
I HAVE USED MICROSOFT PRODUCTS FOR YEARS AND AM VERY HAPPY WITH THEM. I PAID A PRICE THAT WAS SATISFACTORY TO ME AND HAVE SAVED THOUSAND OF MAN HOURS FOR MY BUSINESS.

I AM A HAPPY CAMPER.
SINCERELY,
JOHN F. FOLINO
CEO AMERICAN TRANSMISSIONS, INC.

MTC-00007966

From: johnny sterneker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to close the case against Microsoft. In my opinion, the whole power and majesty of the U.S. Government was brought to bear against an American Corporation in very questionable circumstances!

Get it overwith, NOW!

MTC-00007968

From: RMondillo@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:08am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,
 Enough with these continuing litigation talks! I cannot see how this helps the American consumer at all. Microsoft has been chastened, and I assume there are now "firewalls" in place to prevent abuse in the future. We tout a free enterprise system in this country, so long as certain 'special interests' are not offended, and so long as one innovator does not become too successful. Tell me, how does the innovator stop him/herself from innovating? That is what built and continues to build our country.

I believe that Microsoft like them or not, has been more a benefit to the consumer than a hinderance. In our system, if there were a better, more efficient product available, people would flock to it. So, now that Microsoft has been exposed (as the greatest innovator) and slowed down, where are all these other great products from the competitors, which are going to better all of our lives?

Continuing litigation smacks of a few more hangers on (states) attempting to draw freely from an entity they had nothing to do with creating, and most certainly have benefited from on an ongoing basis (taxes on many Microsoft sales for example).

The settlement is tough and fair! Let's all get on with our lives. I for one hope that Microsoft continues to find the incentive to innovate.

Ron Mondillo

MTC-00007969

From: CB32X4@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:07am
 Subject: RE: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I wish to state my views on the Microwave settlement and they will be short but they fairly represent my position on this matter. I am a small business owner that works from my home as a home builder in North Carolina with 30 years of building experience. I graduated with a degree in Chemistry from Elon College (now Elon University) and started my building career before the computer revolution began. Slide rules, ledger paper, and hand written checks were the order of the day.

I recognized that the computer revolution was going to leave me behind if I did not get on board. So I computerized my business in 1983 and immediately found that I could multiply my efforts with technology in lieu of manpower. As a self taught computer person I cannot continue compete in the building business without the benefits of quality and compressively designed software and compatible hardware. The Microsoft windows software and similar programs are essential to the success of my business and to so many more of the baby boomers trying to compete with the more computer literate recent graduates of today.

I worry that this litigation would reduce the gains of Microsoft technology to another VHS/BETA war that some win and some will loose out and who is looking out for the

loosers. Please allow this great innovative company to settle the litigation and let the rest of us continue to operate our businesses with the best available choices that we can find. If Microsoft's product did not work they would not be selling them the way that they are. This country cannot continue bust up good companies for the sake of a chance on new upstarts that may or may not workout.

The past histories of the breakup of AT&T and the cell service divisions within cities is all of the proof that our Justice Department should stay out of Corporate America. The Justice Department must have better things to do that screw up hard work of so many small business people.

Thanks for reading my views and lets get on with the business of being cooperative Americans, we all have much to celebrate and with which to be proud.

Sincerely,
 Chester W. Burgess
 Burgess Construction Co.

MTC-00007970

From: Chirrip@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is past time for this settlement, which is fair to all, to be accepted and finalized !!!! Let's now put it to bed. George Chironis, of Melville, NY, 11747

MTC-00007971

From: Melvin C. Phillips
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I believe the settlement between the US Dept of Justice and Microsoft is fair and should be finalized. I feel the United States is fortunate to have Microsoft as a company. I trust Microsoft 100% more than any of the media or politicians.

Mel
 Melvin C. & Lillian H. Phillips [757-566-4578]
 7277 Osprey Drive, Lanexa, VA 23089-9410
 E-Mail: mel.va@home.com or
 mel.va@netzero.net

MTC-00007972

From: Anthony Kozojed
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:08am
 Subject: Microsoft Litigation

My husband and I have used microsoft along with Netscape Navigator and AOL since 1994. We are both over 60 and have time to use the computer at home. We can see no possible reason to sue Microsoft when we purchased our computer, we added Microsoft Windows 95 by our choice and since we live in far Northern Minnesota there was no internet service available except through Netscape Navigator from Radio Shack, since then a local phone company and cable company have started internet service. We use the "E" symbol from Microsoft to connect to the ebay site, the light house from Netscape for our family history site, and man from AOL to talk to family and friend and email. WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

Sharon @ Anthony Kozojed

MTC-00007973

From: Ted Staplin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
 I believe that the settlement agreed to by Microsoft, the government and participating states should be enacted.

I am most concerned about spending tax payers dollars pursuing legal action that is not in the taxpayers best interest.

I have worked in the computer business my entire career (37 years).

I have never worked for Microsoft and in fact have worked for their competitors.

It is my belief that they have made a significant contribution to the USA economy and in particular to advancing Computer technology. The consumer has directly benefited from this in being able to buy computer technology that has advanced significantly during my career, at a fraction of the cost.

Sincerely
 Ted Staplin
 104 Garrison Road
 Chelmsford, MA 01824

MTC-00007974

From: J Houston
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:11am
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Get off Microsoft's back. Without its so called monopoly we still be figuring change at the cashier line.

Jesse Houston

MTC-00007975

From:
 John.Shaver@fairfaxcounty.gov@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:11am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Microsoft settlement case should be settled without further litigation. I see little need to prolong this case. The current provisions are fair for all parties. The interests of the American people are better served with less litigation and more innovation.

MTC-00007976

From: Curt Mackie
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:17am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a resident of the State of Iowa. I am very disappointed that our Attorney General continues on what I believe to be a "witch hunt" with regards to Microsoft and its business practices. I have owned personal computers since 1983. I have had many opportunities in the past and currently to purchase other software, both operating systems and application programs. I have elected to run Microsoft Windows and Office as my major production package after trying several others that I have purchased and currently still own. (Red Hat Linux, IBM OS2, and BEOS are examples of the operation systems currently available to anyone who wants them. Also there are too many

application programs available to list them all, however I will mention Lotus 123. I can remember when it was the only spreadsheet available and it cost several hundreds of dollars. And, it was copy protected to boot. So heaven help you if you lost or damaged your disk! I am very happy that Microsoft makes available the products that they do. I am free to chose to purchase them or not. When something better comes down the road I will make that decision also.

I think we should put this mess behind us. Let Microsoft do business. Let its competitors come up with better products and we will purchase them. I am a home user. Thank you for listening.

Curt Mackie
curtmackie@hotmail.com
515-981-0720 cell 515-779-1300

MTC-00007977

From: Win Bartsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to inform you that I am in favor of the proposed settlement with Microsoft Corporation. Since I never agreed with any part of the governments case, I am in favor of ending the issue as quickly as possible.

Mr. Win Bartsch
1850 Beans Bight Rd. NE
Bainbridge Island, WA
98110

MTC-00007978

From: Iceducks@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:17am
Subject: SETTLEMENT WITH MICROSOFT
DEAR SIR,

I WILL MAKE THE COMMENT BRIEF AND TO THE POINT. I FEEL, IT WOULD BE THE BEST INTEREST OF THE COUNTRY TO CLOSE THE ISSUE WITH MICROSOFT AND MOVE FORWARD. I SEEMS THAT ALL ISSUES HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED & NOW IT IS TIME TO FOCUS ON THE FUTURE. KEEP THE INNOVATIVE MICROSOFT AS IT WAS PRIOR TO THE LAWSUITS & DO NOT BREAK UP THE COMPANY! THIS ENTIRE PROCESS HAS BEEN A NEGITIVE FOR OUR ECONOMY! PLEASE SETTLE THIS ISSUE NOW!

JOHN MAJOR

MTC-00007979

From: Lovelace Rucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to advise that as a consumer I am satisfied with the Microsoft Settlement as it now stands. We are tired of always trying to satisfy the jealous public interest people. We are for free enterprise and capitalism. The size of the company makes no difference as the cream always rises to the top. Our government needs to get on with their own business and let ALL the cream risers keep supplying consumers with their tremendous products and new innovations. Micro-soft is a wonderful example of USA spirit in capitalism and the freedom to be successful in the Land Of The Free.

MTC-00007980

From: DCarpenter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Congrats doj the settlement is OK for me
Love Dave

MTC-00007981

From: paul stout
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:21am
Subject: Good Morning,
Good Morning,

As a consumer using Windows, I have never been injured from its use. I find the software to be very productive. The government is wasting tax payer money pursing this matter. The original issue is mute by the march of technology.

Sincerely,
Paul K. Stout
Training Coordinator
ASTD Member
info@PaulKStout.com

MTC-00007982

From: bilehnert@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ:

I have continued to believe that the case against Microsoft has been carried too far. It is important not to stifle innovation. I have been retired for 11 years and my former company still benefits from the 17 years of protection that has been provided for the patents under my name.

One of the issues in the Microsoft case revolves around the browser. I have always had Netscape as my browser and in the 4.5 and 6.2 versions they are just as all consuming as Micosoft in their service.

It seems to me that no one has gained in this litigation, especially because it has been dragged out so long. Let's put this thing to rest once and for all. It was my understanding that a settlement had been worked out but some States have continued to keep the case going. I have already expressed disappointment that my home state of Florida is one of the procrastinators. I have also been disturbed at the way the DOJ has handled the case. The fairest and most sensible thing for all concerned is to end it once and for all. Charles W. Lehnert, retiree and consultant.

MTC-00007983

From: Tyler, Joanna
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:26am

I believe that the Microsoft settlement is in the public interest. I believe that Microsoft has not engaged in monopolistic practices; that the company should have never been sued; and now a settlement should occur—closing this case forever.

Joanna Tyler, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Research Director
Northrop Grumman Information
Technology Health Solutions and Services
1700 Reseach Blvd., Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
301-294-5643

301-294-5401
jtyler@hq.row.com

MTC-00007984

From: leathers@nwlink.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have read and followed the case on and off through the months. I have not read the entire proposed settlement but I will give you my two thoughts on the matter for starters.

- I believe that it is a good thing for our lives, to keep microsoft together, one company, doing the many things that they do best. And that dividing the company in any degree, would be a solution that just pleases certain people, but does not solve anything and probably makes it worse.

- However, I agree with Apple computer spokespeople 100%, that microsoft should not be allowed to pay fees to the court, by flooding the education market "schools, libraries, etc.", with "free" computers, in essence, doing something they have not been able to do through sales, which is to infringe on that market. Allowing them to do so, would tie schools into using their software, their upgrades, for decades, and would further empower them as a monopoly, taking away from the market power of competitive hardware and software companies, like Apple, and Sun.

MTC-00007985

From: Gary H. Minar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's be serious about what is happening. MS Corp. has created more beneficial products that have made the world become better 'connected, enhanced how we commuicate, improved business productivity, improved Gov't efficiency, among others. Why is MS being punished for such never-before seen creativity? It is UNJUST. MS should be applauded at every opportunity. They have done more for human kind thru computer technology than anyone else I know.

05) 688-7957, FAX: 693-8618, Solvang, CA

MTC-00007986

From: Ann Keefe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this suit with Microsoft so the country can move ahead. I believe the uncertainty about the outcome has played a tremendous roll in the stock markets inability to sustain a major rally. The country needs some good news right now, especially with our service men & women overseas and others here still cleaning up ground zero.

Thank you,
Ann Keefe, Concerned Citizen

MTC-00007987

From: Stewart.Menking@relian
cenational.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft created an industry that revolutionized how we work and play. The cost of their products goes down as their products improve. And when they gave something away for free, a few big companies started to scream. I have yet to understand how this has hurt me or any other consumer.

This case should be put into the history books as soon as possible.

MTC-00007988

From: Davis, Suzanne
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 10:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to put this issue to rest and proceed with the agreed upon settlement. As a business user and a personal user I have always believed that all end users would not be where we are today without the efforts and uniqueness of Microsoft development. I'm not a lawyer so it is possible that Microsoft did go over the legal line with regards to marketing and sales efforts, but competition certainly did not have these same tools to offer. I don't believe that this suit was fair in the first place and it was a "marketing tool" used by competitors to save their businesses and "award" them for not being able to fairly compete with Microsoft. Do not waste my tax money on any more proceedings that do not result in this settlement being completed. The lawyers have had a chance to earn their fees. Our economy and international business communities need to get back on track.

Thank you for allowing me to express my feelings.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Davis
Information Manager

MTC-00007989

From: JRobin1001@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen
It is my view that the Microsoft Settlement is fair and reasonable and should be concluded without further litigation or delay
John G. Robinson
49 Bay Shore Drive
Plymouth, MA 02360

MTC-00007990

From: linnco .
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my strong opinion that this case be settled once and for all. Please do not allow business competitors to derail the settlement for their own gain. SETTLE THIS CASE! The economy needs this to be finalized.

MTC-00007991

From: PopPopOne@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:32am
Subject: microsoft settlement

The settlement the government has reached with Microsoft is more than fair for the Government. I happen to believe that this suit should not have been brought in the first place. Settle it and get it over.

Jerry Simmons

MTC-00007992

From: Mike Gnad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern/DOJ:

I am the owner of a small business that has been using Microsoft products for over a decade. During this period, I have found the pricing, after-sales support and user friendliness to be superior to other products that we have tried.

In addition, the availability of an extensive variety of different products and business tools that are designed to run on the Windows operating system has enabled me to be more productive at a cost that is affordable. Consequently, I have been able to reduce the cost of doing business and pass some of savings on to my employees in the form of higher salaries.

I have had a significant share of my own personal retirement funds invested in stocks like Microsoft and other related companies that rely on the business generated by Microsoft. Since the DOJ initiated the litigation with Microsoft, I have watched my retirement funds retreat to lower valuations. It is my sincere belief that this litigation, while being extremely expensive and unproductive, it is not in the best interests of the American consumer. Additionally, the cost to the economy in general is too much to sacrifice for a litigation with such little merit. Basically, I do not believe that the Government has demonstrated that Microsoft has damaged the consumer; and, therefore, Microsoft should not be forced to divert any more financial and intellectual resources to its defense.

Very sincerely,
Myron A. Gnad

MTC-00007993

From: WenParrish@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:33am
Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:
I'm very much in favor of the Microsoft Settlement, and believe it's in the best interest of the Country to get this settled now. The economy will suffer if this settlement is not honored.

WenParrish@AOL.com.

MTC-00007994

From: El Sawy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:34am
Subject: Common Sense

Can good common sense please prevail?
Our portfolios have been devastated ever since the Department of Justice started taking creative US technology to court.

Soraya El Sawy

MTC-00007995

From: David G Marek
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am not one accustomed to writing letters to the DOJ. However, I believe it is time that we put the entire Microsoft fiasco behind us.

I look at what Microsoft has given us in terms of Operating System, Word Processing, Spreadsheets, Presentation Software, Database, etc. and am amazed of the seamless interfaces between these products. I am tired of special interest groups trying to manipulate government for their own interests. It is time to move on. As a government, with terrorism, recession, etc. facing us, we have much better places to spend our time and money. The only thing this continued case is doing is putting a lot of lawyers to work.

david g marek

MTC-00007996

From: Betty Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:35am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Further litigation is unnecessary, you should settle now ! It is in the best economic interest of all concerned, especially the consumers. SETTLE!!!!!!

Betty Z. Thompson

MTC-00007997

From: Blondin, John Q (SEATTLE SE/TE/ZQ 335)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 10:38am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ:

This suit has drained this country for far too long both financially and mentally. It is time to wrap up and move on. Microsoft has created the standard for computer usage in the world. It has become much like the English language, the common language of business and air traffic and tourism. It enables the world to function much better than it would with many computer languages. It has created a platform from which many others can build and sell products further enabling us all to communicate and do business. The US Govt is wasting its time and taxpayer dollars trying to hamstring a national treasure at the request of its competitors. I thought this country was about competition.

The US Govt should spend even a fraction of this effort on doing something about airport screening. Since 9/11 almost nothing has been done. Nationalize the job and get QUALIFIED US CITIZENS to work there. Stop just talking.

John Q. Blondin; Seattle, WA., 98136

MTC-00007998

From: Jumana Scoggins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement with Microsoft. Do not let Microsoft's competitors dictate what will only benefit them in this settlement. The consumers and the economy need this settlement.

Sincerely,
Jumana S. Scoggins

MTC-00007999

From: Joe Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am writing to voice my support for the settlement with Microsoft. I think this lawsuit has been a travesty of justice from the beginning. The lawsuit does not stem from consumer harm but from the mindless ambition of the Clinton administration and the corruptness of Janet Reno. The state attorney generals have proven to be nothing but greedy opportunists who have no regard for the well being of their citizens, many of whom are Microsoft or other technology stock investors. The supposed "harm" that Microsoft has caused has only been noted by one group, the competitors of Microsoft. The lawsuit against Microsoft, on the other hand, has created real harm to our entire country. The stock market has been decimated, wrecking retirement accounts, college savings accounts and all other investment vehicles. The snowball effect of the stock market decline has brought our entire economy to its knees, and is the true reason our country is in a recession today. It is time to put this entire affair behind us by settling this lawsuit.

Sincerely,
Joe W. Taylor, II
160 Willow Bend Court
Bowling Green, KY 42104

MTC-00008000

From: CTJ592@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Tell the government to go after bin Ladin, Kadafi and all the other government terrorist that are right here in the U.S. with the same zeal that they are going after Microsoft and maybe we wouldn't be in the predicament that we're in now.

MTC-00008001

From: e baxter lemmond
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:44am
Subject: microsoft settlement
APPRVE THE SETTLEMENT! END THE LITIGATION!
E. BAXTER LEMMOND
2711 BROOKWOOD ROAD
RICHMOND; VIRGINIA, 23235

MTC-00008002

From: bdkittley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:47am
Subject: Observations about case & Microsoft business practices

I think that the original motives of DOJ in bringing the lawsuit were misplaced. Fear it was punishment, because Microsoft no longer wanted to "cooperate" with other US agencies demands for access to systems. Microsoft writes good software, but some of the things that the systems "enable" are regularly abused by third party software. This is why the OS is always locking up.

Financially punitive remedies will solve nothing. This said, "It would be a mistake to allow Microsoft to continue to extend the standards to insure incompatibility with all other OS's". This practice cost the government and consumers far too much, and contributes little new value. Please, bias this settlement to focus open standards and

on building a better mouse trap, not another marketing scam.

Settle this thing, and get on with business.
Dave Kittley
P.O. Box 203
Rule, TX 79547
bdkittley@westex.net

MTC-00008003

From: Pierre PAPA DOC Legrand
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:44am
Subject: Stop attacking one of the engines of our Growth...

Sheesh will you people find something more constructive to do..? Like maybe find the people responsible for killing so many of us...? That might be a bit more useful than going around extorting money from AMERICAN corps. Im embarrassed that I have to say that to adults who are supposedly smart.

STOP ALL ACTION AGAINST MICROSOFT NOW. Allow the market place to work...its impossible for anyone except the government to break the way the marketplace works.

Pierre Legrand
4137 Broussard Street
Baton Rouge, La. 70808
225-924-6661

MTC-00008004

From: Motelman2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The proposed Microsoft settlement is tough, fair and just. The vast majority of the people in the nation believe the antitrust case should be settled now and we should move on!

Special interests should NOT be allowed to drag this thing out. Technology is our strong suit from a business and innovation viewpoint. It drives our economy. It should not be hampered by undue preoccupation with fighting a case that has already been fairly decided.

MTC-00008005

From: Lauren Friedman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern,
I strongly support settling the Microsoft case. Too much time and effort has been wasted on this already. It is time to let a company that has brought good products to the American public get on with business. By the way, I have no relationship with Microsoft other than a small investment in their stock.

Lauren Friedman

MTC-00008006

From: Origger@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:46am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The nine states that have refused the federal government's settlement with Microsoft are trying to make Microsoft share holders pay for their foolish spending.

MTC-00008007

From: Pierre PAPA DOC Legrand
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement ——— Original Message ———

From: "Pierre PAPA DOC Legrand"
<plegrand@home.com>
To: <Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov> Sent:
Thursday, January 03, 2002 9:48 AM
Subject: Stop attacking one of the engines of our Growth...

Sheesh will you people find something more constructive to do..? Like maybe find the people responsible for killing so many of us...? That might be a bit more useful than going around extorting money from AMERICAN corps. Im embarrassed that I have to say that to adults who are supposedly smart.

STOP ALL ACTION AGAINST MICROSOFT NOW. Allow the market place to work...its impossible for anyone except the government to break the way the marketplace works.

Pierre Legrand
4137 Broussard Street
Baton Rouge, La. 70808 225-924-6661

MTC-00008008

From: McCauley, John Joseph Jr.
(091)AMSTA-AR-WEA(093)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 10:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern,
Settle the Damn Case, for the life of me I still can't figure out how it got to Court in the first place. Stop wasting money and time on this situation. It is a shame that with Real Estate Rip Off's, Insurance Rip Off's, Health Care Rip Off's and yes the Attorney Fee rip Off's the Government has the time and the money to waste to continue with this.

John McCauley
4123 Conashaugh Lakes
Milford, Pa.18337

MTC-00008009

From: Robert MacCallum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:48am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please bring this settlement to a close. It is my personal opinion that the stock market drop had its beginnings in the Microsoft case brought by the DOJ. Whether it really did, or not, it seems that dragging out this settlement can do nothing to help the economy get going again.

Your truly, Robert W. MacCallum
Travelers Rest, SC.

MTC-00008010

From: Mike and Judy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:50am
Subject: This is to submit my comments on the Microsoft anti-trust settlement:

This is to submit my comments on the Microsoft anti-trust settlement:
1. It is encouraging that the justice department was able to save the tax payers money by allowing Netscape to write/dictate the complaint. They didn't charge us for that, did they?

2. I was much encouraged that the word monopoly was used so frequently in the complaint. I am sure that by using the word so frequently it must be true.

3. Now that you have used millions of our tax-payer dollars to prosecute this case, I am sure the reasonable prices previously experienced by the American software users will be greatly enhanced. This, I am sure will offset the great expense.

Conclusion: If you haven't determined from my remarks, I feel this entire proceeding is a miscarriage of justice. However, since justice is not the business of the American court system, I hope at least the lawyers who profited had a good time.

I believe it is in the best interest of the American people to complete this case now, with the settlement that is on the table.

Mike Frye

MTC-00008011

From: Diane Crawford

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:53am

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I HAVE NEVER QUITE UNDERSTOOD EXACTLY AT WHAT POINT FREE ENTERPRISE BECOMES MONOPOLY BUT I THINK THIS SUIT AGAINST MICROSOFT HAS GONE ON LONG ENOUGH. THERE WILL PROBABLY ALWAYS BE SOMEONE WHO IS NOT HAPPY WITH THE RESULTS BUT IT IS TIME FOR BUSINESS TO CONTINUE AS USUAL. MICROSOFT HAS DONE SO MUCH FOR THE SEATTLE AREA AND WASHINGTON AND THE COUNTRY. PLEASE END THIS SITUATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU

DIANE CRAWFORD

MTC-00008012

From: Keith D. Olinger

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:53am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly urge the Court and the remaining nine states to accept the settlement reached between Microsoft, the DOJ and nine states. It is long past time to put this very politically motivated piece of our history behind us, and let the economy begin to heal. It is truly a sad time in our history when good American companies are put through this type of punishment for being innovative and relentless in their pursuit of helping the world advance. End this pathetic madness now! As a person that deploys massive numbers of computer desktops, laptops and servers, I can tell you that the benefits of having a common desktop, massive resources for development and deployment, and literally thousands and thousands of applications that work on that platform are a tremendous time and money saver for me.

Take a trip though history to find out why Windows has the largest market share. It is because they provided a great, open operating environment at a reasonable price that runs on commodity hardware, and ironically, opened up the operating system to developers through vehicles like MSDN and developer API's and tools. That is precisely why OS/2 faltered, and the Mac never lived up to its potential. Mac has still not opened

up the developers! If Scott McNealy, Larry Ellison and Steve Jobs would spend half of the time they spend bashing Microsoft in developing and marketing their own product line, they would be have much better companies. Have you ever heard these guys?! It is amazing!

Again, I STRONGLY urge you to end this now by accepting the proposed settlement. This suit does not, in any way, reflect on capitalism and a free market society. Actually, it reflects quite the opposite.

Thanks

Keith Olinger

MTC-00008013

From: LHSig@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:54am

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I wish to voice my opinion that the Microsoft settlement should be concluded with no further litigation.

Bill Clinton spent more time and money investigating and prosecuting Bill Gates than he did Osama Bin Laden!!!!!! Look where he got us. Consider all the millions of PC users who have benefited from Microsoft's products.

Sincerely,

Linda Hood Sigmon

5805 Woebegone Trail

Maiden, N. C. 28650-9038

704-483-5159

MTC-00008014

From: Dennis Santoro

To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...

Date: 1/3/02 10:55am

Subject: Comments regarding the 2 proposed settlements in the Microsoft cases

To the Department of Justice and the States Attorneys General,

I am writing in submission of comment regarding your proposed settlements in the 2 cases regarding Microsoft corp. I beleive I am entitled to submit comments as per the Tunney act of 1974 and wish you to consider the below as public comment on the cases.

With regard to the proposed settlement in the antitrust case, unless the remedy actually addresses a consumer's ability to buy any computer from any manufacturer with a choice of any OS (Linux, Unix, Windows) preconfigured on the machine and MS is prohibited from using its market position to make that difficult or to impose penalties on manufactures who wish to do so, MS's position and behavior will not be changed.

No remedy that fails to address this issue will be successful. Further, similar measures should be enacted to address bundling of productivity software (office suites) to allow competition form Corel, Star Office, IBM (Lotus) and others. The fact that purchasers have only the MS office suite as a choice in most cases (as per terms usually included in the Windows OEM license) means that most other suite vendors are precluded from much business de facto.

The bundling issue should also be addressed but, in my opinion, with the exception of the browser and e-mail client choices, most of the rest is a non issue. But MS should not be allowed to further bundle

IE and Outlook unless other choices are also provided and the APIs are sufficiently published and documented so that other competitors can easily offer seamless integration.

All remedies should be monitored and enforced by a group actually capable of doing so. MS has proved by past behavior that they are untrustworthy in terms of following the letter or spirit of agreements they enter into. Penalties should be clear, easy to exercise and easy to trigger. The proposed settlement does none of that. Nor will simply requiring MS to provide a stripped down version of Windows. Furhter, MS's attempt to become the arbitor of identity on the internet (Passport) should be precluded so that MS cna not extend their monopoly to the internet itself using the strength of their current monopoly. As for the consumer suit, while the fund amount and it's distribution to schools is quite appropriate, these funds should be given without restriction. MS should have no input into the spending of these funds. Schools should be able to use these funds for infrastructure (wiring, PCs) software from ANY vendor, OSs from Apple, Linux vendors, Sun, or MS, etc. These funds should be placed in the hands of a group that can not, and will not, be connected to nor influenced by MS. MS should not have any representatives on the board responsible for the funds. It should be made up of credible education professionals and computer professionals unaffiliated with vendors and manufacturers. The charge to the board should be to help schools meet the needs the schools believe they have in the best way possible for the school in question. It should NOT be for the purpose of promoting MS products in the schools.

Thank you for your attention and feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Denn Santoro

President

Resource Development Associates

<http://www.RDAWorldWide.Com>

Offices in the United States and Germany

Providing solutions to health care, business, governments and non-profits since 1982

MTC-00008015

From: Henry Cimetta

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:54am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is good for everyone, but most important to the US economy and financial markets.

MTC-00008016

From: gjohnson@ground.fedex.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:49am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Government,

Please spend your time and my money hunting terrorists rather than Microsoft.

Thank you,

Gary

MTC-00008017

From: Kevin Edwards

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 10:58am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you, in accordance with the Tunney Act, to let you know my comments and feelings regarding the Microsoft Settlement.

I strongly feel that this case has gone too far, has lost the interest of the nation, has caused quite enough economic and legislative disturbance, and feel it is time for it to come to an end.

As a consumer, I feel Microsoft did nothing wrong. In fact, I shudder to think what position we might all be in today had Microsoft not risen to the challenges in this "information age". They are visionary and we are all fortunate that they have hired the best and brightest minds to help keep America at the helm of this burgeoning, new world. In fact, I believe they helped create this new world. Punishing them for it is senseless, useless and harmful.

The suit again Microsoft has caused harm to our economy beyond calculation. A company as large as Microsoft can change the whole climate of the economy when it falters. And it has faltered over the past two years not due to quality of product or due to quality of service or due to inability to continue to innovate. It has faltered due to this useless lawsuit.

It is time for it to be over. After the events of September 11th, this country has greater things to worry about than this lawsuit. Also, the economy is suffering and needs the shot in the arm that an unencumbered Microsoft could provide.

Let's finish this thing. Let's get on with the business of being Americans and with the business of innovation, creation and design. The world suffers while we ponder and clog the courts with this useless matter.

As a consumer, as a stockholder, as an American, I want this thing to end.

Thank you very much for your time and for hearing my thoughts.

Kevin D. Edwards
302 West Sixth Street
Benton, IL 62812

MTC-00008018

From: jay@comter.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are a small consulting company in the Fairfax, VA area managed by a group of very entrepreneur US citizens—Comter Systems Inc. We also do have issues with the bigger players in the field but I have to say salutations to them for getting there. I feel the same for Microsoft. They started out like everyone else and had worked their way to the top and I cannot believe a bunch of jealous competitors can create this level of aggravation and insult to them.

Hope you settle with Microsoft ASAP and thus they can move forward and take us to the next generation of Technology and keep US, the leader in Technology like they did last time.

Thank you

MTC-00008019

From: dale janus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:01am

Subject: microsoft settlement

January 2, 2002

Dear Justice Department:

I would like to add my comments to the proposed settlement of the microsoft antitrust case.

I feel the DOJ has not done enough to end microsoft's monopoly position. The remedies in the settlement will not change the way microsoft does business. The DOJ has already been down this road with microsoft before and the remedies imposed in the past have done nothing to change their business practices.

I feel the settlement should be thrown out or at least re-negotiated so that microsoft changes their business habits.

The penalty that has been imposed and is going to be paid to school districts is so overtly designed to gain sympathy for microsoft that I question the skill of your negotiating team. Every person with school age children in the country are going to clamor for their share of the penalty pot. Microsoft has used their vast fortune to create allies among the general public by paying their fine to schools instead of the DOJ.

The current settlement is not enough. The microsoft monopoly will continue.

Dale Janus
dalejanus@compuserve.com

MTC-00008020

From: robert e tolleson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a citizen in Nashville, Tennessee, who is tired of this continuous dragging out of the Microsoft case. From the beginning I have felt that proving the consumer has been harmed by Microsoft over the past 10 years was hard to comprehend. Today a consumer can own a computer for less than \$1000 with an operating system of software under \$100 that ten years ago cost thousands of dollars and only corporations could afford them. Also by Microsoft pioneering this home computer industry many other companies have emerged and grown tremendously on the surge of this new industry. If competitors have been harmed, I am not sure they would have been in business if not for the early innovations of Microsoft. That brings us to today and a few states funded by special interest groups who will benefit at Microsofts demise are continuing to pressure the politicians in thier states to refuse to accept a settlement hashed out by the Federal Government and other states. We are at war as a country, and I feel that to prolong this case is embarrassing and ridiculous in the scope of priorities for our country now.

Please use whatever means legally to discourage these states who do not represent the average consumer by continuing this case. IT IS TIME TO STOP.

MTC-00008021

From: Tina Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:04am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to let you know my feelings on this proposed settlement. I believe it is a

tough but fair settlement and should be approved. It is not in the best interests of consumers or our economy to prolong this litigation further. To do so would stifle further innovation.

Sincerely,
Dan R. Johnson

MTC-00008022

From: rbonine@millermartin.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...

Date: 1/3/02 11:05am
Subject: Comment on Microsoft settlement
This e-mail is sent in accordance with the Tunney Act of 1974. It is my personal opinion as a 17-year veteran of the IT industry that the proposed Justice Department settlement is completely useless, and it will not hinder Microsoft's attempts at monopoly in any way. Microsoft's monopolistic actions since the settlement proposal have only intensified; witness the early release of Windows XP to try to avoid an injunction, and the continual push toward usage of Microsoft Passport, which has potentially serious consequences to not only software companies, but to all e-commerce. For the long-term health of the IT industry in specific and the American economy in general, I strongly urge that the DoJ settlement be completely rejected and that much harsher measures be put into place. I would like to further suggest that the original judgement (the breakup of Microsoft into seperate companies) be upheld.

Thank you.
Roger L. Bonine
Information Technology Manager
Miller & Martin LLP
Chattanooga, TN
(423) 785-8393

MTC-00008023

From: ROBERT STROHL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

AS A concerned citizen I uge the DOJ to end the political persecution of Microsoft and do all things necessary to make the proposed settlement become reality.

A George BUSH Supporter
Robert D Strohl

MTC-00008024

From: The SHADOW know
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

The public perception is that more money was spent by the previous administration fighting Microsoft than was spent fighting terrorism. True or not, perception is everything, so it is time that the Microsoft settlement be approved. We need to put this behind us so that we can concentrate on America's real enemy—international terrorism.

Thanks,
Dr. Ray A. Gaskins
Hampden-Sydney College
Hampden-Sydney, Va
rayg@hsc.edu
Ray Gaskins

“The world’s a little poorer for a soldier died today. We’ll hear his tales no longer for he has passed away. He was just a simple soldier who was sworn to defend his home, his kin, his country, and would fight until the end.” Anonymous

MTC-00008025

From: Harry LeBlanc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:06am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am a professional software developer with 13 years experience, and have used both Microsoft and non-Microsoft operating systems, middleware, development tools, and applications. I am deeply disturbed by the proposed settlement, both for what is included and what is left out. I exhort Judge Kollar-Kotelly to remedy these flaws.

What is included:

1. A five-year limit. Given that Microsoft is riding the wave of ill-gotten profits accrued over a decade of illegal monopolistic practices, five years isn’t enough to restore a marketplace of normal competition, even if the settlement didn’t provide mechanisms (noted below) for Microsoft to hamper the function of the implementors of the proposed settlement. It seems to me that the enforcement period should be at least twice the duration of Microsoft’s criminal past, and perhaps certain structural elements of a sound settlement should be enforced in perpetuity.

2. Microsoft’s voice in the technical committee. Since when does a criminal choose its guards? Given the pervasive influence of Microsoft in the market, and their persistent monopolistic behavior, it is dubious at best that their chosen representative, and the representative who can be vetoed by that person, will fully have the interests of the public at heart. Watchdogs chosen by Microsoft, on the Microsoft payroll, and working fulltime in secrecy on the Microsoft campus, do not meet any reasonable criteria for impartiality.

3. Moreover, crafting in a feature that allows Microsoft to dispute costs gives Microsoft a handy built-in mechanism for sandbagging. I quote: “Microsoft may, on application to the Court, object to the reasonableness of any such fees or other expenses. On any such application: (a) the burden shall be on Microsoft to demonstrate unreasonableness; and (b) the TC member(s) shall be entitled to recover all costs incurred on such application (including reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs), regardless of the Court’s disposition of such application, unless the Court shall expressly find that the TC’s opposition to the application was without substantial justification.”

Given the vast wealth Microsoft has illegally obtained from the public through its monopolism, setting enforcement expenses as “reasonable”, and giving Microsoft a mechanism for subpoenaing their watchdogs (thus distracting them from their true duty) is asking for trouble. Microsoft’s bearing of the “expenses” of such activity will be trivial, and more than compensated by the implicit protection of any future monopolistic behavior concealed from the technical committee—not to mention that it

lets Microsoft run out the clock at a very cheap cost. The technical committee should have a free hand, and an unlimited budget underwritten by Microsoft.

4. Microsoft has implicit control over who is permitted to be their competitor. Again, I quote: “(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business...” Why does Microsoft get to apply the litmus test of the “authenticity and viability” of who is permitted to see their API’s?

Another quote: “Microsoft shall disclose to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs, for the sole purpose of interoperating with a Windows Operating System Product, via the Microsoft Developer Network (“MSDN”) or similar mechanisms, the APIs and related Documentation that are used by Microsoft Middleware to interoperate with a Windows Operating System Product.”

Doesn’t Microsoft have control over who participates in their proprietary MSDN program, and don’t they set criteria of participation (eg, nondisclosure, etc)? This is one of the very mechanisms by which Microsoft has implemented their monopolistic strategy. Such APIs should be *freely distributed* to the *public*, not sold to the few acceptable competitors that Microsoft designates, on terms of their own setting. Allowing Microsoft to use their MSDN mechanism and decide which business is authentic and viable is too weak. It specifically gives Microsoft a mechanism to exclude open source developers, academics, etc.

What is left out:

5. Recompense. Microsoft has illegally profited for years from their monopolistic practices. That money rightfully belongs to the public, and should be returned to the public. It should be fairly straightforward to measure the average profitability of their nearest competitors vs. Microsoft’s illegally enhanced profit margins, thus determining how much Microsoft illegally profited. Perhaps this money could be funneled into educational grants for computer hardware and (completely non-Microsoft) software for elementary, secondary, and college tuition. These funds should easily cover the expense of putting (for example) a Linux computer on the desktop of every student in public schools, state universities, etc.

6. Punitive damages. Over and above returning the ill-gotten gains to the public, Microsoft should be penalized for their illegal activities.

7. Document formats. Microsoft enforces its monopoly by keeping their file formats proprietary. Since Microsoft chooses which competing operating systems to support with their applications, companies who have been monopolistically pressured into buying Microsoft applications (eg, MS Office) are trapped on the Microsoft platform by their inability to migrate their (proprietary and copyrighted) corporate data to other operating systems. This is key. Microsoft applications compel users to stick with Microsoft operating systems, this perpetuating their monopoly. The only remedy would be to open up their file formats (or possibly to require them to

provide fully and publicly documented import/export features that allowed users to migrate *all their data* (including “objects” such as forms, reports, etc.) to competing products, and to likewise recreate data from compliant import files (even if created by competing products). In other words, the public deserves a way to get all their data out of Microsoft products, and Microsoft should pay for providing such a mechanism.

I’ve heard the rationale that punishing Microsoft would be bad for the economy. First of all, that’s no excuse for failing in the duty to enforce justice. Secondly, the leverage Microsoft has in the economy was acquired through their crimes, and the judgment should not perpetuate the consequences of their crimes for fear of rocking the boat. Third, monopolists have always been bad for the economy, the contrary arguments of monopolists notwithstanding. And finally, the amount of money from recompense and punitive damages, pumped back into the economy in such a way as to stimulate competition in the computer software field, should provide an enormous economic boost.

American citizens are counting on Judge Kollar-Kotelly to faithfully perform her solemn duty to uphold justice by preventing this weak and flawed proposed settlement from being implemented, and properly addressing the true interests of the United States of America by returning the ill-gotten wealth from Microsoft to the public from whom they stole it, further penalizing Microsoft financially, and crafting structural remedies to prevent Microsoft from ever being able to commit the same crimes again.

All America is counting on you, Judge. Do your duty.

Sincerely,
Harold C. LeBlanc
1300 Powderhorn Terrace
Apt. 11
Minneapolis, MN 55407-1669
(612-729-9670)
hleblanc@bitstream.net

They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety. —Benjamin Franklin

MTC-00008026

From: alton.g.declaire@gm.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I think the government has spent enough money and time to litigate the Microsoft Settlement and should close this case.

Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft

MTC-00008027

From: Robert Cahall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:06am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The court should accept the settlement and put this matter behind us for the best interests of all of us

Bob Cahall
drquaack@fuse.net

MTC-00008028

From: Retha Bennett
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do believe this is a settlement that does benefit the consumer. Microsoft has always built a better mouse trap and the market place has reflected it. It is time to get this behind us and get the economy moving again and Microsoft is a key player in that process. We do not need a few to benefit we need many to benefit if we are going to move forward and this settlement certainly helps.

Sincerely
 Retha Bennett

MTC-00008029

From: Vance L. Ray
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:13am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
 I disagree with the Final Judgment against Microsoft, it is much too harsh.

Microsoft does not have a monopoly.
 - Vance L. Ray

MTC-00008030

From: MMRHART@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:13am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the settlement as it presently stands. There has been too much intervention by others in the developments made by Microsoft. Where would America be today, if it were not for Microsoft and its wiliness to bare the cost of development? Inventions should be encouraged, not discouraged by law suits, etc.

Joseph W. Hart
 Naples FL

MTC-00008031

From: Bill Colburn and Susan Marcolina,
 M.D.
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:12am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am completely in favor of the Microsoft settlement that has been reached between the DOJ, several states and Microsoft, and I urge the Judge in this case to accept those terms, reject the outrageous claims of the states who have refused to settle and close the case in it's entirety.

Please stop your horrendous waste of our tax dollars in harassing and prosecuting one of the most admired companies in America, one that will be a key to getting our economy out of the dumps, and get back to the serious business of pursuing terrorists, murderers, gangsters and others of their ilk. Get back to the real work of serving the people of the United States instead of continuing to waste the taxpayers' money on private vendettas driven by failed competitors of Microsoft and a few Attorneys General who think a tough position on high profile case will help them get national name recognition and either re-election when their terms expire or a nice spot on a national party ticket in the next presidential election.

Thank you.
 William Colburn

420 Datewood Court NW
 Issaquah, WA 98027

MTC-00008032

From: Sheldon Katz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:14am
 Subject: microsoft settlement

it seems outrageous to me that the government has spent so much time and money prosecuting microsoft when there are other problems that are so much more deserving of the money and effort.

you spent years chasing ibm amd accomplished nothing but making lawyers rich.

you broke apart at&t so that we all pay more money for less phone service and cannot identify which vendor is at fault when things 'do not work'. while microsoft is not perfect, they do produce a consistent predicable product that fully integrated those option in the pc operating system that i care to use.

i do not look forward to the government getting me something better that i will end up paying more for and spending hours installing it.

it ain't broke—why do you have to fix it. let sun and oracle fight their own battles.

the american consumer has been well served by microsoft- better than the doj serves us in this case

spend your time on terrorists and organized crime—do something useful
 sheldon katz

MTC-00008033

From: Cecily Wood
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:11am
 Subject: MS Monopoly comment

I was appalled at the settlement for the regular suit, and for the settlement for those states that held out for more. The remedy is little more than a slap of Ann Lander's proverbial wet noodle. And, as Apple has rightly pointed out, the schools provision puts the fox solidly within the hen house. Microsoft engages in monopolistic practices. So we hand them a great opportunity to take over one of the few markets of its alternative in operating systems? I don't need a doctorate in electrical engineering or jurisprudence to see this lacks any common sense, nor does the punishment fit the crime.

Microsoft's disdain for any government remedy for its monopolistic tendencies was revealed at about the same time as the regular settlement was announced. They knocked all users except those using Microsoft browsers and email programs off their MSN.com internet provider service - which is generally paid for by users. A free subscription to the MSN ISP is often given for a limited time with new Windows machines, but after that free period, people have to pay to get the use.

Of course there was a great uproar and they were forced to back down, but the very fact that they'd pull such a egregious stunt at the very time they were to learn of their court penalties shows that they MUST be closely monitored.

Their new operating system doesn't show much of an improvement in the monopolistic tendencies although it's made some grudging

hooks so different web browsers can be used. And it has grudgingly allowed PC makers the option to sell machines on which the Windows operating system is not installed.

And they say they will offer open systems? And they say they will follow/allow existing standards? That must be why the cell phone standards are being set by all except Microsoft which is offering its own? Unhuh, and I have a bridge to sell you.

Cecily Wood,
 Technology Planning and Support
 (Although my views are part and parcel of my job, they may not represent the school system's.)

MTC-00008034

From: M. G. Fred Kick
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:18am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel it is long overdue for the settlement, prolonging this action to please special interests especially AOL (the most consumer unfriendliest ISP and the most expensive) will only hurt the consuming public and cost the taxpayer an other fortune. Let Microsoft get on with it's service to the consumers worldwide, it will help our exports, provide jobs, and help our ailin economy.

M.G. Fred Kick

MTC-00008035

From: HPotler@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:18am
 Subject: Settlement

Please settle this matter as quickly as possible.

Harold Potler

MTC-00008036

From: Jpricecpa@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:19am
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
 TO WHOM IT CONCERNS,

I AM NOT A PERSON THAT TYPICALLY WRITES THESE LETTERS.....JUST TOO BUSY.

HOWEVER, I FEEL STRONGLY THAT IT IS TIME TO CLOSE THIS CASE AGAINST MICROSOFT.

THE INDUSTRY AND THE PUBLIC HAS GREATLY BENEFITED FROM THE STANDARDIZATION BROUGHT BY THEIR STRONG MARKET POSITIONS. WE SHOULD STOP PUNISHING THEM.

ALSO, OUR ECONOMY NEEDS US TO LET THIS GO AND FOCUS IN OTHER AREAS.

Judy L. Price
 Judy L. Price, CPA, Inc.
 jpricecpa@aol.com
 REDDING OFFICE:
 1616 West Street
 Redding, CA 96001
 530-246-4114
 530-246-4115 fax
 COTTONWOOD OFFICE:
 3861 Country Estates Drive
 Cottonwood, CA 96022
 530-347-1726
 530-347-4558 fax

MTC-00008037

From: Jack Burleigh
 To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/3/02 11:21am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:
 I've read about the Microsoft settlement on the Department website. The settlement seems entirely fair and reasonable to me and I urge the Department to finalize the settlement. In my humble opinion, it is time for this litigation to end.

Sincerely,
 Jack Burleigh

MTC-00008038

From: Nbpman@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:22am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement should stand in its current form. Those who desire to reject it and force the breakup of Microsoft do not understand economics. If Microsoft truly does not serve the public market because of security flaws in its products or other factors, then innovation on the part of competitors will bring about desired changes. It may take a little longer than a government lawsuit, but ultimately the free market will be served and government intervention will not be needed. Microsoft became as large as it is because its products were innovative and made computers easier to use by the general public. They may have gone in a direction that discouraged competition, but I personally have not found many products that can compete — and I have looked. Linux may be the catalyst that causes the corporate shakeup the Clinton Administration looked for in the original lawsuit. We do not need the expense or use of DOJ resources for additional action against Microsoft.

Abbott Barclay
 Richmond, Virginia

MTC-00008039

From: Rudolf Forster
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:22am
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the settlement accepted by the DOJ is fair and reasonable and should be the end of the litigation. We have spent far too much already on this vendetta of a few competitors and it is time to end it.

Stop this fruitless litigation and let Microsoft and the US get on with life. The very people (the public) that the litigation was supposed to have been protecting have NOT been complaining so who is this really about?

Rudolf Forster
 rforster@alltech-inc.com

MTC-00008040

From: Betty H meng
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:23am
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sun and Oracle need to compete fairly with Microsoft in the market place not in the courts—anti-trust doesn't apply when there is no way to put a price tag on creativity and entrepreneurship—

Let the customers be the judge and the jury—We know how to make our decision—

These 9 states should not be granted a license to sue—Let them all create competitively and we be the judge and jury and decide—

Mrs Betty B Meng (78 years old and experienced)

MTC-00008041

From: Dewire
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:23am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is hard for me to understand my government's instance on trying to punish an American company that has become a world wide standard for excellence. How does it help consumers to prevent a company from giving away features with their product? True, it hurts their competition because their competition did not think of it first.

I as one American Tax Payer, am tired of the government wasting my money going after a tax paying American Company.

Foreign government encourage and support their industries...only in America do we try to tear down what our citizens create and develop...under the banner of being too big and powerful. Other countries laugh at our Justice Department for doing their work for them in trying to eliminate our own American powerhouses.

In Japan Bill Gates would be declared a Living National Treasure...In Great Briton he would be knighted....here you are doing everything you can to destroy him!

Come to your common senses and enjoy and hail what Microsoft has accomplished.

Robert and Carol Dewire
 3640 Bal Harbor Blvd. # 511
 Punta Gorda, Florida
 33950

MTC-00008042

From: RKlein8198@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:22am
 Subject: microsoft settlement

can you imagin the mess the computer industry would be in if microsoft had not set a standard that every could follow. boot the politicians out out of the process.

MTC-00008043

From: Dixie DeRoshia
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:23am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support Microsoft's right to innovate and feel the Federal Government has overstepped it's duty to protect and it has in fact, harrassed a private concern unnecessarily.

Dixie Coster-DeRoshia

MTC-00008044

From: William Wertz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:24am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 CC:tellupton@mail.house.gov@inetgw

MTC-00008045

From: Bob Blake
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:25am
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I concur in the agreement in the Microsoft Case

Robert Blake Jr
 13 Ethel Avenue
 Peabody, MA 01960-530813

MTC-00008046

From: RPPVLP@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:25am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There needs to be a prompt resolution of the cases involving Microsoft. I am a substantial user of various interrelated Microsoft products which I use to conduct my daily business. Those products currently meet my needs very well. I cannot afford to have their interdependency shattered!

MTC-00008047

From: JANE WALKER
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:27am
 Subject: Case settlement

This case needs to be settled as soon as possible. With the state of the economy, another company does not need to be damaged by the interference of the government and people who are not dependent on this company for their living. We should not punish people for being brilliant and having innovative ideas.

Martha Jane Walker
 3663 Briar Creek
 Beaumont, TX 77706

MTC-00008048

From: richard tigue
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please- Let us settle the Microsoft case, and not continue to litigate!

MTC-00008049

From: Fred Benson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:31am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

In my opinion the Tunney Act covering the Microsoft Settlement is fair, equitable and in the public's interest. I think that this law should stand, all the litigators should go chase other fire engines and our country should get back to building our economy instead of tearing it down. We should not attack corporations based on the fact that they have been successful. If a company can't compete it can't make it up by litigation. 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-00008050

From: Leroy E Gardner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to complete the settlement as proposed. It is fair and balanced and removes further uncertainty over an entire industry. This should be beneficial to the stock market and to business generally. Leroy E. Gardner

MTC-00008051

From: Rick Deno

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 11:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please put this litigation behind us and let the economy finally take a step forward. Microsoft's customers made Microsoft a monopoly, NOT Microsoft. If we chose some other alternative, I want to be the one doing the choosing, not the Government.

MTC-00008052

From: Hrenforth@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DOJ wants to hear from YOU!
For nearly four years, my 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 my 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.

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.

I AM IN FAVOR OF TAKING THE SETTLEMENT THAT HAS BEEN APPROVED AND LETTING THIS MATTER BE SETTLED ONCE AND FOR ALL. ANY FURTHER LITIGATION WILL DO NOTHING BUT MAKE A LOT OF LITIGATORS WEALTHY AND THAT IS NOT NEEDED AT THIS TIME IN OUR LIVES.

THANKS FOR TAKING THE TIME TO LISTEN TO MY COMMENTS.

HOWARD F. RENFORTH
144 CROSSTIDE CIRCLE
PONTE VEDRA BEACH FL 32082

MTC-00008053

From: Clark, Nick
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is good to see that some of the states are finally getting on with settling their dispute with Microsoft. Although I've never felt indebted to Microsoft for the career I'm currently in I do however feel that it was their foresight and technology that pushed a technology market so far that eight years ago I finally found what I wanted to do for the rest of my life. I love working with their product! If it weren't for all the dumbass hackers making it harder on consumers Microsoft would probably be an even bigger company.

It's a shame for the states that are still in dispute over the current settlement agreement but you can never please everyone all of the time. I know alot of the issues that are still being mulled over are purely political and it's sad that nobody will remember the idiots still attacking Microsoft come the next election. Microsoft got to where they are because of their innovative ways. Yes, business deals have been made and they do need to play nice with their desktop and server operating systems. As for the market that either competes or works with Microsoft, they too need to develop better technology. If they didn't get behind in the first place we probably wouldn't even be going through this right now. Thank you for your time.

Nick Clark
IT Manager/Consultant
<<http://www.kebcpa.com/html/information-technology.html>>
Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP <<http://www.kebcpa.com/>>
Springfield, IL 62701

MTC-00008054

From: Katy Ainsworth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:37am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To Whom it May Concern:
Please note that I am a voting citizen of the United States of America. I am writing this letter in response to the settlement agreement with Microsoft. I feel this settlement to be in the best interest of consumers, the country, and especially the economy. With the downturn of the economy of the United States since the 9-11 I feel it to be of utmost importance to get this mess behind us and keep the economy stable. America is a capitalist country and we should do all we can to keep it this way.

Thank you.
Katy Robertson

MTC-00008055

From: LNLEVERETT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:37am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This suit by the federal government against Microsoft has not been in the public interest. Microsoft has plenty of competition and prices on all things electronic continue to drop. Please settle this case so Microsoft and the country can get on with it.

F. Lynn Leverett
7604 SW 178 Terrace
Miami, Florida 33157

MTC-00008056

From: rewone.nineoh@verizon.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:39am
Subject: Micosoft Settlement

You must force Microsoft to place a warning sticker on any software that requires the user to first install the Microsoft Internet Explorer browser before the said software can be installed. I use the Netscape browser and they wanted me to install MS IE before I could make greeting cards! I declined and asked for a refund.

William Kenney
Jamaica, NY

MTC-00008057

From: levinej@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:41am
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement. I believe it works in my favor as a customer.
Joann levine—

MTC-00008058

From: Mary Selvick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:40am
Subject: settlement

I hope you can forward this to the senators; I have had it with the government sticking its nose into "honest" companies! Leave Microsoft alone! The settlement was fair!

What I would like to see is a committee come together to investigate the "Pork" that all the senators push through and the tax payers have to foot the bill!

I am for term limits and get those damn bloodsuckers out!

MTC-00008059

From: MVL240Z@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Bill Gates did not force me to buy his products. I evaluated his products and am glad I do not have to hire a consultant to make various software programs work seamlessly together. My productivity has increased because I do not have to waste time figuring out various software programs. Clearly, Gates and Balmer have been aggressive and at times arrogant (Balmer).

Give them a fine, tell them not to do it again but let them get on with business and offering new products. Microsoft may not be the most innovative but they certainly make things work better. Do you use Word and PowerPoint? I am considering switching from Quicken to Microsoft because Quicken constantly crashes and according to reviews has been surpassed by Microsoft Money. Netscape and AOL's internet browser are inferior to Microsoft Explorer.

Give Microsoft credit for turning on a dime and realizing that the internet would change our lives. Do not be dictated by competitors who think a lawsuit is the only way of "beating" Microsoft.

Stop wasting more time and money and let's move on. America should concentrate on being an economic superpower that will further globalization to help wipe out individuals or groups like the Taliban and bin Laden.

MTC-00008060

From: MSullivanMaram@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:46am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 TO: Dept. Of Justice
 FROM: Mary Ann Sullivan 65 Park Ave.
 Williston Park, NY 11596

I am pleased with the DOJ ruling on Microsoft. I do not believe that it would be in the best interest of the American economy to break up Microsoft. If other states want to go ahead and sue Microsoft, I wish them luck! They won't succeed. We need a company like Microsoft to keep the American economy strong and progressive.

There are idiots today who hate Microsoft and don't even know how to use a computer!
 CC:MSullivanMaram@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00008061

From: CpiCfo@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:46am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The attack on Microsoft because they built a better mousetrap is unwarranted and outrageous.

I have been a computer user and analyst since my entry into the workforce some thirty years ago. In 1966, I was first introduced to programming (FORTRAN) as an engineering student. I can tell you I had no interest following this experience in being a computer geek! I left school and served in the USAF, with Viet Nam service. I returned to school on the GI Bill and obtained my BA and MBA. In this process, I was exposed to GPSS, Wang calculators and other cutting edge (at that time) computer models. They still left me with wanting someone else to do my modeling.

Graduating with my MBA, I then became a systems and financial analyst for a Bank holding company designing major banking systems (we were the first to install ACH in Florida and mini-computers in the bank branches) and using timeshare models. As computers moved away from the "big box" towards the ultimate "personal computers" I became more of a hands on user.

I became a CPA working for a major firm and then as the #3 financial spot with a fortune 500 which became a LBO and then liquidated. After the liquidation, I went into the work force as a consultant/CPA with my only staff being a PC under DOS. Without my computer background, it would have been extremely difficult for me to grasp what was going on in the PC—DOS environment—with separate, unintegrated Lotus, WordPerfect, database and other applications. It was only several years later that I finally migrated to Windows which I initially resisted because I did not want to retrain myself.

When I found what Windows and the integrated applications could do—I never looked back. AND THE TOTALLY INTEGRATED PACKAGES I PURCHASED WERE FAR CHEAPER, MORE EFFICIENT AND BETTER than the more expensive packages that I had perviously been working with. Because of the systems created by Bill Gates—I have less office staff, am more efficient at what I do, am willing to do my own modeling and correspondence, email, internet access, etc. etc. etc.

I am at a loss as to what you think Bill Gates and Microsoft have done to harm me—the consumer! As I understand it, the major issue against microsoft revolves around their internet access system (MSN) which I do not use. I am an AOL user. And while I have found some conflicts which are an irritant—I do not consider them actionable. I still use AOL (my kids would not let me move) and have figured out how to defeat whatever conflict (perceived or real) existed. Note: AOL Instant messenger is another example of an innovative creation which for the life of me I do not understand why someone who creates and builds a better mousetrap (and is the only one who has and everyone wants it) needs to be punished for doing so! If you want someone to attack—why don't you look at some of the tax software firms—Why do I have to pay so much for software from them? Their fees are excessive in my opinion.
 SETTLE THIS ACTION AGAINST MICROSOFT AND MOVE ON!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

MTC-00008062

From: Ralph Askam
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:50am
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am in favor of settling the microsoft case as has been proposed in the final sttlement agreement.

I think enough time and money has been wasted on this matter and that every one would be better off withit's settlement.

Thank you
 Ralph F. Askam M.D.
 4120 Nobhill Dr.
 Muskegon.Mi. 49441 231 780 2252

MTC-00008063

From: Robert Hess
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:47am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I'm writing to you in regards to the proposed settlement of the anti-trust suit against Microsoft.

I have several points of view on this matter.

As a (minor) shareholder, I feel too much time and money has already been spent by the company and the taxpayers on this matter. The company has agreed to abide by the proposed settlement to which the federal government and nine states have also agreed.

As a long-time personal computer user, I have never been forced to utilize Microsoft products. Over the years, I use, and have used, different operating systems, internet browsers, word processing software, spreadsheet programs, etc. In some cases, the Microsoft product was the best choice for me, in other cases, it was not...but I have a choice.

As an American taxpayer, I'm tired of the taxes I pay being wasted on a handful of lawyers making their careers on long, drawn out bureaucracies such as this.

It is time for this matter to be settled.

Respectfully,
 Robert Hess
 Wyomissing, PA

MTC-00008064

From: Ted Michael

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:50am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I think that Microsoft should be able to conduct business as it sees fit. Microsoft has announced its plans all along to the competition who thought that their grip was enough to see it through. When reality struck they called foul. When they had Microsoft on the ropes and tied up in Federal court they forged alliances themselves trying to become the ruler of the computer/on-line worlds. To what avail? Allow Microsoft to continue to move ahead in its product development and desktop integration. Don't punish them for their innovation but rather allow the market place to dictate the direction of the marketplace and may the best companies win!

Ted Michael
 248-877-5772
 CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00008065

From: JRKRAWIEC@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:50am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to make my voice heard regarding the Microsoft suit. The suit against Microsoft was a huge mistake from the beginning. Since when is our government in the business of suing successful businesses, because the competition says it is unfair.

I believe that the settlement which has been reached is fair to all parties. The government has never made a case showing where consumers were harmed by Microsoft. In fact, the exact opposite is true. Microsoft has made it possible for more and more consumers to benefit from use of computers and the internet.

Please end this costly suit at once and move forward with the settlement already agreed upon.. If Microsoft had an unfair advantage, shouldn't the competitors have been benefitting from the tough times of Microsoft this past few years (due to this litigation)? The opposite has occurred. We have all seen our stocks in all of the internet companies go down the tube. Look at the numbers. This decline began almost in direct correlation with the Lawsuit. Now consumers truly have been harmed, but not by Microsoft, but by our own Government which will not leave the free market free.

Please do the right thing now.. Thank you for your time...Joyce Krawiec

MTC-00008066

From: Hjbaron@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:51am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone-The settlement is reasonable to all parties-Stop wasting money on more litigation pushed by wealthy special interest groups!!!!

Julie Baron

MTC-00008067

From: MEIJERA@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 11:56am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US Department of Justice,

As we all know, our economy is suffering and we are now in a recession. If the case against Microsoft is resolved soon, I think our American public will gain the confidence it needs to begin investing in our great economy again.

Because Microsoft has brought so much to this world in software technology, they should be applauded and not obnoxiously criticized for their efforts. Sure, they should operate accordingly and be punished accordingly, but enough is enough. Let's get on with it and start this economy rolling again.

AMM

MTC-00008068

From: Edgar Lambert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It appears to me the states are only interested in getting revenue out of this law suit similar to the tobacco lawsuit. I don't believe the public interest has anything to do with it. Microsoft should be free to continue to innovate as they've done in the past which has made vast changes in our lives as well as helped the economy to grow.

Ed Lambert

MTC-00008069

From: Margaret Murdock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:

I think you should accept the Microsoft settlement that has been reached by the DOJ and the various 9 states who wanted something different than the original DOJ agreement. Microsoft has paid enough for being a successful company. As far as I am concerned the whole thing has been a miscarriage of justice.

You learned all your computer use/knowledge at tax payer expense and with an Information Specialist standing by to get your computer straightened out from any screwups you did. We tax payers have not had that luxury.

When I bought my first computer, for my son to use at college, it cost more than I was able to save in one year, and then when I got it home, I had to figure out how to put DOS 3.3 (for which I had to pay extra) on it. Then I had to pay another \$150 for a word processor, which I had to install on it, in the hopes that it would all work together. AND, I did not have the luxury of any one to help me if it didn't all work OK. And if I broke it—to bad.

Microsoft has made the purchase of a computer to use a pleasure, not the nightmare it use to be. All the software that you need to do the things that you want your new computer to do—is on it, and runs correctly!! More than any other company, Microsoft has made computers able to be used by anyone in the world. It is no longer only for the computer savvy few. Even you would not be able to use your computer if it were not for Microsoft making it easy enough that you can simply point and click your way around different windows.

Don't let the special interest groups stop the settlement.

Margaret Murdock

MTC-00008070

From: Joe Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I believe that the lawsuits brought against Microsoft are for the most part politically (self interest) motivated. Obviously Microsoft has been very successful and, as a result, has become very big. However, it is still important that the software industry be allowed to have a definite leader in a free market. I think that other companies should be guaranteed the right to compete with Microsoft, but they should not be guaranteed success! In general, I believe that the current proposed settlement with Microsoft by the DOJ is more than fair to the parties which have filed charges against Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Joe E. Johnson

MTC-00008071

From: Jim Applebaum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sir or Ms.,
I believe the settlement of the DOJ suit against Microsoft should be approved as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Jim A.

MTC-00008072

From: DnBMcKee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:58am
Subject: Micro Soft Settlement

My wife Billie and I both believe that the whole Microsoft trial has been unamerican and a total travesty. We grow up being taught that as Americans the sky is the limit. We are told that hard work, original thinking and attaining goals are the keys to success. Apparently not so if we take the example of the Microsoft affair as an indication of how it works. There isn't a single company in the U.S. that has done more for the American Image than Microsoft, and it is a world-wide perception. They should be rewarded, not punished!!!!

Billie & Don McKee

MTC-00008073

From: Lyle McDermed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that Microsoft is being punished for being successful. There seem to be several Microsoft wannabees that have an inferior product that want to see Microsoft pay through the nose for good business practices that the wannabees do not have! Since capitulism allows for and encourages success, I fail to see why the federal Justice Department and the different States are trying to destroy Microsoft. Success should breed additional success and not PUNISHMENT!

Lyle K. McDermed

MTC-00008074

From: Ken (038) Audrey Smith

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We feel the settlement is fair and should apply to all the states involved.
We are not sure why the states should get anything, Microsoft has given all states computers and training.

Sincerely,
Audrey Smith

MTC-00008075

From: DICKBEAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:02pm
Subject: End The Legal Obstructions
Senator Hatch and Microsoft's Utah competitors should get a life. The court has ruled and we should all be moving on.
Richard C Bean

MTC-00008076

From: GERALD HARTZ
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I think this foolishness has gone far enough, too far in fact. If you can't see that these lingering nine states are in "it" strictly for the money than I have a bridge I want to sell you after this foolishness is concluded. We cannot control the success of one company, i.e. Microsoft, and the failures of others by taking money from the successful one and giving it to the slackers in an attempt to even the playing field. This is absolutely stupid, and My Government must act more intelligently than that. This entire "suit" thing (designed by the previous Clinton Administration who when faced with what to do and had no intelligent way to turn, sued) makes me sick. Wake up Justice Department!!!!!!

This email comes to you from US Citizen:
Gerald Hartz
19 Diller Line Road
Chesterville, ME 04938

MTC-00008077

From: Frank (038) Debbie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please finalize the settlement. Stop further frivolous litigation and let the computer industry get back to business.
Thank you,
Frank Hobin
409 S. Beech St.
Winnsboro, Tx 75494
(903) 342-9222

MTC-00008078

From: Thelma Stevens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:04pm
Subject: No subject was specified.
Re. the Microsoft Settlement:
With regards to the new Microsoft settlement, we would like to add our thoughts to what so much of the American public thinks. We agree with the settlement and find it a tough but beneficial settlement for all concerned. We believe that the interests of all the parties are well served by this proposal and we urge you to finalize this

settlement as soon as possible. As a consumer, we think the terms are fair to us as well as to the aggrieved parties. Please do not delay this proposal, Let's get this behind us, and keep the American economy moving!

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Thelma and Nelson Stevens
Barrington, IL.

MTC-00008079

From: Luiz De Lima
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The litigation against Microsoft has already damaged the economy perhaps more than terrorist acts. I think it is time to settle the case and move forward to resume growth.

MTC-00008080

From: Allan Kalar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:08pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Yes, Microsoft has some problems, but delaying the settlement is not the way to solve them.

Microsoft's biggest problem is that their operating systems aren't reliable. No amount of legislation or court action is going to fix that. The marketplace will. Linux is currently replacing Windows as the system of choice for web sites because it's more robust and cheaper per node. Hardly the scene you'd associate with a monopoly situation. Don't let the special interests whine their way into the proceedings. Settle this thing now so the world can get on to something important.

Allan Kalar
Viking Waters (not connected with Microsoft)

800-838-5958
alkalar@attglobal.net
PO Box 1975
Elma, WA 98541—

Don't put a question mark where God put a period.

MTC-00008082

From: Arden Warner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off of Microsoft's back.

Please end your never-ending, apparently obsessive, interest in the Microsoft case. You've done enough. Send your people after someone—or something—of consequence. Prosecuting a business, simply because the business is successful, provides a large group of—otherwise (possibly/probably) unemployable—attorneys with ample, overpaid, employment and on-the-job training. But it serves very little, if any, meaningful purpose. Microsoft does more good for the United States of America, by sheer accident—in one week, than your organization does, with hundreds of overpaid bureaucrats, working around the clock, in 20 years.

Buy your staff some pool tables and foosball machines, and keep them busy with those interests and activities. By giving them anything else to do—you are taking the risk of doing much harm. I am proud of what Microsoft has done for society—and for the

entire world. I am not at all proud of what you people do—either for a living or as a potential benefit to society. In fact, what you do for a living is kind of embarrassing. Try looking for some honest—and meaningful and productive—work. There must be something that you can do.

Arden Warner
11038 Quail Run
Dallas, TX 75238-3712
214-341-8174

MTC-00008083

From: Larry Cox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:10pm

I work in the travel industry. We're struggling to stay in business and it will be a tough year in the best of scenarios.

In the interest of our nation and economy, I ask that the case against Microsoft be closed.

Thanks,
Larry Cox

MTC-00008084

From: Marty McCafferty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very disappointed with the settlement. It seems to just bandage the problems with Microsoft's monopoly powers. Microsoft can easily use the delays in court to damage competitors.

Microsoft's illegal advantages have striped the computer industry of real innovation. A simple look at the computer related technology growth in the 80's compared to the 90's to present Microsoft era shows we are stagnate. Microsoft has choked off innovation so only the monetary strong can attempt to compete. This severely limits innovation.

For instance, In the 80's a \$300 Commodore 64 could play music and simple voice recognition and used the latest technology and most people could afford it. An Amiga computer was about \$600 could 32-bit multi tasking operating system, play digital music, speech synthesis, video capture and has hundred of affordable graphic and sound programs and was capable of hi speed modem access. The PC controlled by Microsoft has just recently been able to offer these abilities mostly because of the cost to do business with Microsoft and the ability of Microsoft to starve a small innovator out of the market using there illegal monopolistic power.

The only way to really help the consumer is to break Microsoft's up into competing Microsoft companies. The vacuum left behind would be filled with lots of innovative competitors keeping prices down and new ideas and technologies affordable. We would see the computer growth of the 80's of a scale of today's PC market.

Microsoft's biggest market strength is they can "include" products in there OS that a person would not purchase but may keep someone from purchasing a competitors product. Netscape is one big example, Explorer was an inferior product and few would download it, so Microsoft included it in the OS. Now a user could use the inferior

product because it was included and they may be less likely to download the competitive product. Microsoft's recent Media Play 8 is following the same game plan. There are better products out there but users are less likely to download them because they have a "similar" product included with the OS.

Why invest in competing with Microsoft with their ability to force new computers to have there competing products "integrated"?

The computer industry could really used more competition in the OS and application fields to bring down the cost of good products.

Regards, Marty
Marty McCafferty
Network Administrator
Nissei Sangyo America, Ltd.
Phone: (847) 273-4327 Fax: (847) 273-4127

E-mail: marty.mccafferty@nissei.com
mailto:marty.mccafferty@nissei.com

MTC-00008085

From: LRoddis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: Without Microsoft products, I would be unable to have my business and help my daughter with school. Microsoft made products that work for the private person and are affordable. The case against this innovative company is ridiculous and is hurting our economy. 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 in creating technology that is affordable to so many people.

Thanks for providing a means for me to express my opinion
Linda Roddis
St. Paul, MN

MTC-00008086

From: maryasara
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This was never really a DOJ case. If there was a problem with Microsoft's competition, they should have spent their own money and brought a civil case. How about a DOJ case against the competition for collusion.

MTC-00008087

From: James Morss
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello,
It's time to settle and get on with business. We need companies like Microsoft to stay healthy and competitive. Microsoft has given the US a big competitive edge in the tech market and we need to help them not punish them further. Let's move on.

Jim Morss
206 174th Pl. NE
Bellevue, WA 98008

MTC-00008088

From: Annegstout@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 12:23pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

To the Department of Justice:
I am writing to let you know that I am in favor of the settlement of the Microsoft dispute. I believe that it will be for the good of our economy and our sense of fairness and freedom to accept the settlement and get on with the growth of our technological businesses.

Sincerely,
Anne G. Stout

MTC-00008089

From: CHASTU@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Continued interference by government in the free market is unwanted and not what we are electing politicians to do. They are only hurting economic recovery. Get off the back of business.

C.S. Griffith, Ponte Vedra, Florida

MTC-00008090

From: John, Christine, Cailyn and Jared Cattell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please complete the proposed settlement as soon as possible. I strongly believe this is in the best interests of our country's freedom to innovate and to help our economy pull out of recession. I believe these lawsuits were motivated by Microsoft's competitors who are trying to "rob" Microsoft of their rewards for producing outstanding products that have propelled our technology growth over the last decade.

Again, please do not stand in the way of an economic recovery and freedom to innovate with new products. Complete the proposed settlement now and let's move on.

Thank you,
John Cattell

MTC-00008091

From: Bill Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My thoughts on the subject case.
I am glad the subject case is coming to a close. I understand litigation of this magnitude takes time, however, in this case you took way to long in reaching a final decision.

By not coming to a quicker decision it affected the economic well being of many developers waiting in the wings for a decision. Small to mid-size organizations are still the backbone of our economy and you under-cut their ability to act and/or react. Most organizations do not have the cash that a Microsoft has, therefore, quicker decisions are necessary. I agree Microsoft should not have been broken up.

I am disappointed that you are allowing them a long-term free hand in entering the education market. The long-term effects will favor Microsoft and put competition at a disadvantage. Other remedies would have been more realistic and would have encouraged long-term competition.

Punishment was in order and you fell short.

Bill Williams
wgv21@hotmail.com

MTC-00008092

From: LAPUNE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:23pm
Subject: settlement of governmebt lawsuit
Come on!! Lets get this thing behind us and encourage the lawyers to work on something that really is worthwhile.

Microsoft has been a boon to world economy. They shouldn't be punished! Microsoft deserves to be #1.

Microsoft's competitors should spend their money \$\$\$ on improving their businesses, not on lawyers.

Al Boden

MTC-00008093

From: Vince Yelmini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the midst of these uncertain economic times, the last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

This settlement is in the public's interest: it is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. It is good for consumers, the industry and the American economy.

Please settle this and clear the court system!

Sincerely, V.A. Yelmini

MTC-00008094

From: Fred Clarke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:25pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to settle. The DOJ had a poor excuse to start with and hammered the tech sector with the threat of breakup. Settle as agreed.

MTC-00008095

From: Catherine Ansbro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:28pm
Subject: comments

I am concerned about the proposed "penalties" on Microsoft. These so-called penalties do not really punish this company for its monopolistic activity over many years. In fact, they make it possible for Microsoft to continue its monopolistic activities in the years to come. This is simply not acceptable.

Microsoft has attempted to maintain a monopoly on the Internet Web Browser market. This is more apparent to a software developer who works 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. 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. Whether or not

they supposedly did it 'on purpose', the result is the same: a monopoly.

Specific training programs such as MCSE (Microsoft Certified Software Engineer) and MCS D (Microsoft Certified Solution Developer) are geared towards maintaining the internet browser market by gearing Microsoft Certified individuals (who must pay for courses and tests, and so become personally invested) to use only Microsoft Products.

One could argue that nobody else has attempted these things on the level that Microsoft Inc. has. Of course not, because they didn't have the chance to because of Microsoft's illegal monopoly and its unfair treatment of would-be competitors. This lack of competition is still hurting us all, at the level of individual users who do not experience freedom of choice in the products that are made available to us, and at the level of businesses who could have made different and better products and considerable profits during these years that Microsoft was an illegal monopoly.

Hardware manufacturers is hiding the price of the operating system on new computer systems. And they are not permitted to sell the hardware separately from the software. This is fundamentally wrong.

The legal resolution to this matter should include the following demands on Microsoft:

(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, and other software manufacturers will have a chance to compete. Installation of software selected by the user can remain free. For example, I prefer to be able to buy a linux operating system installed on a new computer. Why should I have to also pay for a Microsoft OS that I do not want or need? And why is the price of the Microsoft OS & Software not published?

(2) 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.

(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 manufacturers 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. It also helps the average consumer because they get a better product. Judgment in this case needs to be fair to the consumer, because future cases will look toward this as a precedent. Please take these steps to ensure that Microsoft is truly penalized from its years of monopoly activities—including harsh financial penalties that will resound throughout the computer industry—and include the recommended steps above to ensure that Microsoft is never able to do this again.

Catherine Ansbro
236 Pawnee
West Lafayette,
Indiana 47906

MTC-00008096

From: Fdcdyc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:28pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think the Microsoft settlement is fair. Lets get this over with. There must be more important things to spend our tax dollars on. FDCartwright.

MTC-00008097

From: branden—
hoopes@peoplesoft.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
I have no business affiliation with Microsoft. I am simply a very happy consumer of their products. I have used Microsoft and competing products for years and I firmly believe that Microsoft's dominance in the market is the result of a superior product. Computer software has never been so easy to use and has never been so integrated.

On the other hand, I am not blind to the mistakes Microsoft has made. However, I believe the remedies agreed to by Microsoft and the Department of Justice are more than adequate. The states that have chosen to not accept the agreement between nine states, Microsoft, and the Department of Justice are states in which Microsoft's largest competitors are based. These states are rejecting the settlement because large corporations in there districts want Microsoft removed as a competitor, NOT because there is a public outcry by consumers over how they have been mistreated and overcharged by Microsoft.

Please accept the proposed agreement and let Microsoft survive. The alternative remedy proposed by the other nine states would cripple Microsoft, demoralize their employees, and ruin any incentive the company has for continued innovation of their products. It would be a mistake far bigger than the collapse of Enron.

Branden Hoopes
A happy Microsoft consumer

MTC-00008098

From: Harry E. B. Sullivan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe there should be no governmental action of any kind against Microsoft. I have used a wide variety of Microsoft software and hardware since 1992. For the moderate amounts of money these items cost, I have received immense value. These products have made computing and use of the internet much more efficient and enjoyable. Instead of penalizing Microsoft, the U.S. Government and the American people should praise Microsoft for its many innovations, which have greatly improved American productivity and provided thousands of good high-tech jobs for Americans.

The anti-trust case against Microsoft is ludicrous—to prove an anti-trust violation, the government must prove harm to consumers, and it has failed to do so. From personal experience, I know of no such harm. Besides, anyone who does not like Microsoft has always been free to buy Apple products. Thank you for your attention to my views.

Sincerely,
Harry E. B. Sullivan

MTC-00008099

From: JEBenecki@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

First I offer my relevant credentials. My wife and I are retired residents of South Carolina, owners of 400 shares of Microsoft and users of Microsoft products in our home computer and previously in our careers.

I am very grateful for the productivity gains Microsoft has given all sectors of our economy through the products it has made available to the consumers at what I believe have been reasonable prices. Microsoft was also a leader in providing products and systems that are both compatible and integrated for ease of use by the consumer.

On the other hand, Microsoft was overzealous in pursuing market position in the past and the public has a right to expect some adjustment in Microsoft's behavior.

I believe the settlement agreed to by nine states is fair and sufficient to control Microsoft's business directions in the coming years. I encourage the Justice Department to use its influence and power to bring the other nine states into agreement with the settlement as well.

Thank you for your attention to my views.
John E. Benecki

MTC-00008100

From: Connie Hutchison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a school board member of the McFarland School District. We are a small school district in Wisconsin and face a difficult time continuing to provide a world-class education because of climbing costs and a limited tax base. Funding for computers, hardware and internet access must be balanced with the other basic educational and staffing needs in our district.

However, in order to help prepare our students for the jobs, businesses and the everyday world they will face after graduation, our district's ability to provide current technological equipment and training is essential. The proposed Microsoft settlement will help small schools districts like McFarland provide the technology our students need to meet the challenges they will face in the coming years. The settlement not only provides the technology, but also provides the training so teachers can effectively use the computers in the classrooms.

Please support the proposed settlement which establishes an independent foundation to distribute technology funds, computers and software to those districts in the most need of these essential resources.

Thank you for your consideration,
Connie Hutchison
5608 Chestnut Lane
McFarland, WI 53558
(608) 838-3728

MTC-00008101

From: Francesco Gallo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft proposed settlement

From: Francesco P. Gallo
216 Hitching Post Dr.
Wilmington, DE 19803
To: CHARLES A. JAMES
Assistant Attorney General
Antitrust Division

United States Department of Justice
I would like to express my gratitude, as a small consumer of PC products, to the US Attorney Office that in few months has put the basis for an end to a saga that has attempted to destroy an industry leader for so many years, and certainly not favoring the consumers and the economy.

Although I'm not a technician, I have perused the documentation on the Antitrust Case, and I'm very happy to express as consumer few comments for the Tunney Act.

It seems appropriate that the remedies invoked by the Proposed Final Judgment and the Competition Impact Statement are a reasonable solution to this long war, giving competitors an opportunity to integrate products and forcing Microsoft to reveal its source code, without stopping Innovation. In addition, Microsoft would be under federal monitoring until 2008. It is time for the few States opposing this settlement to dedicate more of their resources to support the economy and the innovation that will enhance the productivity.

Respectfully,
Francesco P. Gallo
CC:Francesco Gallo

MTC-00008102

From: BOB52545@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing in support of the proposed settlement of antitrust claims against Microsoft Corporation. As a retired lawyer, I believe that settlement of these claims is in the best interest of the taxpayers and the

American consumer. Far too much money has already been spent prosecuting questionable claims (although I suppose Judge Jackson's Order, to the extent upheld by the Court of Appeals, has laid to rest the questionability of these claims).

I don't believe that the consumer was ever really damaged by any monopoly power wielded by Microsoft, nor do I believe that any competitors were seriously harmed by "monopolistic practices", if any, of Microsoft. Having a superior product is not against the law nor should it be. I seriously doubt that any true unregulated monopoly exists in the US today, nor has one existed here for a long time.

It is time to move on to something that will truly make a difference in the lives of Americans and leave successful businesses alone.

Robert G Currin, Jr,
225 Springlake Rd,
Columbia, SC 29206

MTC-00008103

From: Harold (038) Dorothy Clinesmith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: I feel that it is high time to settle this litigation and get on with business. It serves no purpose to keep chipping away at a company that has had such good success at innovations that make the computer easier to us by the average person. Why keep punishing a company that has done such a good job just because other companies didn't have the ability to do the same if they had had the expertise to do the same first. Lets get on with the business of being a country that rewards companies and people for doing things that helps the economy of this free country. Please end this as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Clinesmith

MTC-00008104

From: tbrown@orionconsulting.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my support of Microsoft and request a swift and fair completion to their litigation. I am both a consumer of Microsoft (MSFT) software and in a business that relies in part on MSFT's success. As a technology professional, I am keenly aware of the importance of fair competition in our field. Unfair competition or monopolistic behavior is very damaging to us as it slows the development and adoption process of new and better technologies. To this end, I support the prosecution of MSFT and the success the DOJ has had in getting MSFT to stop their unfair practices.

On the other hand, there is an overwhelming danger to our industry if this settlement is drawn out or if the punishment is too severe. MSFT has created some of the best software products on the market today. They create millions of jobs and drive billions of dollars in the U.S. economy. My company and thousands of others are working with MSFT everyday to expand the technological lead the U.S. enjoys over other

countries. I rely on them to be successful in selling their software so I can sell consulting services and make my own company profitable. Punishing them unfairly will hurt many innocent people, like myself and my employees.

The settlement with MSFT should be focused on assuring they adhere to open standards for their software and open commercial arrangements for potential resellers or licensees of their technology. The technology industry in the U.S. has tried in vain for years to create a sanctioning organization that everyone subscribes to—fairly. If there is a single greatest opportunity for the DOJ to provide a legacy out this huge prosecutorial effort, it would be in the mandate for the creation of a technology standards council.

Companies like MSFT, AOL, Oracle, SAP, HP, Sun, etc would all be required to be involved in and fund this organization. This would allow the technology industry to police itself with oversight by the government. Our economy has been hurt enough by recent events. Our industry is in its worst slump in 10 years. Please do what you can to reverse this decline, not make it worse.

Sincerely,
Thomas J. Brown
Chicago, IL

MTC-00008105

From: William Browning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a shareholder of Microsoft as you might have guessed. I favor the settlement, of course.

There is, however, another aspect which I find particularly disturbing. That is the transmission by the Senate Judiciary Committee to Judge Kotar-Kelly of the results of their hearings favoring modification. If ever there was inappropriate interference by the legislative with the judicial branch this is it. The threat that the Judge will not get a promotion to higher judicial office unless she follows their recommendation is palpable. I really hope you can do something about that.

Bill Browning.

MTC-00008106

From: Ross, Joyce
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 12:22pm
Subject: MSFT

Dear Sirs ... I feel that the proposed settlement with Microsoft is both reasonable and fair. We need to allow for innovative research and expect that the best will rise to the top.

jrross

MTC-00008107

From: RCllnd@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Clinton Administration's going after Microsoft was not a good thing to do. Microsoft is a very good company and has made many people successful in their

business. Leave it alone. Let the settlement that has been agreed upon stand.

Sincerely yours,
Rosemary Cleland
Bishop, Ca 93514

MTC-00008108

From: JR LONGMEIER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:37pm
Subject: SETTLEMENT

THE SETTLEMENT WITH MICROSOFT NEEDS COMPLETED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND GET ON WITH BUSINESS. IF THE PREVIOUS A.G. HAD SPENT AS MUCH TIME HARASSING BIN LADEN AS IT DID BILL GATES, I THINK WE WOULD HAVE A BETTER WORLD TODAY.

MTC-00008109

From: JBWeed@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: DOJ
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to register my support for the proposed Microsoft Settlement. I think it represents an acceptable way to resolve the issues.

Jeff Weed
11320 Grenelefe Ave. N.
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

MTC-00008110

From: Theodore Nelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft

The DOJ and majority of states have reached an agreement with regard to Microsoft. I believe this settlement was in the best interest of consumers and American business. We as Americans must be concerned about our global competitiveness and further litigation of this case will further increase the risk of damaging the competitive edge we have in computer software. Therefore, I strongly recommend proceeding with this settlement agreement.

Theodore W Nelson
2812 Shamrock Drive
Allison Park, PA 15101

MTC-00008111

From: Jim Dowling
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:38pm
Subject: Enough is truly ENOUGH !! Let's move on and quit wasting

Enough is truly ENOUGH !! Let's move on and quit wasting my tax dollars as well as the tax dollars of other tax payers

Sincerely,
Jim Dowling

MTC-00008112

From: Danoe38111@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:39pm
Subject: Microsoft/ Settlement in the Courts under the Turney Act; The Contribution that Microsoft has made to the Computer Industry over the Years, has been phenomenal. Today's Computer expertise by millions would not have happened if there had not been a system that had

some continuity to it, and kept it as simple as possible.

Therefore, I hope that the powers to be will accept the present settlement that is being offered, and get on with teaching more people to utilize the computer and its many many advantages. Please settle now, this has gone on for 4 years too many.

Thank you for listening.
D Noe.

MTC-00008113

From: Eddie Bunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The previous Clinton administration seemed to attack big business as bad for us private citizens when a lot of folks either work for those type of companies or related industries. They went after tobacco, they went after the firearms, and they went after Microsoft to name a few. They said they were doing it for us, but most Americans saw through this ruse and realized it was a way the politicians could bring in more money, through fines, to support their spending habits. It wasn't about us, it was about money, money, money for our government. Ultimately, it had a very real and negative effect on our economy... Enough is enough. When Microsoft was attacked, it seemed to mark the beginning of our economic downturn. I thought it then and I believe it now. Why? I'm not sure, but it falls under weakening consumer confidence. I don't work for a big company. I'm a small independent businessman. But my feeling is that the economy is trying to turn around and if this Microsoft case doesn't continue to drag on, and is settled soon, it will be a big boost to the American psyche which in turn will help consumer confidence. We sure could use that right now.

W.E. Bunn

MTC-00008114

From: Jim Stout
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I just wanted to voice my opinion regarding the settlement. I think the settlement is tough but fair. I'm glad to see that this matter can be settled and that we can all just get back to the business of making this country a leader in the world. Get on with it and let the economy recover!

MTC-00008115

From: Barbara Winter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Department of Justice
Re: Review period for Microsoft Antitrust case

As a consumer of Computer software for 20 years, I wish to express my dismay that special interest groups—primarily Microsoft competitors—are attempting to derail the Court of Appeals settlement agreed upon in November of 2001. 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 interest.

In the settlement, Microsoft has agreed to provide software developers the necessary access to the code that enables them to create programs that interact with Microsoft platforms. The new .NET platform has raised more excitement in world-wide software developer communities than any previous operating system, in large part because Microsoft is encouraging developers to innovate, and supporting them in that effort regardless of their allegiance or affiliations. This freedom to innovate is essential to American values. It's good for competition, good for consumers.

Please take a balanced and fair look at how the proposed final settlement will affect CONSUMERS. That is the group anti-trust laws were meant to protect.

Thank you,
Barbara Winter
13872 NE 60th Way
Redmond, WA 98052
425-895-8836

MTC-00008116

From: Mail
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:44pm

MTC-00008117

From: Chris Mayhall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing this country needs at this point in time is a prolonged randomizing conclusion to the Microsoft anti-trust case—let's finish it with the proposed settlement as it stands.

After seeing how decisively the American public reacted to the horrific acts of September 11, do you (the DOJ) really think that the people of this nation would support Microsoft or any other company if we actually thought that their products were designed and built to our detriment? This must be a time of rebuilding, economically as well as spiritually, to show the terrorist community that they have not succeeded in their efforts. Further litigation against Microsoft would very likely lead to even more stagnation in the economic markets, and this would surely be viewed by some as a direct effect of the recent terrorist acts.

Certainly people everywhere, and in particular in the United States, have become more productive through the use of Windows, the Internet, and software applications that run on the Windows operating system. To overlook this economic trend of the past decade, is a significant oversight.

And finally, to anyone who has not developed software it is unthinkable that a manufacturer would release a new product, such as an operating system, that "didn't work well" in the marketplace—it is an

economically-driven decision with sharp competitors (such as AOL and Sun Microsystems in this case) doing all that they can to take that marketshare. The number of hours and test cases examined in order to be sure that Windows works well with all of the popular software products is staggering. Integrating software such as an internet browser with the operating system, as in this case, is done in order to raise the quality of the software. This occurs because common code that is shared between the two software applications only has to be written once, tested once, documented once, manufactured once, and sold once. If these same two applications were not integrated, all of these production facets are doubled. Eventually support costs double and the price of the software increases. It is hard to imagine how this latter approach is ultimately to the benefit of the American public.

Sincerely,
Chris Mayhall, Applied Digital
Photography, LLC

MTC-00008118

From: Bill Gish
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice

With the job losses, Income losses for most citizens, Stock market down; it is time that when a settlement is reached, for it to be honored and the individuals who profit, who already have more income and assets than the average person stop prolonging the final settlement to enrich their pockets, get votes in their states, to hold offices that they are unable work and reach agreements with other government departments. Any system that can't reach an agreement is shorter time than this should refund their pay for ineffectiveness. People are losing faith in the over all government. The auto industry doesn't have compatible parts for interchanging with other autos, neither the appliance industry, or for that matter the human body. Every company tries to increase their market, look what your organization has allowed the Super Stores to do the small business person. Stop this delay now.

William D. Gish

MTC-00008119

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:48pm
Subject: Microsoft—Settlement

THE PFJ IS RIDICULOUS. WHY LET THEM GET AWAY WITH PAST ABUSES AND GIVE THEM A DEFACTO GOVT APPROVED MONOPOLY GOING FORWARD???

GWS

MTC-00008120

From: Phillip Young
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ, Complete the Microsoft Settlement. Please settle with Microsoft to allow Microsoft and the whole electronics industry get on building their industry. Let the market place decide the winners and loser—NOT THE GOVERNMENT.

Thanks,
Phil Young
San Diego, CA 92109

MTC-00008121

From: Alexandra Stocker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To The Justice Department:
Please end the litigation against Microsoft once and for all. As a taxpayer, consumer, and small business owner, I object to our government intervening in the free market and persecuting a company such as Microsoft, one of America's great success stories, whose only crime was to be too successful.
Sincerely,
Alexandra Stocker
Alexandra Sanderson Stocker
Principal
Sanderson & Stocker, Inc.(R) (formerly Sanderson Capital)
2333 N. Tripphammer Rd. #201
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 257-5117

MTC-00008122

From: JD Loden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:52pm
Subject: Resolution
Microsoft has made the technology industry more competitive, and has demanded that it's competitors achieve excellence. When the automobile was invented, could we've prevented car makers from designing cars with four wheels similar to the first car?
Obviously we need a platform, and from this platform competitive products and services will surface.
J.
D. Comprehensive Business & Personal Financial Planning Services
Naples, FL 941-430-0104, FAX 941-403-9987 EMAIL jd@gulfaccess.net
Investments offered through Jefferson Pilot Securities Corporation-Concord, NH

MTC-00008124

From: Judy Sawyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust suit
I feel this litigation has taken up valuable time and money and should have been over a long time ago.
Microsoft have been a wonderful intivator. I do not see any gain for anyone in pursuing this case 1 day further.
Judy Sawyer
Sawyer@wilmington.net

MTC-00008125

From: Nkozimor@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I want to commend our government on finally putting this settlement behind us! I thing that Judge Jackson was way out of line with his decisions and I applaud the new judge who is showing some semblance of common sense!
Nick Kozimor

Mansfield, Ohio

MTC-00008126

From: DBC1998@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:56pm
Subject: msft settlement
I think this settlement is fair & i congratulate doj for it.

MTC-00008127

From: Richard Beckert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Hi, I am writting to express my support for the Microsoft antitrust settlement. I believe it is in the public interest, it addresses the monopoly maintenance charge upheld by the appellate court and it is fair and reasonable. While addressing the anti-competitive behavior, the settlement still allows Microsoft to innovate and compete with other companies.

In these tough economic times, this is one uncertainty that can be put behind us. Imposing tougher restrictions on Microsoft could cost more jobs and cause more uncertainty in the high tech industry. I believe this settlement is in the best interest of the consumers and the public. I only wish that all States could have been on board as oppose to holding out for their own self centered political gain!!
Sincerely,
Richard D. Beckert
11620 127th. Ave. N.E.
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
(360)653-5464

MTC-00008128

From: Normakorn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsoft
I would hope that Microsoft be allowed to pursue their efforts in developing cyberspace. They have done so much, and success should not deter them from marching forward in their plans to better this computer age.
Sincerely,
normakorn@aol.com Norma Korn

MTC-00008129

From: Charles A Schuster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

MTC-00008130

From: JTDDDS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:

I am writing to encourage the that all litigating states be required to accept the DOJ settlement with Microsoft.
This case has drug on entirely too long and now is only hurting the economy. The states who are not accepting the settlement are politically motivated by Microsoft competitors in their respective states and are not considering the national interest.
Sincerely,
John T. Darling, DDS

MTC-00008131

From: BETH KEMMER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:58pm
Subject: settlement
We should leave them alone!

MTC-00008132

From: Clyde Serda, CC
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Setteltment
Why is the government ordering Microsoft to do just what they sued them for? Giving away software with each computer or giving away software to public schools. I still leaves out the consumer who purchased the software. if you can't get it right just drop it....Clyde Serda

MTC-00008133

From: Reve Carberry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To The Department of Justice,
I believe it is in the interest of the public and the economy for the case against Microsoft to be settled as proposed in the agreement crafted with Microsoft by the federal government and nine states.
Reve Carberry
Reve@CarberryGroup.com
www.carberrygroup.com
914-277-1103

MTC-00008134

From: Douglas Hale
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I think your judgment was fair and just for all!

MTC-00008135

From: LEJ254@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:04pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTELMENT
THE STATES AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD GET OFF MICROSOFTS BACK AND GET BACK TO GETTING THE ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK. THE STATES SAY THEY ARE DOING IT FOR THE CONSUMER,WELL I AM A CONSUMER AND I DON'T THINK THAT MICROSOFT HAS DONE ANYONE HARM. THEY ARE TRYING TO GET THE BEST PRODUCT TO THE PUBLIC BUT THE GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES WANT TO TIE THEIR HANDS.
SETTLE THE CASE AND LET GET ON WITH BUSINESS.
L. E. JACOBS,....CONSUMER

MTC-00008136

From: Jim Greene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
<bold>It's time to settle this case and move on to something more important !</bold>

MTC-00008137

From: Elizabeth Grandy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:08pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 3, 2001

I think it is about time this ridiculous lawsuit against Microsoft is settled once and for all. As far as the public is concerned Microsoft did not do anything detrimental to the public. The crybaby companies that cannot compete are just trying to get money from the best software company ever built. Companies like Microsoft should be free to make their product anyway they see fit. If the public want to buy the product they will and if not they won't. The only reason Microsoft has a monopoly is because they are the best and everyone wants their products (including the US Government!). This whole suit should have just been thrown out of court instead of costing Microsoft thousands of dollars in attorney fees and court cost and the taxpayer also. Please settle this with as little harm to Microsoft as possible. The suing states and companies should be the ones paying not Microsoft!

Sincerely,

Gary and Elizabeth Grandy

MTC-00008138

From: John Carey

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:10pm

Subject: Microsof Settlement

John L. & Patricia A. Carey
4072 Peshurst Park, Sarasota, FL 34235
941-378-8666 careysrq@home.com
January 3, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

This letter concerns the settlement that was reached earlier this fall in the Microsoft case. We think that it was a mistake for the case to have been brought about in the first place and, at this point, the settlement should be accepted, and the matter put to rest. No company should be penalized for creative thinking.

This settlement punishes Microsoft more than enough. Microsoft will be forced to disclose information about the internal working of Windows, making it easier for computer companies to remove Microsoft programs and install similar programs from other software vendors. Microsoft will also be forced to streamline Windows so that other programs will run as well as their own in the operating system.

Additionally, Microsoft will be obligated not to seek retribution on any of the firms that originally sued it.

Finally, Microsoft will submit to oversight by a government committee to ensure that it complies with the terms of the settlement.

Microsoft has agreed to all of these terms in order to shift its resources away from legal strategy. We hope that the settlement will be swiftly finalized and implemented.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John & Pat Carey

MTC-00008139

From: NIK9@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:12pm

Subject: MICROSOFT LAWSUIT

To Whom it may concern:

I believe it is wrong for the government to attack private business. I also believe the Microsoft finding in mar/Apr of 2000 is directly responsible for the recession we are in now.

Please quit pursuing this company. They have done nothing but be a great company, responsible for untold jobs in this country.

Very Truly Yours

Greg Loomer

MTC-00008140

From: Edwin(038)phyllis Evans

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:17pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

I think the government and microsoft should accept the terms of the settlement. if microsoft is indeed a monopoly , we need more like it. where else can i get a product that me and my family enjoy and use at work and home every day, that last for years, and costs less than a hundred dollars.

edwin evans

631 ne washington

lewistown,mt 59457

MTC-00008141

From: Mike Springer

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:12pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Honorable Sirs:

I have been an independent systems consultant for the last 20 + years. I have seen IBM screw its customers with predatory activities and with providing Products did not work very well at all. Yet they were left unscathed.

Now you have an entrepreneurial company, Microsoft, that has attempted to make A product that is easy for the relatively unsophisticated end user that will provide him with all the tools to use his computer effectively. (That's more than IBM ever thought of).

Yet, for their ability to meet the market effectively, you have persecuted them in the name of the people. Your track record is less than stellar in protecting the people. Would you like to revisit MCI and ATT. The courts broke up ATT and now we have very little logic In our phone systems. I can call someone from a pay phone and pay \$7 or \$8 for a two minute call.

That is working in the best interests of the consumer? I suggest NOT. Of should we talk about the tobacco settlement fiasco? Ask the people in your office over 50 years of age what the slang was for cigarettes. May be we called them ?cancer sticks? or even ?coffin nails?!

That was over 50 years ago when I was a teenager. I knew they were deadly then. Let Microsoft due what they can to make end user use of computers more effective. Ultimately, That will benefit our society more than a bunch of restrictions and penalties will. Just get the government out of this mess without spending a ton more in our tax dollars. It would be far more beneficial for our tax dollars to go for paying our military, or replenishing our arms inventory.

Respectfully,

Michael Springer

630-202-2921

1800 East Denison Road

Naperville, Illinois 60565

MTC-00008142

From: dinshah

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:13pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir,

As the Federal Government and the state governments except nine states have agreed the settlement, the case should be decided on this settlement basis. To me it is not prudent to waste our resources at the time of the severe recession in US economy and World economy with unstable political climate.

Thank You,

Dinesh Shah

MTC-00008143

From: john tabar

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:14pm

MTC-00008144

From: Bill Wallace

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:18pm

Subject: Microsoft

Please drop all of the lawsuits against Microsoft immediately. This has all been a bogus witchhunt from the start. Let us get on with trying to make money instead of spending time and money defending lawsuits that are already totally outdated by the speed of progress in the technology business.

Bill Wallace

Box 10354 Midland, Tx 79702

MTC-00008145

From: Thomas W. Culbertson

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:15pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want doj to leave Microsoft alone.

MTC-00008146

From: larry schaffel

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:18pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a proud American and Microsoft shareholder of long standing, I am highly distressed by the continuing effort by a small, self-interested group of companies—of which, incidentally, I am also a shareholder, to continue harassing the efforts of Microsoft to continue innovating and providing a great service to the public and the economy as well as its shareholders. I urge those responsible to accept the recent settlement reached with the justice department and many states so that we can get the economy and technology industry back into a growth mode in 2002.

MTC-00008147

From: Irv Alpert

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:20pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

To quote Mark Da Cunha, is Microsoft a "predator" as the Department of Justice insinuates? A predator is someone like Adolph Hitler who kills people in

concentration camps, or a member of the mafia who hunts down a neighborhood businessman for not obeying his wishes. A predator is someone who initiates the use of physical force. Microsoft has pointed a gun at no one. Clearly, a far stronger case for predatory acts can be made against the Department of Justice—who seeks to violate Microsoft's rights by taking control over its property—than for the make-believe "predatory" acts Microsoft is accused of.

Is Microsoft a "monopoly"? Not in the proper, derogatory, traditional sense of the term. Unlike the old AT&T Bell monopoly, or today's U.S. Post Office monopoly, Microsoft did not gain its market share by having the government outlaw its competitors: Microsoft earned its position in the free-market. All real monopolies are the result of the government giving a business a "monopoly"—exclusive control of a given market by outlawing the entry of competitors. Free competition is not some Marxist, egalitarian, "perfect" ideal where all competitors end up with an equal market share of a given industry. Whether in sports, or in business, the whole point of competition is to beat your competitors—even to the point of having them going out of business. Bigness should not be confused with monopolistic; size is not a criterion of wrongdoing; success is not a crime.

Did Microsoft halt "innovation"? Innovation is the process of discovering a better way to do things. No private business can stop other companies from innovating except by out-innovating them, or by buying them out (in the which case the buyer would want the acquired company to innovate even more). The only way to halt innovation is by the threat of physical force, which is a legal power that only governments possess.

Did Microsoft "twist the arms" of its competitors? This sloppy metaphor is a vicious lie. Only the government has the legal power to twist—and even break—arms. The only "twisting" Microsoft engaged in was the legitimate practice of setting the terms of sale for its property. By what stretch of the imagination, does the Department of Justice conflate "arm-twisting" with Microsoft's refusal to license its products to vendors who do not accept its terms? This is not coercion because if a vendor refuses Microsoft's offer and walks away (and he is free to), the vendor will be no worse off than if he did not deal with Microsoft in the first place. For a real example of "arm-twisting" see what happens when you refuse to hand over half your income to the IRS next April.

Did Microsoft "hurt" competitors like Netscape by giving away a free Internet browser with its Windows operating system (when Netscape wanted to charge you \$30)? No more so, than when McDonald's bundles its meat patties with a McDonald's bun does it hurt all the bread makers. Such actions may frustrate their competitors wishes, but their rights are left untouched.

Did Microsoft violate the rules of competition? It is the application of the political principle of individual rights to the economic realm of production and trade that gives rise to the rules of free-competition. To determine whether Microsoft violated the rules of competition; therefore, one has to determine whether Microsoft violated

anyone's rights. Clearly, Microsoft did not violate the rights (life, liberty, and property) of anyone.

Yet, in the name of "protecting" competition, it is these inalienable rights that the antitrust process ignores in favor of such subjective considerations as the "public interest" (which fails to include the interests of the millions of members of the public who do not side with the Department of Justice), the "consumer interest" (which the Department of Justice has awarded itself the title of official spokesperson for), and "relevant markets" (the government defines the relevant market small enough so that Microsoft becomes a monopoly, even though Microsoft comprises less than 4% of the computer industry). Such "protection" is tantamount to helping a man to see by thrusting burning coals into his eyes.

By allowing judges to sidestep the issue of rights in favor of considerations, such as the "public interest," the antitrust laws effectively grant government the power to violate Microsoft's rights, i.e. the power to take over and control Microsoft's property against use it against Microsoft's interests. Thanks to the antitrust laws once a judge has arbitrarily classified a business as a "monopoly", the government is given free rein to: plunder of vast sums of money from Microsoft's bank account (through triple fines for so-called "damages"); replace Bill Gates with a government "overseer" who will make the important strategic decisions at Microsoft; force Microsoft to advertise and distribute its competitor's products; compel Microsoft to give up its "trade secrets" and intellectual property to those who condemn it.

From start to finish the entire antitrust process is no more than a process of sacrificing successful American businesses—such as Microsoft, ALCOA, US Steel, Standard Oil—on the guillotine of egalitarianism to appease envious competitors. Or, to quote Alan Greenspan, who upon a complete examination of the theory and history of the antitrust laws wrote that ". . . the effective purpose, the hidden intent, and the actual practice of the antitrust laws in the United States have led to the condemnation of the productive and efficient members of our society because they are productive and efficient."

The truth of the matter is that Microsoft is not the predator; Microsoft is the victim. The real predators are the bureaucrats in the Department of Justice when acting according to the antitrust laws, second-rate competitors-like Sun, Novell, and Netscape—who seek to profit from the government's actions (what do they think will happen when the government under the antitrust laws deems them "too successful" in their "relevant market"?), and the anti-capitalist intellectuals who support them. Businessmen like Bill Gates are the one group of minorities that best symbolize the American way of life: that of a free, moral, rational, capitalist society.

Irv
Irvine Alpert
Founder, OnviaGuides
Executive Vice President
Onvia, Inc. (www.onvia.com)

1260 Mercer Street
Seattle, WA 98109
(206) 373-9541 direct
(206) 890-9471 mobile
ialpert@onvia.com

MTC-00008148

From: Old3putter@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Only the public will be hurt by imposing harsh penalties on Microsoft. Microsoft has enabled users (individuals) to get the most out of their computers. The various states Attorney Generals are not thinking of computer users. Microsoft developed the software should not be penalized. It is a proprietary. Any other software manufacturer had this opportunity and, they still have the opportunities, to develop their own software. Hurting Microsoft will certainly not be in the best interests of the individual users.

MTC-00008149

From: raymondw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Department of Justice,

Please do all you can to settle the Microsoft settlement as quickly as possible. In these trouble times we need to do what we can to move forward, and not tie up our resources in court battles. For the records, I do own Microsoft stock, but I use an Apple computer. Thanks Raymond Wolf

MTC-00008150

From: Troceen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement, and support this action being completed expeditiously.

Dan Troceen

MTC-00008151

From: Augenstein, Rob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been following the anti-trust case against Microsoft for almost four years now and believe that Microsoft did nothing wrong. The bottom line is that consumers were not harmed. As a user of Microsoft products, and previously of Netscape Navigator, I actually benefited. When I was using Navigator, Netscape improved and expanded the product due to the competitive pressure from Microsoft. To make a switch in Internet browser compelling, Microsoft had to make their own improvements. Now that I've switched to Microsoft, I wouldn't go back to Netscape. What no one involved in this case seems to see is that people like me benefited because we had choices and the products available to us were improving at a rapid pace.

It is not necessarily a bad thing if a company has monopoly power and then tries to use it. It is most certainly a good thing in fact if a broad base of consumers will benefit. Unfortunately, Judge Jackson did not see that people like me benefited from Microsoft's

actions. In fact, I have actually been harmed since the ruling by Judge Jackson. With Microsoft on the defensive, the pace at which significant new products have come to market has been slow. I think the browser was the latest new product genre—and that was 5 years ago. So I haven't had as much new software to play with as I did before. More importantly, the ruling initiated a long slide in the stock market that still continues. Since my investments in the stock market have declined in value, I have not made further investments in things for my family like a new car, house or computer. And since I believe that I am not the only one who has had this happen, I attribute our country's economic slowdown to the ruling by Judge Jackson against Microsoft.

I am interested in seeing the economy get back off the ground and firmly believe that letting Microsoft pursue its free enterprise strategy of innovating with new products is in our country's economic interests, both domestically and internationally. I am hoping you will see things similarly and will move aggressively to stop the legal challenges aimed at Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Rob Augenstein, CPA
Lighthouse Group <http://www.lighthousegroup.com>
<<http://www.lighthousegroup.com/>>
800.385.2511
770.512.8990, extension 1015
770.512.8991 fax

MTC-00008152

From: Blake Buzzzini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express strong support for the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. The proposed settlement is reasonable and fair and addresses the issues found by the Court of Appeals. I also urge you to dismiss the vocal minority of Microsoft competitors who seek to hobble the company permanently.

MTC-00008153

From: James Buzzanco
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough! Microsoft is one of us. Bill Gates is not Osama Bin Laden! Microsoft is the philanthropic industrialist of our time. Our Country and world is better off because of it. Microsoft is the Einstein of our time. Enough already. Let's get on with life and progress in the United States as it should be. Don't stifle the progress of American Citizens. Microsoft is not just one of us, it is us. Enough!

Sincerely,
James P Buzzanco

MTC-00008154

From: Bill Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This country was built upon the ability to spend time and effort to invent and develop new products and ideas. If this is not the case, we would not have patents, copyrights, etc. I believe we have provided enough time,

effort and lawyers salaries, in developing the present settlement. This can drag out forever, as the breakup of Bell Telephone did in the last century. We do not need to duplicate that mistake in this century.

Bill Williams

MTC-00008155

From: LJ Sweet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft

Mircorsoft made the computer work for the common person at a price we could afford they should not be punished for this "Stop the political blackmail" LJSweet Taxpayer

MTC-00008156

From: LJSJD19012@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

Doesn't the govt. have enough to do to protect the air travelling public and its office workers from airplanes used as bombs than frustrate one of the most dynamic companies in the world?? It appears to be a question of mixed priorities. The politicians grandstand at the public expense to ensure their own continuity. All that posturing on C-span is ludicrous.

MTC-00008157

From: Ooott@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am in favor of the settlement agreement reached in the Microsoft lawsuit. Please allow free enterprise to continue. No further litigation should be pursued.

thank you.sharon doyle
las palmas way
sarasota, florida

MTC-00008158

From: nateandsandra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe that it is definitely in the best interest of the consumer for the case to be settled. We also feel that Microsoft has more than demonstrated a reasonable attitude and made every effort to settle this case, in the consumer's best interest. We are very tired of hearing all the complaints from Microsoft competitors and their special interest groups and in-turn the Attorney Generals from some states that seem to feel that it is their job to side with Microsoft competitors. We feel that the Microsoft competitors have the same opportunity in the USA as all businesses. They need to work a little harder, hire bright, and innovative employees and stop whining all the time.

Let's get on with getting the economy back on track. Stop punishing companies for hard work, brains, and innovation.

Thank you,
Nate and Sandra Ribelin

MTC-00008159

From: ALTRU1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:28pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

DEAR SIR,

CAN THE NATION AFFORD TO "FIDDLE WHILE ROME BURNS" IN THE MICROSOFT CASE? SURE, COMPETITORS SHOULD GET A SHOT AT THE BRASS RING, BUT SHOULD GOVERNMENT BE CHOOSING WINNERS AND LOSERS AS TELECOMMUNICATIONS EVOLVE?

THE RACE TO THE NEXT LEVEL WILL BE "TEMPORARILY" HELD BY THE COMPANY OR INDIVIDUAL WITH THE MOST AGGRESSIVE MARKETING METHODS AND THE MOST INNOVATIVE PRODUCT, AND THAT POSITION WILL BE HELD SECURELY ONLY AS LONG AS IT APPEALS TO CONSUMERS POCKET BOOKS AND COMMON SENSE.

MICROSOFT WENT ONE STEP FURTHER. THE FOUNDERS OF MICROSOFT IDENTIFIED THE ONE THING MISSING FROM EARLY PERSONAL COMPUTERS. A "STANDARD OPERATING SYSTEM" THAT COULD BE USED AS A PLATFORM FOR FUTURE GROWTH WAS A "MUST HAVE" ITEM. MICROSOFT EXPLOITED THE IDEA OF A STANDARD OPERATING SYSTEM. EVOLUTION AND ADDITIONS WOULD APPEAL TO CONSUMERS WHO WANTED A COMPUTER TO DO THINGS FOR THEM EASIER THAN THE WAY THEY DID THE TASK AT PRESENT. THUS, THE MASS APPEAL FOR THE PC WAS CREATED, ALONG WITH AN ENTIRE INDUSTRY TO SERVE THE DEMAND FOR MORE AND MORE FEATURES AND FASTER AND FASTER SPEEDS.

A WHOLE INDUSTRY DEPENDS ON THE STANDARDS. CONSUMERS SIGHED WITH RELIEF! AT LAST THE COMPUTER COULD BE UPGRADED EASILY. ACTUAL WORK COULD BE DONE. HOW MARVELOUS! MICROSOFT RESPONDED TO THE DEMAND BY LOOKING THE OTHER WAY WHEN BOOTLEG COPIES WERE ADDED TO OTHER MACHINES. CREATING A STANDARD WAS THE KEY TO FUTURE SUCCESS. LET THE BOOTLEGGING CONTINUE. ALONG THE WAY MORE FEATURES WERE ADDED AS PART OF THE PACKAGE (BUNDLING), AND CONSUMERS LOVED IT. WALMART DOES THE SAME THING AND CONSUMERS LOVE IT!

WHY DO THEY LOVE IT? SIMPLE, IT'S CHEAPER!! MARKETS WORK THAT WAY. SO WHY MUCK IT UP?

MTC-00008160

From: Sue Shannon-Biddiscombe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:29pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I want to see this case settled immediately and with as little disruption to Microsoft as possible. Microsoft has not taken advantage of consumers; on the contrary, Microsoft has always provided the best products and progressively lower prices. Frankly, if I turn on a computer and do not see the Microsoft logo, I will be very concerned about what I am getting myself into. It only makes sense to have a standard software so computers can communicate. The last thing this country (and World) needs is several different platforms. Deregulation is not working to consumer advantage in telecommunications or utilities. Sometimes it makes sense to have uniform service.

Sincerely,

MTC-00008161

From: jryan@nmsu.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

—I am a firm believer in free enterprise system. The government has a right to watch the adventures of large companies to insure our competitiveness. I do not want the government to take over the running of the system as a whole. We need companies that are adventures. The system of private entrepreneurship is the best for the United States. Ask any one in the government run venture.

Thank you

Jim Ryan.

James Ryan Email: jryan@nmsu.edu
New Mexico State Univ. Voice: 505-646-1641
Box 30001, MSC 3545 Fax: 505-646-1253
Las Cruces, NM 88003

MTC-00008162

From: Richard H. Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello: I am a Microsoft user of many products. Specifically, WindowsXP, WindowsME, OfficeXP. I have been a Microsoft software user since I started using a PC—back in 1991.

I feel that my use of a computer has been greatly enhanced by the Microsoft Operating Systems and other compatible software. I think that it is competitively priced and think that my computing experience would be greatly LESSENE if there was not a company such as Microsoft that offered excellent functionality and compatibility.

The number of software offerings that DO NOT talk to each other (compatibility) would have seriously damaged the business workplace and greatly increased costs.

Microsoft, for all of its faults, which are few in comparison to other large companies—provides Industry Standards so critical to anyone using a PC.

I would like to know what remedies AOL is under in not making their Email and Instant messaging software compatible with the majority of the industry? AOL clearly has the market share in the Online Subscriber area—Where are the “government encouragements” for AOL to join in an industry standard?

The tremendous cost of litigation for Microsoft, The Federal Government, The States should indicate that it is time to close this chapter soon. It is hard to see how the consumer has been harmed by the invention of integrated WORKING software that is very competently supported (technically).

Lets get on with productive endeavors—the introduction of new products and the encouragement of innovation and not hamper one of the most successful and profitable AMERICAN companies.

Thank you

MTC-00008163

From: Richard A. Arrett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:33pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a patent attorney and a Microsoft product user. I am glad that the Federal Government finally settled with Microsoft. I think that the settlement should go through and we should let Microsoft get back to improving their products and making the competition improve theirs.

Richard A. Arrett, Esq.
Vidas, Arrett & Steinkraus, P.A.
6109 Blue Circle Drive
Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343⁹¹⁸⁵ USA
Phone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563³⁰⁰¹ E-Mail:
rarratt@vaslaw.com

MTC-00008164

From: avenger999@earthlink.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:32pm
Subject: On Microsoft.

Attn: USDOJ

As a taxpaying citizen I would like to say I'm disappointed that all this effort is being placed to investigate an honest company such as Microsoft. It has broken no laws. Microsoft's competitors are only upset that they have been beaten in the business market. They can't compete against Microsoft so now they want the US to control Microsoft in order to level the playing field. The playing field was already fair, and they lost.

Please allow Microsoft to continue running the company as it has done, without violating any laws, which ultimately benefits the people.

Don't allow this to continue.

Thank You,
Sam Torres

MTC-00008165

From: Brett and Angela Wharton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ representative,

I would like to voice my opinion as an “average consumer” concerning the antitrust settlement with Microsoft. I work in the computer industry developing new servers and PCs for a major computer manufacturer, and I have been using computers for over 12 years (ever since the days of 9600 baud modems and BBS's). Obviously I have seen a lot of changes over the years in our industry.

Having said that I will make my observations concerning Microsoft and the antitrust case. Microsoft has put out some great software over the years, but it is painfully obvious that their focus has shifted from designing great software for the industry to designing software that garners more money, power, and influence over the industry. I remember the days when the software industry flourished with creativity and unique ideas from many different companies. I was always excited about the newest titles and ideas that were being put forth year to year. Microsoft was at their best in this environment, and it would be unfair to say that they did not contribute to the boom of the PC industry around the world.

Unfortunately Microsoft's business practices have also done a severe injustice to

both America and the computer industry at large: Their unchecked monopoly power has stifled the creativity and competitive environment that they thrived in. Their continued bundling of Microsoft only software is no longer helpful to the consumer, but in fact it serves to limit choice and crush competition before it even starts.

As an example, when CNET recently reviewed browsers on their website (www.cnet.com), they graded Opera, Netscape, and Internet Explorer on several fronts: ease of installation, feature set, usability, etc.. Internet Explorer won the comparison, but what is interesting is that CNET concluded that it was basically a tie except for 2 facets: Internet Explorer comes preloaded on PCs so the installation was therefore easiest and cleanest, and its integration with the OS made it much more stable. I say that is unfair. Microsoft's mantra is that “integration is innovation and is good for the consumer”. If that is the case, then why don't they integrate MS Office, since that is the most useful feature set for the user outside of the OS itself? I'll tell you why, because they would lose \$300 per license on the Office Suite.

So why is it ok to integrate Internet Explorer, Messenger, Passport, Media Player? Because they have direct competition in these areas (i.e. Netscape, AOL Messenger-ICQ-Yahoo Messenger, and Real Media Player to name the obvious ones). Microsoft must not be allowed to use their OS platform monopoly to undercut their competition like that!

It is my strong opinion that Microsoft neither regrets, nor intends to change, their business tactics or their corporate behavior. It is also my opinion that the proposed settlement plays right into Microsoft's hand—that they will be able to skate around the words and ambiguities in the agreement to maintain their status quo, and therefore their monopoly. I am sad to see that the possibility exists that they will get off “scott free”. For what its worth, I think they should be held to the carpet and made to see the error of their practices. I propose Microsoft be required to do the following:

1) Offer a stripped down version of Windows at a much cheaper price, and allow OEM computer makers to bundle whatever they want with the OS at the Factory Level.

2) Be required to share APIs and protocols that a competitor would need to know in order to develop a stable competitive product. Microsoft should also not be allowed to “tweak” their OS in such a way that it “accidentally” breaks competing software titles.

3) They need to be publicly convicted of their behavior! Examples are VERY necessary, and if we don't punish Microsoft's behavior then other industry players will follow their “example” of success.

Do we really want that?

In conclusion, I respectfully ask that we please uphold the law and punish them for the violations that they have committed. Only then will creativity flourish again in our industry.

Thank you for your time,
Brett Wharton.

MTC-00008166

From: Sean Flynn
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:33pm
 Subject: United States v. Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern regarding the matter of United States v. Microsoft Settlement,

In general I believe the terms of the agreement are fair and just. It should be noted that NO other company in this industry provides the levels of access to source code and APIs as defined in this agreement. This includes the Java platform which unfairly has been described as a "community" of vendors. The Java platform is a significant competitor to Microsoft and is a proprietary implementation that falls under the sole discretion of Sun Microsystems in how it is used and by whom it is disclosed to.

Two significant factors should be examined when considering the fairness of this agreement: the merits of the original case made to the courts and the current climate of competitiveness. On the first point the main case against Microsoft was concerning the anticompetitive actions against Netscape. Upon examining the history of Netscape one can easily see that it was purchased by a significant competitor of Microsoft, AOL, and then purposely dismantled the company to prevent it from effectively competing. It should be noted that Netscape, after the purchase by AOL, did not release a major version of their browser until just a few months ago after the Microsoft verdict was overturned on appeal. Obviously it was in AOL's best interest to show that Netscape was harmed by Microsoft so they purposely prevent the product from moving forward. On the second point the computer operating systems marketplace is extremely competitive. Depending on how you distort the figures you can make them say anything you want them to. The normal statistic quoted it that 95% of the operating systems run on Intel PC processors is Microsoft. If you broaden this to say what operating system do most end users interact with: IBM mainframe OS's. If you look at what operating system most transactions are processed on: IBM mainframe OS's. If you look at what most Internet sites and applications run on: UNIX. When you look at the whole computer field you can easily see that the it is a very competitive environment.

Thank you for considering my comments.
 Sincerely,
 Sean Flynn

MTC-00008167

From: Earl Helbig
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With all the important matters facing our nation, it is time we act on a Microsoft settlement that favors innovation and protects competition. Dragging out this settlement is not in the national interest. Let us have closure at once.

Sincerely,
 Earl G. and Ruth E. Helbig

MTC-00008168

From: PEDAMNER@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:35pm
 Subject: microsoft

the agreement between microsoft and the doj should let stand. the country is in a rfecession now and perhaps the agreed settlement could helOp to allow everybody to get back to work and the doj to tackle more meaningful cases. i knows a lot of people and all with computers and i have never heard,not one, complain that windows software was too high. i don't know where that came from.

yours very truly,
 philip damner.

MTC-00008169

From: Paul F. Poelker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The agreement reached between Microsoft, the nine states involved, and the Federal Government addressed in the Court of Appeals ruling should be ACCEPTED.

It is time to stop any further litigation in this case and finalize the above mentioned agreement.

Paul F. Poelker
 Dallas, TX

MTC-00008170

From: Linda Welshons
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:41pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this destructive and unjustified lawsuit now. Microsoft has done nothing to harm customers. They enjoy popularity because their products work and are inexpensive. Their competitors want to charge high prices and are fighting to protect them. This suit does not serve the American people. It is a waste of our tax dollars and it is destructive to the economy.

Linda Welshons

MTC-00008171

From: Valda Redfern
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sir,
 Microsoft has done nothing wrong. It has EARNED its "monopoly". Nobody has ever been forced to buy Microsoft products; every single one of Microsoft's millions of customers chose to buy them. You can get computers that don't come bundled with MS—I used to use them all the time in my work. If most people prefer computers that do come bundled with MS, that's because Microsoft offers them a value.

If the government of its own country, the freest in the world, continues to victimise it, what hope will Microsoft have in Europe?

Yours truly,
 Valda Redfern
 17 St Laurence Road
 Bradford on Avon UK BA15 1JQ

MTC-00008174

From: Espey, John
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not believe that ANY settlement against Microsoft is just. In fact, I believe if anything the US government owes reparations to Microsoft for the damage that was caused over the past year and a half. Bill Gates should be revered as our greatest man, not spit on and insulted at the behest of jealous and less wealthy billionaires (Larry Ellison, Steve Case, Scott McNealy, et al).

Thank you for your time and consideration
 John Espey

MTC-00008175

From: Matthew Ballin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:45pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please defend the free market by not persecuting Microsoft for being more successful than its competitors. America has risen to greatness by leaving the talented and productive alone to do what they do best; an attack against Microsoft is an attack against our founding principles.

Regards,
 Matthew Ballin

MTC-00008176

From: Norm Thomas
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I write in support of the current settlement agreement between the US DOJ and Microsoft. Please defend it assiduously against further corrosion by the judge(s) and/or the remaining states attorneys general.

MTC-00008177

From: Auren Hoffman (BridgePath)
 To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/3/02 1:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge,
 Though I am a huge believer in free markets, I do not believe the Proposed Final Judgment (PFJ) is a the best solution. Microsoft is a wonderful company staffed by wonderful people, but they are guilty of some very grave anti-competitive violations. Moreover, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for its remedies.

Best,
 Auren Hoffman CEO, BridgePath Corporation
 Auren Hoffman BridgePath
 <<http://www.bridgepath.com/>>
 463 Bryant Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94107
 dir: 415-946-6019

The BridgePath Exchange enables staffing firms to monetize unfilled job orders and unplaced candidates

CC:'microsoftcomments(a)doj.ca.gov'

MTC-00008178

From: John Arnold
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 1:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The attached article I wrote to illustrate my concern for the Microsoft suit. Please read it and include it in the record of the public comments.

Thanks

John E. Arnold

John E. Arnold

2521 SW Pepperwood Ct Topeka, KS

66614

Mr. Walter Mossberg WSJ via email: mossberg@wsj.com. Re: The Microsoft Case I read your column regularly and usually enjoy what you offer. I wrote this piece a bit ago on the Microsoft Case as my perspective. I'm moved to send it to you after your piece today on Microsoft costing consumers. I don't think so.

The U.S. Justice Department in its zeal to protect the anti-trust laws has destroyed about two trillion dollars worth of the nation's economy. It has done more damage than Castro, Saddam Hussein, global warming, and the last five hurricanes. Defenders of the Justice Department will say, "Yeah, right. Those stocks were over priced." Those need to recall that the Great Depression was caused, historians and economists uniquely agree, by the actions of the U.S. regulators misjudging their actions' impacts. The Justice Department is wrong and wrong-headed on the issue. Microsoft has, arguably more than any other firm, made the so-called New Economy, and brought unparalleled economic health to the country. Moreover it has made the use of the computer seamless.

Contrast Microsoft with the AT&T breakup. I had the joy of starting a new agency in 1986, just after the breakup of AT&T and the creation of all the entities necessary to get phone service. Where before that you called "the phone company" and ordered "phones and phone service and maintenance," afterwards you called the phone company and could get only local service. When you asked for long distance, they said you have to call someone else. Surprised, you asked who to call, who was out there? You were told, "I can't tell you that." When you asked about phones, you were told you had to go somewhere else. But again, they couldn't tell you where. Maintenance of the lines? Somewhere else.

So while before we had a seamless, wonderfully efficient phone system, all bundled together, afterwards we had to become knowledgeable about phones, knowledgeable about long distance, knowledgeable about maintenance of lines, knowledgeable about all the disparate pieces. It no longer was easy and quick. It will be worse with an unbundled Microsoft.

Think of the complexity if Microsoft had not bundled operating system with software with Internet connections. I had an early microcomputer. Not all the software was compatible with it. I had to become knowledgeable of arcane details I wasn't interested in learning, and this was a simple machine. I wanted to spend my time using the machine, as a productivity tool. As the PC has progressed and the seamlessness has progress—largely through Microsoft's efforts—I am more and more able to use my time the way I want—in applications. I don't want to have to go to one store for my computer, another for my operating system, another for my software—which may not work with other software—and another for the Internet connection.

That's a wrong-headed approach, a step backward from productivity. In fact, I think no judge, attorney, or justice working on the case should be allowed to do so unless they are the systems operator of the computer of their family or office, and routinely add software, software upgrades, and computer enhancements. No one who doesn't know firsthand the complexity of determining which component of the mix of hardware, middleware, and software is the incompatible one can say that forced unbundling is a good idea.

Incredibly, I heard Judge Jackson interviewed on NPR and he said he didn't know what kind of operating system his computer at home had. He said it wasn't a Mac. The interviewer was incredulous and so was I that the man we allowed to make the most critical judgment on the integrated operating system and the industry had so little knowledge.

In fact, most attorneys in my experience do not even do their own keyboarding. They rely on dictation or hand written legal pads. None who do business that way are sufficiently grounded in the technology to be involved in the case.

Many have written articles offering evidence that the Justice Department is on the wrong track. The evidence of pricing: a monopoly would have raised the prices, and the evidence is clear the prices of software and of operating systems and of computers have declined. That early computer I bought cost me \$2,000. It had less power than today's Hewlett Packard calculator. Today we can buy a personal computer with power of a 1975 Cray machine (which the U.S. government prohibited from being sold to a foreign nation as an issue of national security) for less than \$1,000, some less than \$500. That's not the workings of a monopoly and the Justice Department and the Judge must not be seeing clearly as these impacts are relevant.

Byte editor Jerry Pournelle recounted the competitive wars and the bad business decisions made by the competitors of Microsoft, when they were strong and Microsoft was weak, allowing the Microsoft innovations to make inroads into markets others had sewn up, the better product beating out the inferior. That's what innovation and creativity in an atmosphere of freedom is supposed to do. Microsoft was inconsequential to IBM and to Apple and they didn't surpass either by monopoly tactics but by building products that served consumers. Pournelle pointed out several products that commanded the market and failed to take advantage of it, while Microsoft built a better one. VisiCalc was the spreadsheet lead (it was on the first computer I bought), then Lotus 1-2-3 had the lead and let it slip, and now Excel is dominant, as is Word, having innovated beyond Word Pro, WordStar, Wordperfect and others.

Attacking Microsoft for its successes as excesses of power is just plain factually wrong. And it's wrong-headed. I hope you find that of some use.

Sincerely,

John Arnold

MTC-00008179

From: OKUBOHB@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:49pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

It is about time that the federal government reached an agreement with Microsoft. American economy need to move forward, continued lawsuit against Microsoft is counterproductive to the economy.

Sincerely,

Hikaru Okubo, PE

MTC-00008180

From: HeleneTr@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:50pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's roll. Settle the Microsoft Court litigation. I agree with the law as stated in the Tunney Act.

Barbara Reinoehl

MTC-00008181

From: Beverlylsky@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:48pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft Alone! Lets put our energies into creating not destroying. Lets get to work on helping everyone in the world get connected. There are universes of technology waiting to be discovered.

Beverly Sky

<http://www.beverlylsky.com>

MTC-00008182

From: Mildred Weiner

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:51pm

Subject: Netscape Litigation

Good Luck!

VTY MMW

MTC-00008183

From: John Ritchie

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:52pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

Microsoft got its start in inovation and is contionous in these veins to build a strong company. Why must costly and unnessary leagal actions persist, even after bush administration and federal government has endorsed the completion of this juducial wrangling. Please for the world, nation, states, company, and mostly for the high cost that consumers will pay stop this wastful investigation! This matter will only give money to a handful of lawyers and hope to further the careers of some prosicutors who hope to use this as a platform from which to aide their political ambitions. It has grown time to resolve and rebuild not wound and drive at the very heart of U.S. economic strienght, where market influence can and will over time reduce this to a non-issue. Please urge all states to have a hands off approach to this matter. In hopes that these comments can help you decide.

John B. Ritchie

Carlisle, MA. 01741

MTC-00008184

From: Jeff Hatfield

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 1:52pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings,

I wish to express my view that the Microsoft Corporation is right and the U.S. government is wrong in its Antitrust case.

It is my opinion that the U.S. government should stop wasting my tax dollars to persecute Microsoft's alleged "Antitrust" violation. Antitrust is just a means for envious politicians to cut down successful businesses that supply the public with goods that are in popular demand. Antitrust is a throwback to a fabian socialistic era that sacrificed the demands of the consumers to the demands of the politicians. Any settlement terms are a compromise of the right to the wrong. That is if you believe that a free market is right... If I were Bill Gates, I would "settle" this case by offering to close down Microsoft, instead of prostrating myself to the incompetent.

Sincerely,
Jeff Hatfield
P.O. Box 2151
Windermere, Florida 34786

MTC-00008185

From: Quinn Woodworth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:56pm
Subject: Micosoft Settlement

The anti-trust assault on Microsoft is immoral and anti-American. The government is attempting to punish Microsoft for the same moral values that have helped make America the beacon of the world: hard work, creativity, achievement. Unlike kings of the past and governments of the present, Microsoft has acquired its wealth—not by confiscation—but by production, by creating products that people want to buy. Politicians have been bought by Microsoft's competitions to bring suit against Microsoft. Since they are unable to compete fairly then they resort to gaining political pull. Then government pawns can cripple their opponent for them. That's what this anti-trust suit against Microsoft is all about. It has nothing to do with serving the public. If the government truly was interested in the public good, it would leave Microsoft alone and the government would stop interfering by "regulating" business. All the government does is cripple some business so their competitors can take over.

The anti-trust suit should be abolished. Microsoft should be left alone.
Quinn Woodworth

MTC-00008186

From: FitzS1801@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are sick and tired of Senator Hatch and his Utah competitors of Microsoft make Microsoft and the government spend so much time on this issue. After all microsoft has done all the work to bring this computer business to so many millions of people around the world that to let these politicians keep this issue alive is a travesty. Only the nasty lawyers get anything out of it. And our government looks stupid!

Very truly yours,
Mr. Richard FitzSimmons

MTC-00008187

From: vince duschean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:52pm
Subject: micrsoft settlement

To whom it may concern at the justice department. Please settle the suit you have with microsoft as you have outlined. The only advantage continuing this or other suits against Microsoft goes to other non-performers in the software business like SUN-Micro systems and Oracle who have not delivered and continue to blame others for their failures.

MTC-00008188

From: Munari@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:52pm
Subject: Settlement

I firmly believe that this whole Microsoft thing has gone on too long. Since the government and nine states have come to a settlement, I see no reason to drag this whole thing on.

Our country has bigger problems that trying to crucify one corporation. Let the government's decision stand and put this matter to rest.

Jo Ann Feikes
Las Vegas, NV

MTC-00008189

From: Dick Jensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 12:13pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am in agreement with the microsoft settlement. Let's not waste any more government money on this matter.

R.F.Jensen

MTC-00008190

From: Ricky Morris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Speaking as a private citizen on the proposed Microsoft Settlement, I strongly support the DOJ's proposed settlement and urge all concerned to accept it as the final arbitration of the dispute in question.

Ricky Morris, MCSE Microsoft Small Business Server Support,
Las Colinas, TX
* 469-775-7290 (Direct Line)
Email: rickym@microsoft.com

MTC-00008191

From: Bruce Rogovin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sir,

I am writing regarding the proposed settlement between Microsoft and The US Dept. Of Justice.

I find it totally unacceptable to not put Microsoft in a position where it is unable to pursue the immoral and unethical business practices that it has shown itself prone to. I read the findings of fact that were released by the judge months ago, and was dumbfounded that any company could get away with the actions that Microsoft took. Anyone involved with the case should re-

read these statements of fact that show Microsoft as a monopolistic predator with almost unlimited power. A viewing of the video taped depositions of Bill Gates would convince anyone of the 100% sleaze of Gates and Microsoft. They will do anything to increase their power if left unchecked.

Please take the appropriate measures to remedy the situation. Microsoft should be broken into smaller companies that do not have a death grip on the tech market. If this is too drastic, at least do something that makes a difference and restores competition.

Sincerely,
brogovin@fuse.net
Dr. Bruce Rogovin
8686 Winton Rd.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

MTC-00008192

From: PROWLON99@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:58pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, BILL GATES WAS ABLE TO PROVIDE A VERY USEFUL COMMUNICATIONS TOOL TO VERY LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE WORLD WIDE. THE SAYING IS SOMEONE ELSE WOULD HAVE DONE IT, BUT WE HAVEN'T SEEN THAT HAPPEN IN PAST YEARS.

I'M VERY THANKFUL TO BILL. I'M NOT AN EXPERT ON THE COMPUTER BUT MANAGE TO GET AROUND WITH THE BASICS. THE COMPUTER HAS PROVIDED ME MANY HOURS OF USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS A TOUGH TIME MANAGING ITS SELF, SO IT SHOULDN'T TAKE ON OTHER COMPANIES. ENOUGH TAXPAYERS' MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT ON THIS CASE MAKING ATTORNEYS SUPER RICH. HOW ABOUT WE FEED AND CLOTH THE POOR?

THANK YOU,
DRUE

MTC-00008193

From: Otto Dieffenbach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 1:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Seems about right. Now lets get on with the economy!

MTC-00008194

From: Melinda York
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:00pm

Settlement is good do it now. Enough time and money has been wasted on all this needless litigation. Imagine in the one country in the world where creativity and imagination can lead the way to tremendous development of new technology and creation of jobs for people, where the government is going after and murdering and stifling one of the largest and most successful companies of its kind. Leave Microsoft alone so it can continue to create jobs and new technology in the world and especially in the US where we need it now. Get off their back and let us recover this weak and sad economy. YOU the government are using my money for the wrong things.

Thank you.

MTC-00008196

From: David Berry
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

As a concerned citizen, I wish to use the public comment period regarding the Microsoft Settlement to comment as follows.

1/Discharge AOL Complaints: With reference to the 1995 case of AOL vs Microsoft regarding bundling of the MSN on-line service with Windows 95, AOL claimed that this bundling would make it difficult for AOL to succeed in the on-line market, and so it was anti-competitive. The case was overturned. Since 1995, AOL has achieved approximately 80% market share, and built profits that enabled them to acquire Netscape and Time-Warner (one of the largest mergers of all time). Therefore, it's clear that bundling MSN with Windows 95 was not anti-competitive.

AOL's role as an injured party in the current Microsoft case is disingenuous. In fact, history shows that after MSN was bundled with Windows 95, on-line services became more pervasive, companies like AOL boomed, and consumers obtained services more easily because connectivity infrastructure was included with Windows. The pervasive nature of this infrastructure in Windows made it possible for a generation to participate in the "internet revolution", which yielded significantly greater consumer benefits than the closed nature of (for example) AOL, MSN, and CompuServe, as these existed in 1995.

2/Discharge Netscape Complaints: I understand that the current case against Microsoft is based on a complaint that Netscape's browser market was damaged by the bundling of Internet Explorer with Windows, and that this was not in the public interest.

In fact, Netscape's browser (Navigator) was free (like Internet Explorer), so the business that may have been damaged was non-existent. If Netscape chose to base their market on a zero-price commodity, that's bad management on their part, not Microsoft's fault. AOL now bundles Netscape Navigator as part of their service, which is clearly in consumers' interests, just as the bundling of IE with Windows.

If such bundling had not taken place, it's believable that the "internet revolution" may have been delayed, as people would have been required to purchase separate pieces of software, and figure out significant technical complexities in order to go on line. Not having a browser in the internet age is like having a car without an engine - the Internet would be useless. Therefore, it's unthinkable that a software company with vision and leadership would NOT bundle a browser as a fundamental base technology. Obviously Microsoft's actions benefited consumers, and did not damage any then-existing revenue stream for other companies. On the contrary, Microsoft made a contribution to the entire US economy by helping to drive connectivity and Internet browsing as base functionality available to all consumers.

3/Discharge "Monopolistic behavior" complaints: In 1991 I worked for Chevron (oil

company) and attended a forum for the top customers of the Lotus Corporation (spreadsheet software vendor). At the time, Microsoft Excel and Word had negligible share in a market dominated by Lotus 123 and WordPerfect, and Microsoft was trying to encourage all software vendors to produce applications with a graphical user interface (GUI), to make it easier for consumers to use their software.

At this 1991 forum, Mr Manzi, then Lotus CEO, gave a keynote speech in which he spent 45 minutes explaining why users did not need a GUI, and why Lotus would not have a Windows version of their spreadsheet. He was followed by Mr Peterson, then CEO of WordPerfect Corporation, who presented almost the same speech about why WordPerfect users did not need a GUI.

Obviously, both these companies were wrong about what their consumers required. The fact that Microsoft Excel and Word have replaced Lotus and WordPerfect as market leaders is a result of bad business management, and wrong strategic decisions by Microsoft's competitors. It is not due to monopolistic behavior, as Microsoft did not have a monopoly in spreadsheets or wordprocessors. The success of Excel and Word is because these are superior products, not because of behavior that makes Microsoft a threat to the public interest.

Conclusion: While it's true that Microsoft is an aggressive company, I cannot understand why their vision, commitment, and resulting success should be held against them. Windows has approximately 80% of the operating system market. Logically, this means that Windows should get credit for 80% of the success in making computers pervasive, and the resulting benefits to consumers and the US economy. The only entities that could benefit if the Microsoft Settlement is overturned are a small number of companies that compete with Microsoft. I am convinced that these companies have their own management to blame for any perceived lack of success, and in many cases (like AOL/Netscape), they are actually more successful as a result of Microsoft's market position.

Please resist the self interests of the companies that complain against Microsoft, and consider the enormous progress that has been made in consumer-oriented computing in the past few years while Microsoft has been providing vision, leadership, and superior software.

Dave Berry

MTC-00008197

From: Lynne Garvie
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I would like the Microsoft case to be settled and have no further litigation.

Thank you,
 Lynne Garvie

MTC-00008198

From: Albert Howard
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madam/Sir:

I cannot accept without writing the settlement agreed to by the Department of Justice.

The usual expectation is that when a property crime is committed, the perpetrator is required to restore the ill-gotten gain. And, after that, the perpetrator is punished.

The proposed settlement does not begin to approach restoration of a competitive environment for computer operating systems. Nor for computer applications. The breakup of Microsoft looked like a reasonable start to me. While hardly the total punishment deserved, it certainly was the proper starting point.

I hope you will refuse to accept the DOJ agreement with Microsoft. We deserve better service from our system of justice.

Yours truly,
 Albert O. Howard

MTC-00008199

From: Mike Zyskowski
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:05pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement proposed by Microsoft should be agreed to and accepted by the Federal Government.

Michael K. Zyskowski

MTC-00008200

From: Ron and Lucy Flenner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are sending you this e-mail to ask that the Justice Dept accept and approve of the settlement that has been made with Microsoft recently. We believe that the settlement is kinda tough, but fair and reasonable to all sides. To delay the instrumentation of this settlement would only serve to delay final justice.

Sincerley,
 Ron and Lucy Flenner
 Louisville, IL 62858

MTC-00008201

From: Jearl R. Waddell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft

Please insure that the Microsoft settlement is carried out and not derailed. The settlement is good for the consumer and the country.

Thank You,
 Jearl R. Waddell
 115 Lauderdale Road
 Woodbury, NJ 08096

MTC-00008202

From: Sparky Sanford
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:03pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After observing this case for four year, it's time to settle, and let America and Microsoft return to work. This case has gone on long enough. The proposed settlement properly restricts Microsoft's business practices without the extreme penalties being asked for by some.

Byrne Sanford
 Sammamish, Washington
 Sparky Sanford

PI
425 889-1615

MTC-00008203

From: Tempel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,
Please accept the Microsoft settlement as is. My family believes that this is a tough but fair settlement. And any more delays to getting this behind us is going to be bad for our economy and bad for our belief in the fairness of our justice system!

Bob Tempel
Sherman, IL

MTC-00008204

From: web blank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

"((hey associate top boxes))" "9job code; NO5rc-en)" "99hey pay per view channels cable net microsoft at&t time warner comcast puget sound technology microsoft what is the innovation I.D. code dismissed or ignored or brushed off it is mine govt)"
(((signed, RICHARD JOHN FRANK 1-4-2002)))

MTC-00008205

From: Lou F
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I feel that Microsoft has done everything right, he has worked on this project form many, many years, There should not have been any settlement on this company at all. As for how much, 1.00 US dollar should be more then enough. Leave this man alone, and let him bring us into the furture. That is all I have to say.

MTC-00008206

From: Jean Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:14pm
Subject: Litigation, submitted 1-3-2002
To Whom It May Concern:

It is my belief from the information I have read That this has been going on too long. The freedom of progress has been slowed, and the publicity has been mostly adverse. It is time to close this matter and get on with regular daily business for the sake of promoting our economy. Microsoft is one of the most generous business firms in the world, and should be a promotion business to follow.

Sincerely submitted,
M. Jean Thompson,
2034 E. No Crescent,
Spokane, Wa 99207
The greatest of these is LOVE!

MTC-00008207

From: Susan Barba
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:14pm
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 Elizabeth Barba

MTC-00008208

From: David Eckman
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/3/02 2:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please submit the following comments to the Judge hearing this matter: I urge you NOT to approve the settlement terms with Microsoft that the federal government has negotiated. Following are several reasons and suggested order terms, based on my extensive use of personal computers in my law practice since 1983-84 and my knowledge of and experience with many operating systems and a wide variety of computer software, as well as in developing software:

I and millions of other OS/2 users have been damaged by Microsoft's illegal use of tying agreements and other illegal conduct to gain a monopoly and its retaliatory and predatory use of its monopoly power against OS/2 (and other operating systems). Based on my experience and knowledge of the industry, what I believe will punish Microsoft most effectively while also stimulating competition would be an order directing Microsoft as follows for at least 20 years:

(1) Require Microsoft to LICENSE AT NO COST to the licensee ALL CODE necessary (a) to allow all other operating systems to run 32-bit (and eventually higher level) programs written for Windows and every other operating system developed by Microsoft, and (b) to allow other developers' software to run as effectively under Windows and such other operating systems as Microsoft's own programs. That code should be made available to developers of operating system enhancements and plugins as well as the operating system developers themselves and should be made available as soon as it is being incorporated into any Microsoft product. The only limitation on such a requirement should be that the licensee be a U.S. citizen or company.

(2) Prohibit Microsoft from any arrangement by which its software would be included in new computers. Microsoft's past use of its monopoly power and its use of tying agreements and other illegal arrangements to discourage computer manufacturers from offering non-Microsoft operating systems and other software on their computers has seriously harmed competition, and those still willing to compete need many years without Microsoft's predatory conduct to catch up.

(3) Prohibit Microsoft from any alterations, modifications or additions to Java and other other open software except those approved and adopted by the consortiums developing the open software for everyone's use. Microsoft has used its monopoly power to write its own version of Java, which was offered by Sun as open software. There are presently sites that my version of Netscape cannot access because they use a Microsoft version of Java. Java developers have felt the stinging impact of Microsoft's illegal behavior. Its consequences in the future may

be even more severe if the federal government's weak legal precedent is established.

With the order components set forth above, what Microsoft does with Explorer would be irrelevant since other operating systems could include other web browsers, yet all operating systems could run Windows (and other Microsoft operating system) programs, which has become the standard for most software being developed today because of Microsoft's past illegal conduct. Imposing the restrictions for a minimum of 20 years would allow other operating systems to strengthen and grow in usage to the point where software program developers would find it profitable to produce native versions of their software for such systems. The history of OS/2 shows that this would work:

While Windows was a 16-bit system and its 16-bit code was included in OS/2, sales and use of OS/2 grew, and native applications were being developed. But when Windows became a 32-bit program and Microsoft's 32-bit Windows code was not included in OS/2, OS/2's market position and its growing acceptance were seriously hurt. That was exacerbated by Microsoft's illegal tying and other agreements that kept manufacturers from including OS/2 on their new computers. While OS/2 has remained alive despite Microsoft's illegal conduct (because of OS/2's superiority as an operating system over everything Microsoft has produced thus far) it cannot return to marketing success without the ability to run applications that most users want. In fact, IBM has been forced to scale back further work on OS/2, and it has almost given up on it because of Microsoft's pressure on it and the difficulty of dealing with Microsoft's illegal use of its monopoly power. OS/2 could return to effective competition with licenses of Microsoft's operating system code, at no cost to IBM and/or those who might want to enhance the system if IBM chooses not to do it. Finally, I understand that Microsoft has violated with impunity consent decrees of the past. It should be ordered to pay a substantial fine. It should also be ordered to pay all costs of monitoring its compliance in the future. This should continue for at least 20 years.

IBM was severely punished over 20 years ago for its antitrust behavior. It then managed to behave in a responsible manner and has continued to do so. There is no reason why Microsoft should not be similarly punished now, so that it and Bill Gates can learn to behave as responsible corporate citizens. The economic consequences to Microsoft, however severe, would be entirely appropriate to its outrageous and illegal conduct. And I have no doubt that it could survive as a healthy company.

[J:] David Eckman
Law Offices of David W. Eckman
daveide@eckman-law.com
http://www.eckman-law.com
3730 Kirby Dr., Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77098-3927
713-661-2065

MTC-00008209

From: Frank Angrisano
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 2:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

As a Microsoft product user I want the Justice Department to accept the agreement that has been mutually agreed upon. The hold out states should be ignored, as they seem to have an ulterior motive for not agreeing with the present settlement. As a product user I have never felt that Microsoft has taken advantage of me or that I have paid an excessive price for any of their products.

Sincerely,
Frank Angrisano
78 Rancho Del Sol
Camino, CA. 95709
e-mail: franking@cwnet.com

MTC-00008210

From: H.Barr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

I feel that the settlement process should go forward with haste. The public and Microsoft have paid a huge price to get to this point and to continue to waste taxpayer dollars is wrong. Microsoft has been an innovator in the tech industry for a long time and they should have the opportunity to continue to do so for the good of the country and its consumers. Please see that this reaches a conclusion soon

Sincerely,
Herbert A Barr
309 Willow Drive
Enterprise, Alabama 36330

MTC-00008211

From: IVLABONNE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this matter. We do not need any more litigation. This does NOT serve the public purpose of the anti-trust act.

Microsoft has been punished enough.....probably more than it should.
Irene M. LaBonne

MTC-00008212

From: Narendra Parekh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am IN FAVOR of the settlement that DOJ and states have reached on Microsoft issue.

Thanks!
- Narendra Parekh
- Amishi Parekh
- Saheli Parekh

Address: 5341 FORTE LANE, CONCORD, CA 94521

MTC-00008213

From: ford658
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justices,
Is Microsoft a "monopoly"? Not in the proper, derogatory, traditional sense of the term. Unlike the old AT&T Bell monopoly, or today's U.S Post Office monopoly, Microsoft did not gain its market share by having the government outlaw its competitors: Microsoft earned its position in the free-market. I like

all consumers vote with my pocketbook. Since Microsoft is the champion in innovation, products, and business acumen, I buy their products. I also avoid the products of those who seek the power of the government to compete.

The problem is not with Microsoft, it is with the anti-trust law—it should be rescinded.

Frederick Ford

MTC-00008214

From: avawter1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Public Comment Attorneys
Department of Justice

As a member of the public using products in the field covered by the recent & lengthy litigation of this case, I urge you to finalize the settlement reached last year. It was evident that much hard work and "give" took place on both sides of the dispute and this is appreciated. It was also evident that this anti-trust case had a severe impact on the technological economy and on product innovation that affects consumers. Please, let's lift this burden with a swift conclusion to the matter in accord with the terms of the settlement.

Antoinette W. Vawter
Pismo Beach, CA

MTC-00008215

From: tom dobbin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs;

I would like to take this opportunity to encourage you to accept the settlement that is now before the courts. It seems to me that we as taxpayers and shareholders have suffered enough at the hands of those who want to return to the protection of the "buggy whip" industry. The antagonists in the Microsoft case are woefully out of touch with reality. In this age of technological advances which look more like a tidal wave, anyone who tries to hold to the status quo of yesteryear is dreaming. For the benefit of us all, let the proposed settlement go forward as written.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Thomas D. Dobbin
422 Island View So.
Mattawa, WA 99349

MTC-00008216

From: Debbie Purdie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is high time the government (Feds and State) and Microsoft put an end to this case. We have learned over the years that when both sides are not happy with it, then it is probably as good a deal as one could ask for. We hear the complaints from both sides which tells us it really is time to put this thing to bed. We strongly urge the Justice Department to accept the settlement!!!!!!

I have informed my Senator that I am not in favor of anymore political posturing via hearings, and that the dissenting states

Attorney's General should stop the political barking (which is just to appease the big software and Internet companies that want to destroy their competitors). Competition is good for the computer industry and this settlement seems to assure fair and honest competition will take place.

Respectfully,
Scott and Debbie Purdie

PS We are stockholders of BOTH AOL and Microsoft and actually have a greater stake in AOL than Microsoft. We think AOL's lobbying against this settlement is little more than sour grapes (and we have communicated with them our feelings as expressed above).

— Debbie Purdie
— purdies@earthlink.net

MTC-00008217

From: Kurt Wiseman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that settlement in the DOJ case against Microsoft is in the best interest of the U.S. and the American people.

Sincerely,
Kurt Wiseman

MTC-00008218

From: jhministry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the dept of Justice has done enough to Microsoft. It has made its case and levied its verdict.

It is time to move on. And allowing the other companies to continue to drag Microsoft down after your verdict has been given is a shame. Every business would love the opportunity to squash its competition to fill its own pocket and that is what you are allowing the other 9 states to do lead by the Microsoft competitors. When will it stop????????????????

Rev Johnie Hinson
109 Flinton Dr
Hampton, VA 23666

MTC-00008219

From: Jack (038) Dot O'Hara
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Our Comment on the subject ,as provided by the Tunney Act, is that the settlement is the best available result in a case that should never have been prosecuted by the U. S. DoJ or the Attorney Generals of the States involved, because there has been no damage to the purchasers or to the users of computers that were sold with Microsoft software installed. On the contrary, the public, the computer manufacturers and the economy of the nation were, and continue to be, greatly benefited by Microsoft products and marketing practices.

We have studied the bases advanced by the USDoJ and the States as justification for their prosecution and have found them to be wholly without merit. On the contrary, our study has convinced us that the prosecution was politically motivated and has resulted in a gross injustice to Microsoft and has done irreparable damage to the credibility and the

reputation for trustworthiness of the Attorney Generals of the US and of the States concerned and of the Federal Judiciary.

Respectfully submitted

John A. O'Hara, Jr. and Dorothy M. O'Hara
81 Highpoint Lane
Chelan WA 98816

MTC-00008220

From: Jim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I respectfully submit these comments and observations. I am a technologist who has been in this industry since 1985. I currently work for a brand building corporation that uses both Windows and Macintosh systems. In a prior career I worked for Ameritech (now SBC) for 30 years, five of which were in the IT organization.

I am writing this letter because I strongly believe the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting the illegal conduct, promoting competition in this industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains. It appears that Microsoft has again accomplished its objectives and will continue now on its campaign of total dominance of anything it chooses. I fail to understand why our US Justice representatives, would once again offer a simple slap on the wrist to a company that has ignored a similar punishment in the past. Clearly, this approach has not and will not work. Microsoft has so many ways to interpret this proposed agreement that it is a total waste of paper. Were they not convicted of being an illegal monopoly? Did they not destroy competition in as many ruthless and illegal ways as they desired? Will this agreement, increase competition? Is this agreement good for our future? I believe, along with many others, that the answer to all these questions is a resounding NO.

I strongly encourage you to persist in your efforts to vigorously bring this case to justice. A justice that will encourage competition and send a clear message to Microsoft and any others who operate outside the law. Microsoft's aggressive and illegal behavior should be curbed once and for all. I believe it is harmful to our future IT economy to allow this evil doer to continue in its illegal pursuits.

Respectfully submitted,
James R. Felbab
Technologist,
Hanson, Dodge Design
jfelbab@hanson-dodge.com

MTC-00008221

From: Catherine
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think it is high time this come to an end. Dragging this (ridiculous) lawsuit on any further is helping no one. I wish I were more eloquent— but I just want to be heard that some of us are sick and tired of this and ready for it to come to an end. Personally, I think it should never have happened in the first place.

Catherine North
Federal Way, WA

MTC-00008222

From: SandybyC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer of Microsoft products, and one who was supposed to have been "damaged" by the business practices of Microsoft, alleged by their competitors, I must tell you that this action has dragged on for much too long. It seems to me that the Settlement reached and agreed to by all parties should be the end of it. The economy cannot stand any more of the never-ending litigation which has been the real cause of damage to me as a consumer and stockholder of Microsoft.

Sandra L. Pratt
Carmel, CA

MTC-00008223

From: mark@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR, Michael.McLagan@Linux.Org@inetgw, joh...
Date: 1/3/02 2:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Government Anti Trust litigation has achieved 2 things to date.

1) Bringing the Linux and Open Source communities (as the only credible competition that Microsoft faces) to the attention of Venture capitalists, the stock market, etc too soon, resulting in the destruction of many good companies who were not ready for the ruinous competition from the rise of companies that had no business being in business... the ones that survived will be stronger, and new ones will spring up.. but that does not set aside that fact that this entire industry was set back a several years by capitalist greed out of control. From the very beginning I'd prefer that this case against Microsoft had never happened.... eventually the bully gets turned on by everyone else. The effectiveness and Return on Investment of Open Source technologies are so stunning that Microsoft has been looking for an effective way to battle it, discredit it, whatever works and this brings about the second point

2) Assuring Microsoft that they can beat anyone, and don't need to fear even the government, so now they are free to continue as they always have, with impunity. The many blatant lies they told in court make this clear. Why isn't this a good thing? Because it deprives real innovators of the fruits of their innovations, and as a result removes the incentive to people to keep our nation in the lead technologically. It also reinforces many people's worship of the ends despite the means being inappropriate, and this undercuts our entire society. Winning is not everything, it is just part of life. But isn't Microsoft an innovator? A marketing truism is that if you say something often enough and loud enough people will believe it. And people don't care enough to find the truth. For any innovation that Microsoft has made, it can also be shown who they busted in the chops to take it away from them, generally with strong arm tactics, and no thought of ethics. This goes all the way back to their

original product, Microsoft Basic. They've left many a good company and organization shattered in their destructive wake. People break laws, not companies... and I think they should face penalties appropriate to their situations. That certainly has not happened in this case. The public interest is not served by encouraging mafia like tactics in the name of economic recovery, the very greed and business tactics that lead to the recession in the first place.

The next Einstein will probably be a kid from a third world country that had access to a cheap castoff PC, the source code for Linux, and the internet. With clubs formed by these kids, that country, and other countries that actually allow and encourage continued innovation, will then have a new technological revolution. It can only happen outside the sphere of Microsoft's control. Linux is only the beginning.. and companies that spring up around new technologies need the opportunity to succeed.

Microsoft has 2 strengths, and they have been there from the beginning. 1) Convincing sales, marketing & PR, and 2) a willingness to be totally ruthless and as unethical as they have to be to get what they want the way they want it. And then claim credit for it.

When have you seen someone who fights clean in the schoolyard beaten a dirty fighter? Only if they are much, much better trained, especially if smaller. Aren't trust, ethics and morals the fabric of our society, especially assumptions behind our legal system? So wouldn't the biggest winners be those actually able to get around the rules, above the law so to speak?

If ethics don't stand then our society falls into anarchy. How often have you heard "It's not personal, It's business" used as a justification? But don't people who act this way deprive themselves and their organizations of future benefits that might be gained from those whom they are cheating? Isn't this counter productive?

Most people won't believe this, but Microsoft not only has NOT invented the computer industry and the internet, but rather they hijacked it, and in the process actually slowed it down... and the slowdown continues. Now we are paying the price of what they have sown. As The founders of our great country knew, freedom requires responsibility, and when we abdicate responsibility in great enough numbers, we will also lose our freedom in time.

Microsoft is about making money, selling whatever they can push, always creating a new need, a new desire... remind you of anything? How about the drug pusher at the schoolyard? Ever wonder why computer people are called "users"? Think of it, an entire economy held hostage by one company and what Microsoft chooses to do or not do. Thinking that daily or hourly reboots are the way computers "are", and putting up with the unnecessary loss of productivity, the continual and often unneeded upgrades. Microsoft is not concerned beyond getting your money, and what they sell you being just "good enough" that they get to keep it that money. What is more, as Microsoft slowly takes over the internet, and everyone's computers, as they get everyone's data on their servers at MSN, or have access to it

through hidden back doors concealed in proprietary source code on your system. These hidden doors could only be found by legions of programmers looking at the source. What do you mean that Microsoft wouldn't do this? Check your history, they have already been caught doing exactly this at least twice. What is next for this organization? Where will they stop? When will it get to the point that even the US government will not be able to face down this entity already capable of buying Nukes should they choose to do so?

There is a word in Russian "Pravda", and it is usually translated to english as "truth", but it in fact means not "truth", but rather "what best serves the state". Read Robert Heinlein's extensive essay on the subject ... This is how Microsoft defines truth as used in their various articles and whitepapers, not to mention what they say in their business dealings and the courtroom. This is an opponent the like of which the world has rarely seen, and never with as much terrible power and influence as is within their grasp within a very short time to come if the government does not act appropriately towards them now that the battle has been engaged. When will we all wake up?

Attached to this message is an earlier message I wrote regarding what I consider to be equitable remedies, and also a follow up message by Jon "maddog" Hall, Executive Director of Linux International, which has since been published.

Mark Bolzern
Mark@Bolzern.Org
<http://www.Bolzern.Org> Phone: 303-690-2806 Fax: 303-693-6064

MTC-00008224

From: skip@steuart.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been told that this is where opinions on the Microsoft settlement should be sent. Please correct me if I am mistaken.

As I understand the current state of the Microsoft (MS) antitrust case, MS has been found guilty of abusing its monopoly position. The proposed settlement is that MS will be subject to government oversight for 5 to 7 years. As a 42 year old MIS veteran with Math and Computer Science degrees and over 15 years experience designing and managing computer systems for companies with up to 1,500 users I would like to offer a simple vision of what "conduct" the government should insist that MS follow.

MS has used its dominance of their Operating Systems (OS) to achieve dominance of the Applications that run on top of the OS. The object of the government oversight should be to break MS's lock on the link between the OS and the Applications. The only way to do this is to FORCE MS to publish the documented (and undocumented) Application Program Interfaces (APIs) in the OS necessary to load and run MS Windows Applications. MS will scream bloody murder, and try to spin this as un-American, but running an abusive monopoly is un-American too. Publishing ALL of the necessary APIs should enable other OS vendors to modify their OSs so that

they can run industry standard Windows Applications (including Microsoft Office). I have emulated other OSs like Windows on top of OSs like Macintosh and UNIX. so I have seen it work to varying degrees. Unfortunately these emulated MS OSs have been problematic because they had to be reverse engineered without MS's support. Not only doesn't MS support OS emulation, they have been proven in court to sabotage these efforts (DRDOS). If the government FORCED MS to cooperate then the other OSs could be enhanced to run MS programs natively.

Compliance would be EASY to monitor. If MS were forced to release their OS APIs, then I predict a stampede in the LINUX world (and probably the UNIX and Mac world) to support the APIs in order to run native Windows Applications. The LINUX community already has a global and public means of development and review for projects, and I am sure that a Windows port would become a high priority multi-year project. LINUX should be used to verify compliance because it is the ONLY transparent OS allowing anybody in the world to view the source code of the OS. If MS complies then the LINUX world will be able to make a workable clone of the MS OS. This OS clone would run on top of LINUX and be able to run all MS Applications. If MS "forgets" to mention some of the APIs, the LINUX crowd with its global review system will identify what is missing. If a clone MS OS can be built and it runs MS Applications, then MS compliance will have been achieved. Microsoft Excel, Word, Media Player, Internet Explorer, and Power Point and any other MS Applications that the US government uses could be the applications used to verify compliance.

Even though MS would cry bloody murder, they shouldn't worry unless they are afraid that their OS is so weak that a LINUX based clone could outperform the MS OS. Either way the consumer benefits. If the MS OS is superior, then the consumer has two choices: buy the MS OS or use the slower but free LINUX clone. If the free LINUX version of the MS OS ends up being superior then the consumer is allowed to use a higher quality lower priced (free) product. Either way the MS monopoly on the OS and the abuses that have resulted from the monopoly will be fixed.

By eliminating MS's monopoly on the OS, I predict a new golden age in software development. There should be NO time limit on the publication of the APIs, as long as MS makes OSs they should be forced to publish the APIs.

Skip Steuart
Steuart Investment Company
Chevy Chase, Maryland
phone:301/951-2744

MTC-00008225

From: Bud Graham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:38pm
Subject: Settlement

The Microsoft settlement proposed by the JUSstice Dept is a gfair and just dicsision for all parties Emewrson H graham

MTC-00008226

From: RCB1938@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:40pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I really wish our US Government would accept decisions as they stand instead of dragging suits out years and years and millions and millions of dollars being wasted. A decision was reached.....let's get on with it! The Federal Government and 9 states agreed. Let Microsoft "pay" its reduced liability and let's get on with life! Having been a senior officer in a publically traded company for 20 years, I personally know that a company can't plan anything until it truly knows where it stands. Think of the inefficiencies not to mention the cost! When is our legal system going to get into the 21st Century and quit practicing "Guilty until proven innocent"!!!!!!!

Bob Burress.

MTC-00008227

From: AlirezaR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement, 1/3/02

Thank you for the e-mail and providing me the info.

I believe we live in the "Free Enterprise Systems". My vote is for the Microsoft Executive, Bill Gate. I believe that the court should support Bill Gate and let him do the job to run the technology in our country.

Ali

MTC-00008228

From: Tom Lane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:46pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
To: DOJ

The current ruling is in the best interest of the industry, consumer and our countries economy.

The on going objections originate from competitors who want the government to cripple Microsoft, there by giving them an unfair advantage over Microsoft. Please throw out the petitions filled against Microsoft.

Tom Lane

MTC-00008229

From: David Freitag
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 2:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The economy has suffered terribly from the overzealous pursuit of punitive damages against Microsoft which one of the main foundations of the USA economy. Please expedite the current agreement and do not allow expansion of the suit as sought by the states and competitors of Microsoft. The sooner this litigation is completed, the better.

This e-mail and attachments, if any, may contain confidential and/or proprietary information. Please be advised that the unauthorized use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message and attachments. Thank you.

MTC-00008230

From: Westover, Michael (US-LIHI)
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/3/02 2:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,
 I just wanted to let you know that I believe the proposed Microsoft Settlement is fair and it's time to stop all of the Microsoft bashing.

Michael D. Westover
 Liberty International, e-Commerce
 michael.westover@libertyinternational.com
 (617) 574-5765
 CC:'attorney.general(a)po.state.ct.us'

MTC-00008231

From: Bud Graham
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:47pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The microsoft settlement as submitted by the Justice Dept is fair and equitable for all Parties involved.

Submitted by Emerson H. Graham

MTC-00008232

From: TNSig@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:50pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Leave Microsoft and Bill Gates alone. Their success is earned. Allow this settlement to take place.

MTC-00008233

From: Bob LeVitus
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,
 I've just read the news on the proposed one billion dollar settlement with Microsoft. As I understand the deal, this seems to me to be very much in favor of Microsoft. In addition to few to no changes to their behavior, a portion of the punishment is, in fact, a real benefit to them. The resolution including the dissemination of their software and compatible hardware, training to use their products, and loads of their often bundled software, seems to fly in the face of the very point of the trial.

They have been declared a monopoly for illegal tactics that were specifically meant to increase their market share, for bundling products for free to get market share, and for illegally blocking other's products to gain market share, and now, a good portion of the settlement specifically increases their market share of both the OS and their bundled products.

I believe this settlement should be declined. It does nothing to address their behavior and will not change it in the future, allowing them to continue to bilk the public.

Please don't let them get away with it.

Regards,
 Bob
 Bob LeVitus
 Writer and raconteur
 boblevitus@boblevitus.com
 http://www.boblevitus.com

MTC-00008234

From: m.martwick@att.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 2:53pm
 Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit Settlement
 To whom it my concern:

I am in complete support of the current settlement between Microsoft & the DOJ. I think to continue to pursue Microsoft and seek additional penalties will in the long term damage the American Computer Industry.

MTC-00008235

From: Jerry Blackwill
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:55pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to support the justice department in the terms of the Microsoft settlement. By taking this action, the justice department has put the US on a better economic footing.

Jerry Blackwill

MTC-00008236

From: FPCANDEGC@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please conclude your current agreement with Microsoft and ignore their competitors

Thank You
 Frank P.
 Cyrill Jr.

MTC-00008237

From: RWBurg@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I hope that the government soon stops this harrassment of Microsoft. I realize that Microsoft has a virtual monopoly on operating systems for the personal computers, but that seems to be a more reasonable approach than having to deal with multiple operating systems. If software developers had to write software for multiple operating systems, everything would become more complex and more expensive.

Sincerely yours,
 Richard W. Burg

MTC-00008238

From: Utemills@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 3:00pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Complete the Microsoft settlement NOW! It is time we put this matter behind us and allow Microsoft an opportunity to get back to running its business. Why should our own government keep trying to undermine this great American company? Leave Microsoft alone.

M. Mills
 1/03/02

MTC-00008239

From: toynymi
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 2:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement proposed by the DOJ is fair and adequate, and I would like to see it accepted by the court. I believe the demands of the nine holdout states, including my own home state of Kansas, have greatly exceeded the scope of any

remedies needed. As I understand it, antitrust settlements aren't supposed to rob the plaintiff of intellectual property, and two of the terms proposed by the holdouts do just that, namely the requirements that Microsoft provide source code for Internet Explorer and license Office for other operating systems.

I also object to the request that Microsoft provide a stripped-down version of Windows. I'm a retired software engineer with 30 years of experience, and I know this idea is just impractical. Features that the holdouts want removed work much more effectively if they are integrated into the operating system, not slapped on as an afterthought. It's analogous to air conditioning on an automobile; factory air always works better than an add-on unit. Smart customers would avoid the product, and customers who did buy it would regret it, so what's the point of forcing Microsoft to produce it? It also runs counter to industry trends; every modern operating system now includes these added features, and customers expect them. If Microsoft is burdened with this requirement, they should be allowed to affix a prominent label saying "This product was designed for you by the Attorneys General of Kansas, California, etc. ... Please forward all complaints to them."

I believe that the AGs of the holdout states only want to prolong the case for political reasons (to placate Microsoft's rivals) or for greed, hoping to somehow milk a windfall from Microsoft. I don't think they are the least bit interested in justice, only in benefiting themselves. Prolonging the case is holding back the high-tech industry, and therefore the entire economy. I request the court to accept the settlement as a fair one, move on, and help our country recuperate.

Thank you,
 Tony Miller
 316 Lawrence Avenue
 Lawrence, KS 66049
 785/331-4592
 toynymi@msn.com

MTC-00008240

From: JennetteWilson@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 3:02pm
 Subject: (no subject)
 SETTLE

MTC-00008241

From: Joseph F. Buchanan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 3:00pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to express my dismay at the settlement concerning Microsoft Corporation. Because of Microsoft's tactics in forcing their products (Windows OS and Microsoft Internet Explorer, especially) and forcing out competition, we have to deal the problems that come with not having alternatives to their systems. I work at the University of Utah and deal with a lot of computer users. Because of the monopolistic actions of Microsoft, alternatives to their email systems are not common among our users. Microsoft Outlook, Windows OS and Internet Explorer form together a serious security threat that has caused much expense to our support systems. Because of their overwhelming

market, they are slow to respond to the problems they cause and slow to address quality issues in their products. People have grown to accept what they provide, regardless of inferior quality, security problems or even cost.

I feel that the current settlement has let Microsoft off the hook and allows them to conduct business as usual. This should not be the case. Please seriously consider the states' petitions against Microsoft.

Thank you for your consideration,
Joseph F. Buchanan
(801) 566-1083
joseph.buchanan@utah.edu
Joseph F. Buchanan—
Internet: Joseph.Buchanan@utah.edu
University of Utah
http://www.cc.utah.edu/joseph/
TACC—Marriott Library—295 S. 1500 East
—(really ML2751C)
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0860
— (801) 581-8814
X-Pgp-Url: http://www.cc.utah.edu/joseph/
pgpkey

MTC-00008242

From: Aqualyst
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To the DOJ:

Although I may disagree with some of the ways in which the Microsoft Corporation conducts its business strategy, Microsoft is no more harmful to me than the US Post Office, the local cable TV company, or any other of a myriad of companies that, unlike Microsoft, are monopolies in the true sense of the word.

These companies are granted monopolies by government force, against which I have no recourse except to do without. Conversely, regarding Microsoft products, I can always cast my vote against them by purchasing other products. I can think of no area in which Microsoft actually holds a true monopoly; neither in operating systems nor in any other software currently in the marketplace. I can use an open-source operating system such as Linux on my PC, or I can purchase a computer from Apple that requires me to adjust to, and buy software compatible with, their proprietary operating system. I can use Netscape, and often do, to browse the Internet from my PC with Windows installed.

I can purchase excellent word processing software from Corel, instead of using Microsoft Word. I can even purchase a complete, integrated Office Suite without spending one cent on Microsoft products. The list goes on and on.

Here's what I can't do...

I can't subscribe to a competitive cable TV provider, who may offer better service at a lower price... I must use the one granted a monopoly in my neighborhood. I can't use a telephone company that may offer more value and trouble-free service in my neighborhood... I must use the government-granted monopoly in my calling area. I can't change my provider for electrical service... I must use the power company with a government-enforced monopoly in my area.

I'm sure you get my point here. The Department of Justice (if you're truly seeking

justice) should be striving to eliminate all of the government-enforced monopolies in this country that do untold damage to the economy. If you question the damage that government intervention in the marketplace can cause, I would refer you to the situation in California regarding power generation. Microsoft has earned its market position. It deserves to hold its dominance over the competition because it continues to provide me with ever-improving software and hardware, which enriches my life and makes me individually more productive. The best thing the DOJ could do would be to repeal the Sherman Antitrust Act and get out of the marketplace. The term "laissez faire" is not just a cute phrase. It is a caveat, and a marketplace axiom, that the DOJ, and the rest of the government, should observe. There is not now, nor has there ever been, a justification for government manipulation of business. The marketplace will ultimately take care of itself through the profit motive. The Sherman Act, itself, is an atrocity which was enacted to resolve a situation caused by government intervention. One doesn't cure an illness by administering more of the poison which caused it.

Sincerely,
Robert E. Mehan 1151 Carrollton Ave.
Metairie, LA 70005

MTC-00008243

From: Joan Clarke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I am all for the comprehensive agreement that the Federal Government and nine states reached with Microsoft. Enough is enough.
Sincerely,
Joan T. Clarke Fairview N. C. 28730

MTC-00008244

From: Kbobbi@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
RE: the Tunney Act
For the sake of the public at large please be assured that this settlement is in the public interest and to continue more litigation against Microsoft will only hurt the American economy and benefit a few special interests. Please do NOT continue more litigation against Microsoft and continue to hurt the economy.

The attack on Microsoft has already done damage to the stock market. Just go back to when it emerged during the last administration and see the effect on the market every time a new announcement came out about punishing Microsoft. Its not Microsoft that gets punished its the American Public and Freedom that suffers.

George Korey
060 Marcus Ct
Pinole CA 94564

MTC-00008245

From: Peter Kain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:
Please stop wasting taxpayers money litigating against Microsoft. It is an inefficient

use of the taxpayers money. I buy and use many of the products they sell and do so willingly. Why? They are great products. They are reliable. Most importantly, they allow me to communicate with others who also use Microsoft products.

Enough is enough. Let's move on. There is a time and place for pursuing justice, and that time has passed. The horse was dead a long time ago.

Let's not beat it any more.

Sincerely,
Peter J. Kain
Peter Kain Lighting Accessories Inc.
petek@madpark.com

MTC-00008246

From: Bob Beaudoin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The Utah Attorney General is pursuing harsher punishment for Microsoft along with 8 other states (California, Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and West Virginia).

The Attorney Generals' of these states are correct in pursuing Harsher penalties. The DOJ settlement is not a deterrent on what Microsoft has done to many other companies. The DOJ needs to support the case of these states against Microsoft.

Bob Beaudoin
5435 Riley Lane
Murray, UT 84107
Bob Beaudoin
Computer Support
Plant Operations
University of Utah
801 585-5919

MTC-00008247

From: Patrick McCarthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern—
I would like to urge the DOJ to back off Microsoft and allow this settlement to go forward.

Very truly yours,
Al Maiolo President
Al J. Maiolo
President
Aero Hardware & Parts Company, Inc.
130 Business Park Dr.
Armonk, NY 10504
E-mail: ajm@aerohardwareparts.com
Fax: (914) 273-8550
Phone: (914) 273-8612

MTC-00008248

From: FAY243@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:12pm
Subject: (no subject)
I THINK AS THE NEW YEAR IS HERE, WE SHOULD ALL TRY AND GET BACK TO OUR NORMAL LIFE STYLE. I THINK MICROSOFT AND THE SETTLEMENT IS VERY FAIR. I DON'T THINK THE OTHER STATES ARE BEING FAIR WITH MICROSOFT OR THE ECONOMY. MICROSOFT WILL HELP STIMULATE THE ECONOMY, IF THE OTHER STATES WILL GET OFF OF THEIR BACK.
THANK YOU

BERTIE F. SMITH
243 CR. 2446
SALTILLO, MS 38866

MTC-00008249

From: Henry G Absher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 3, 2002
Attorney General Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I write you in support of the recent settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. After three long years of court battles and round-the-clock negotiations, a fair and reasonable settlement was reached, and then we find out that there are some who feel it needs further examination. What about spending our dollars and time on examining our current economic status or our nation's security? These might be more pressing issues at the moment.

This settlement was not only well thought out, but was formulated with all parties in mind. Not only did Microsoft give up a great deal to allow the competitive market to flourish, but also they agreed to allow these companies to sue them if, in fact, they weren't complying. The settlement addresses everything from pricing agreements to code disclosure, and this should be considered a real coup for competitors. Microsoft has bowed down to dozens of demands, and now we need to let the technology industry get back to business.

The American economy could use some boosting at the moment, and holding up the IT sector and their competitive growth can only harm things. I urge you to support this settlement by helping to see that it no longer gets challenged from those in the federal government who would compromise it. Thank you for your time and effort on this issue.

Sincerely,
Henry Absher

MTC-00008250

From: alfred mizner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I've worked in the technology industry for over 10 years and I have been mystified by the governments apparent attempt(through obvious competitor funding) destroy Microsoft. It is because of their leadership and support for building a common PC platform that we are not still working on disparate and disjoint systems and software platforms. My comment on the settlement is that it goes well beyond what I think is necessary or appropriate. Therefore I would request that this be the end of this odyssey and start putting money and focus in a more appropriate place.

Regards
Al

MTC-00008251

From: GrumpyWes@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:14pm

Subject: Settlement

Please get off Bill's back!!!!!!! All he and Mrs. Gates do is good for the people and kids. Not to mention what he has done for the Kids. We are in a lot of bad times now , and mostly in Seattle.

Thank You
Wes Boyd.

MTC-00008252

From: Sumit Pal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi
The settlement is certainly a positive one for the industry and the American people at large.

Cheers,
Sumit

MTC-00008253

From: mryan@telebyte.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it's time to move on and get off Microsoft's back. This market is moving too rapidly for anyone to maintain an edge too long.

Matt Ryan, CLU
9080 Illahee Rd NE
Bremerton, WA 98311

MTC-00008254

From: Mitch Millar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

This case has been going on too long and has especially added detrimentally to all Technology stock losses in the last two years.

Microsoft is highly competitive, all successful companies are. If they are not breaking the law, get over it!!

Special interest factions are trying to skim the cream off of Microsoft's success because they cannot or are unwilling to compete. Leave Microsoft alone!!

The technology Microsoft provides make the market for the rest of us out there in the software world.

Mitch
mitch@tetradigital.com

MTC-00008255

From: Cathryn22@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:19pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To Whom it May Concern,

I am a public school teacher in Wisconsin and am writing on behalf of the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case. I support the goals that are set forth in this settlement to establish an independent foundation comprised of educators to distribute technology funds, computers and software to the nation's poorest schools.

As a public school teacher, I am made aware of the importance of technology on a daily basis. I am also well aware of the huge technology gap that exists between wealthy and poor communities. This settlement would make a big difference in Wisconsin in that we are below the national average when it comes to computer availability for

students. These funds could also help provide teachers with sufficient technology training, another area in which we are behind in Wisconsin.

Technology can be a powerful teaching tool and if we are going to fully prepare today's students for tomorrow's world, we have to stay current and we have to make technology available to everyone. In my school district we are just beginning to see the impact that technology can have. We recently passed a referendum that enabled the district to purchase one computer per teacher, and is slowly striving to have one computer for every 6 students. While that still is sorely behind what we see in the business world, it has already made a big difference. A settlement such as this could assist other districts, as well as my own, in obtaining the technology necessary for education in the 21st century.

Thank you for your consideration,
Cathy Atkinson
Social Studies Teacher
Waukesha, WI.

MTC-00008256

From: TRENTWOLF@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom it may concern,

I believe that the US Government would find it's self better occupied paying more attention to the terrorist problem, the airplane security problem than bothering with Microsoft. This company only does good, helps our nations civilian and military, with the latest in technology and contributes computers to the nations libraries, provides jobs and pays its taxes to support the Government.

G. C. TRENTANOVE

MTC-00008257

From: DADavis22@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

PLEASE, LET IT BE KNOWN THAT I
DUANE A. DAVIS AGREE TO THE
SETTELMENT, WE NEED MORE JOBS, NOT
SPECIAL INTERESTS WHERE THE TRIAL
LAWYERS RAKE IN ALL THE MONEY
THANKS
DADAVIS22@AOL.COM

MTC-00008258

From: Joseph F. Buchanan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement (added my address)

(This is the same message sent before, but I forgot to add my mailing address) I would like to express my dismay at the settlement concerning Microsoft Corporation. Because of Microsoft's tactics in forcing their products (Windows OS and Microsoft Internet Explorer, especially) and forcing out competition, we have to deal the problems that come with not having alternatives to their systems. I work at the University of Utah and deal with a lot of computer users. Because of the monopolistic actions of Microsoft, alternatives to their email systems are not common among our users. Microsoft

Outlook, Windows OS and Internet Explorer form together a serious security threat that has caused much expense to our support systems. Because of their overwhelming market, they are slow to respond to the problems they cause and slow to address quality issues in their products. People have grown to accept what they provide, regardless of inferior quality, security problems or even cost.

I feel that the current settlement has let Microsoft off the hook and allows them to conduct business as usual. This should not be the case. Please seriously consider the states' petitions against Microsoft.

Thank you for your consideration,
Joseph F. Buchanan
7472 Silver Circle
West Jordan, UT 84084-3946
(801) 566-1083
joseph.buchanan@utah.edu
Joseph F. Buchanan
—Internet: Joseph.Buchanan@utah.edu
University of Utah
—http://www.cc.utah.edu/~joseph/
TACC—Marriott Library—295 S. 1500 East
—(really ML2751C)
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0860
—(801) 581-8814
X-Pgp-Url: http://www.cc.utah.edu/
~joseph/pgpkey

MTC-00008259

From: Konrad M.Kempfe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement:

This is to express my disapproval of prolonged litigation in the Microsoft case. The settlement reached is fair and should be accepted.

It is definitely not in the interest of the public or the US economy to continue court proceedings.

Respectfully
Konrad M.Kempfe, MD
715 Bogar Drive
Selinsgrove, PA 17870

MTC-00008260

From: Kevin McDaniel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is imperative that any settlement should be in the form of CASH only It should NOT be in the form of additional gifts or sales of Microsoft product to schools and others.

I would like to see this case brought to a swift conclusion, but not at the expense of other firms marketing competing products.

Kevin McDaniel

MTC-00008261

From: rick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:27pm
Subject: My 2 cents

This case against Microsoft has been poorly executed by the government, companies and handful of states taking part. It is also quite hypocritical of those companies because they simply do not have the products to available to replace the Microsoft software. I could see their point if they actually had something to sell me but they don't. Have you ever tried

writing a letter, doing a spreadsheet, made a greeting card, edited a photograph on a UNIX machine? I didn't think so. All these companies have a perfect right to manufacture competing products, but they dont, even for their own die hard users.

In addition I as a consumer feel that the deal Microsoft gives me is a tremendous value. Where else can I get a state of the art operating system, with many applications for under \$200? There is no case here.

Microsoft software has done more for our economy, military strength, and business productivity than any single company in history.

Let them keep it up. Or invite them to leave the US and become a corporation of lets say, India. I know the country of India would welcome them with open arms, unlike our own government which scorns them.

MTC-00008262

From: William J. Crittenden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft

There are basically three types of people who have opinions on the U.S. v. Microsoft case:

(1) People who have no idea what the law says or what Microsoft has actually done. (These people should be ignored)

(2) People who have some vested interest in supporting Microsoft or some ideological axe to grind such that they support Microsoft for reasons that have nothing to do with the case, Microsoft's obvious and unrepentant guilt, or appropriate remedies.

(3) (Myself included) People who are absolutely outraged by Microsoft's pattern of deliberate illegal conduct and its total disregard for the law. READ THE DAMN COURT OF APPEALS OPINION!!! IT SPEAKS FOR ITSELF!! Bill Gates is a crook and a liar, and he has created, illegally maintained and repeatedly abused a monopoly in computer operating systems. The harm to consumers is staggering.

Windows is an overpriced and unreliable pile of crap, but most people have no real choice (Apple is an expensive alternative, and there are no other widely used consumer operating systems). In some cases, more than half of the cost of a new computer is the preloaded Microsoft software (which costs Microsoft almost nothing to make). Many non-Microsoft software products perform poorly because Microsoft is constantly fiddling with Windows and refuses to release the source code that developers need to write for.

Windows XP includes many new bundled features which clearly should be sold as separate applications and not as part of the operating system. This practice is clearly illegal and destroys innovation and competition. If this practice is not stopped, Microsoft will soon have a monopoly in virtually the entire personal computer software industry.

TERMINATE THE ILLEGAL MONOPOLY!
STOP THE BUNDLING! STOP WINDOWS XP!

PROTECT REAL JAVA FROM
MICROSOFT'S ILLEGAL ATTEMPT TO
DESTROY COMPETITION! BREAK UP
MICROSOFT!

AND THROW GATES AND BALMER IN
JAIL!!!!!!

William J. Crittenden
Law Office
1325 Fourth Avenue, #1730
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 729-0259
wjcrittenden@attbi.com

MTC-00008263

From: DYMOND Christopher S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I am shocked at what appears to be a disregard for anti-trust laws and the lack of timeliness of enforcing them.

I ask that you please issue a punishment for Microsoft's violations that is both sufficiently punitive to dissuade future companies from behaving as Microsoft has and that it is done quickly.

Christopher Dymond
Salem, Oregon

MTC-00008264

From: David Ayala
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: Please accept this message as my support for the proposed settlement. As a result, I believe Microsoft has learned to act and behave in a manner that promotes fair trade and competitiveness in the business world. Thank you.

D. Ayala, Jr.
West Hills, California

MTC-00008265

From: John McIntosh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:33pm
Subject: microsoft settlement Please lay off
Microsoft. I have no financial interest in
the company.

John

MTC-00008266

From: SHerman999@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:34pm
Subject: microsoft case

please leave microsoft alone. the consumers like me are not complaining, only competitors who aren't as inovative, nor as consumer oriented. microsoft has done an excellent job for the publi worldwide. it's time the justice dept focused on somebody committing a crime that hurts the public. leave them alone and allow them to get back to the business of making a major contribution to the public and business world.

MTC-00008267

From: paul kelly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:32pm
Subject: RE: Microsoft settlement.

Dear DOJ:

I have followed the MSFT "case" and want to add my voice to those of many others. The 18 States continuing efforts to force MSFT to divest is a poor use of valuable time and seems to be largely politically motivated at

this time. My vote is to move on quickly to more pressing issues, such as Enron and collusion between accountancy and business today that are costing consumers and shareholders Billions.

Thank you.
P Kelly, MD

MTC-00008269

From: Sandy Armsrtong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In early 2000, I had made investments, mostly with money inherited from my mother's lifetime savings, on the advise of my investment counselors, for myself and my children. I had about one fourth of what I needed to retire and my children had about enough for college educations and a future down payment on a house. My children were set for a good start in life and I had a start toward financial security for my future. Then, disaster came, in the form of a suit against Microsoft. In my opinion, this suit was the catalyst of the tremendous downfall in the stock market. This occurrence has left me and my children with only 40% of the money we had in early 2000. I never felt that Microsoft was at fault in the first place. What has happened to Americans who have budgeted and saved all of their lives to make their and their children's futures secure in order to improve profits of a few disgruntled corporations who were not able to compete with the innovations of Microsoft is very wrong.

Nothing can be done to compensate for the devastation caused to the American people by those who brought the suit against Microsoft, but the best that can be done is to finalize the Microsoft settlement which has been agreed upon by nine states as well as the federal government. It is time to put an end to this suit. It is my hope that such a decision will act as another catalyst to bring the stock market once more to more favorable gains and that my children and I may recoup some of our tremendous losses.

PLEASE, rule in favor of the present Microsoft agreement

Thank you,
Sandra M. Armstrong
Santa Cruz, California

MTC-00008270

From: LuLuFin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:35pm
Subject: Final Determination of this case

This has gone on far too long. I think it is too strong against Microsoft. It requires that Microsoft disclose all the interface and related technical information for the middleware use and much more I don't think is fair. If Microsoft is smart enough to have figured it all out why do they have to give it away. Let the competitors come up with another way to get their middleware to be compatible. It seems to me you are punishing someone, who has been creative, because the other party can't come up with a better idea and product. If Microsoft agreed then let's get it over with and move on.

Lucille Finamore

MTC-00008271

From: Brown, Terry
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 3:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I consider the entire pursuit of Microsoft for antitrust violations a witch hunt against a company that is guilty of nothing more than engaging in production and free trade in what, upon my last reading of the constitution, was a free and capitalistic society. Based on the evidence and judgments I have reviewed to date, I oppose any form of punishment or sanction against Microsoft. Let the free market reign.

Terry S. Brown
Vice President, Manufacturing and Process Industry Practice
Balanced Scorecard Collaborative, Inc.
55 Old Bedford Road Lincoln, MA 01773
Tel. 781.402.1183
Fax 703.991.7542
Cell 781.929.2713 tbrown@bscol.com
Join Balanced Scorecard Online Free at <http://www.bscol.com>

MTC-00008272

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: <madodel@ptdprolog.net>
To: <piu@doj.ca.gov>;
<attorney.general@po.state.ct.us>;
<ag@oag.state.fl.us>;
<consumer@ag.state.ia.us>;
<GENERAL@ksag.org>;
<webmaster@ago.state.ma.us>;
<attorney.general@state.mn.us>;
<uag@att.state.ut.us>;
<consumer@wvnet.edu>;
<timb001@attglobal.net>;
<Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov> Sent:
Wednesday, December 26, 2001 3:27 PM

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 than 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 than a handful if any among all the major manufacturers. Microsoft can only continue its monopoly by coercion, 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 its 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

MTC-00008273

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: "sbskinner" <skskinner@helicon.net>
To: <consumer@wvnet.edu> Sent: Sunday, December 16, 2001 6:45 PM
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Dear Ms. Mills,

I am delighted that you continue to reject 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).

Thank you again, and happy holidays.

Suzanne B. Skinner

To: Microsoft Customer Service
Dated December 15, 2001

"For the last week or more, every time I after 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 returned 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."

As an afternote, once again, you might be interested to know that when I went to the WV AGs website just a few minutes earlier, and tried to send this email to that office, the above-mentioned "can't be displayed: detect network settings, etc" came up and prevented my emailing Mr. McGraw. Very small potatoes, but very big irritation—plus two more requests from Microsoft for runtime error and another two requests to debug. Just keeps us chuckling, doesn't it?

Thank you again.

MTC-00008274

From: Allan Tingey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am a computer scientist working in human genetics research at the University of Utah and I just wanted to pass along my feelings about the Microsoft settlement. I can tell you, without question, that the Microsoft monopoly has made our work more difficult and wasted considerable tax dollars. Because there is no viable alternative, we are forced to purchase Windows systems for each workers desk so that the usual desktop applications are available. The Microsoft operating systems, however, are not adequate for our research so additional UNIX systems must be purchased. The incompatibility of the systems creates many problems and the extra hardware and training needed to operate both systems is very wasteful.

"Multi-user" operating systems like UNIX, Linux, and now Mac-OS, are able to handle the work of many people if only the application software were available. The "single-user" operating systems from Microsoft require the purchase of a personal computer and software licenses for every user and it is incredibly wasteful. Because of the Microsoft monopoly, tax dollars are purchasing 50 to 100 times as many computers as are really needed with similar inefficiencies in software licensing.

As a computer scientist and a tax payer, I hope to see the Microsoft monopoly completely dismantled so a more efficient method of computing can be adopted.

Allan Tingey
University of Utah
20 South 2030
East Salt Lake City, UT 84112
810-581-4157
al@genetics.utah.edu

MTC-00008275

From: Diane (038) Roland Freeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sirs,

I believe that Microsoft has done no wrong and should not be punished for their actions. Was Ford guilty in the early 1900's, when he dominated the auto industry? The courts said no. I see a remarkable similarity to the Microsoft suit, and the Ford suit. Those who can't compete, have a "sour grapes" attitude. I worked on top secret programs that the government and the vendor both used Microsoft programs to exchange data via the internet, because the "system" worked. This saved the government and the taxpayer lots of money.

Microsoft has done the world a favor by developing what amounts to be a "standard" that the world can use to advance all parties. To punish them for this great accomplishment, would be wrong. All government, should stay out of business that does no one harm. If you want to get involved in bad business practices, look into Enron. How about when oil companies

"conspire" to raise prices (\$3.00/gal) for no reason?

Thank you for your time and efforts.
H.R. Freeman
dinro@pacbell.net

MTC-00008276

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: "Robert Lyday" <rh43@oakhurst.net>
To: <consumer@wvnet.edu> Sent:
Wednesday, December 26, 2001 11:03 PM

Subject: Don't Settle with Microsoft

The government's proposed settlement is a disaster. Please do not settle according to these standards! Hold out for a settlement that will really hold MS' feet to the fire! The government's settlement will do almost nothing at all to stop MS' illegal behavior, which has almost destroyed computing. MS must be stopped for the sake of the industry and businesses and consumers all over the world! Bob

Hiroshima '45, Chernobyl '86, Windows '95.

MTC-00008277

From: Dan Broughton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I wish to express my opinion that this litigation has gone on long enough! Without Microsoft where would PC users be? Would the "information superhighway" be all that it has become without the innovative software produced by Microsoft? The answer to both these questions is no! It's beyond me why the FEDS deem success a criminal act.

SETTLE THE DAMN THING, ALREADY—I AM SICK OF HEARING ABOUT IT!!!
Dan

MTC-00008278

From: Caltax1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ: As taxpayers and citizens of the US, we are frustrated by the ongoing legal battle waged by your department against Microsoft. It is time to move on. The proposed remedies are enough! Let's move on and spend our energies and resources on rebuilding our damaged nation, not on tearing down one of our most innovative companies. Let's use our resources, enriched by Microsoft and other technology-related companies, to take our country to the next level.

Accept the proposed settlement and encourage the hold-out states to do the same.

Thank you,
Callene Lumbard
Callene Lumbard
4600 177 Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98006
425-641-3688
caltax1@aol.com

MTC-00008279

From: Scuta101@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please add my name to the list of those who strongly oppose the proposed settlement agreement. The proposed settlement does nothing to curb the competitive tactics of a proven monopolistic predator and Microsoft continues to violate provisions of the Sherman Act (i.e., break the law) even as I type this e-mail. Surely our legal system can do more to ensure justice than the politically inspired "sell out" agreement offered by the Justice Department.

Mike Perkins

MTC-00008280

From: Michael Brunskill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:49pm
Subject: Public Comment Period

Dear Sirs,

As a computer user who has participated in the evolution of computer systems from the old teletype terminals of the Dartmouth Timesharing System on which I learned to program in Basic in 1973 to the incredible PC technology that exists today, I can say emphatically that Microsoft has done more to improve and enhance computing than any other single entity.

To say that Microsoft has stifled competition is ludicrous. The cost of software, absolute and relative, has plunged dramatically because of the WORLD's acceptance Microsoft's Windows operating system. The very fact that the closest competitor, LINUX, is FREE to consumers proves this point. Another competing product to Microsoft's Office product line, Star Office, is also FREE, and like all others that want to have any chance of acceptance, the files are fully exchangeable with Microsoft systems. I well remember the days of several competing word processing systems, none of which were interchangeable, which truly hampered commerce. Microsoft, though it's innovation and superior products, has set the standard WORLDWIDE for consumer software interoperability far better than any government organization ever could. This in turn has led to sustained increases in worker productivity, which have been a major factor in the economic boom of the 90's.

One of the largest detractors of Microsoft is America OnLine. While Microsoft has opened up it's operating system to any competent software developer, AOL software is proprietary and closed. They do not use industry standards for such basic services as email and news services, requiring the use of their unique software for this purpose. Please consider the source in evaluating the objections to this settlement, which is still punitive to Microsoft in my opinion and entirely unnecessary.

Best Regards
Mike Brunskill
76 Cranbury Neck Road
Cranbury, NJ 08512
michael.brunskill@realiscorp.com

MTC-00008281

From: J MALLOY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has built the best mousetrap. Let them sell it.

Why should my cost include the wages of half of the lawyers in Washington. Please draw this to a close.

MTC-00008282

From: Bertram Kundert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:48pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement

As an IT professional of 11 years standing, I have little confidence that the stated remedies will do much to restrain Microsoft from past anti-competitive practices. More safe guards and clear punishment for transgressions need to be in place. As long as they can claim that adding programs to the operating system is "innovation" they can use their monopoly power to squeeze out any new concept that appears, and claim it for themselves. This is how they have consistently acted in the past and there seems no reason to believe that they will change in the future.

Bertram Kundert
University of Utah
101 Wasatch Drive
Eccles Broadcast Center
Salt Lake City,
Utah 84112
801-581-5698
Bertram@media.utah.edu

MTC-00008283

From: BobJ8806@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern, I feel strongly that the current settlement that was reached by Microsoft and the Justice Department is fair and equitable. It makes no sense to continue the current law suit being made by several states. If half of the current law suit participants agreed to the settlement, then why are the half trying to prolong the process. The longer the case continues, the more it going to cost the tax payers. Microsoft has been a pillar for the High Tech industry and without them and their contributions, I don't believe the many industries that exists today could have existed. Microsoft is a business that has been very successful and because they have been successful, others in the same field are just jealous of their accomplishments. How many companies in the world have not done "things" that would increase their assets, even if it were a little not according to Anti-Monopoly rules.

I am glad that the current judge in this case is taking the appropriate actions to end this ridiculous time consuming case against a respectable company that has been and will continue to be successful. Their projects and service to the customers is great and to say that they are monopolizing the software market, and that consumers do not have a choice, is really stupid. Let the company be and stop wasting tax payers money for a few companies that can't stand the competition.

MTC-00008284

From: Linda Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I give thanks that a settlement can be reached and am anxious for this great company to be able to get back to work on what they do best without fear of government intervention.

Linda Johnson, 308 Seventh Street
Fort Madison, Iowa 52627

MTC-00008285

From: Jim McKinney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:52pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I think the government should be happy with any settlement from Microsoft. In my opinion, the government should leave Microsoft alone to do whatever is necessary for it (and the rest of the tech industry) to survive.

Jim McKinney
14691 Bueno Drive
Chino Hills, CA 91709
Professor, Mathematics; Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona

MTC-00008286

From: herb1000
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is high time the DOJ put this mess to rest. We do not approve of our tax dollars being used to help certain competitors compete with Microsoft. This is supposed to be a free market. If IBM's OS2, Linux and Unix cannot compete with Windows, it is not the Governments problem. You are in danger of unfairly destroying the only competition the huge AOL-Time Warner conglomerate has.

This has never been about protecting consumers.....it IS about helping certain competitors who made some poor business decisions.

Herb & Loretta DeVaan
1749 Tanner Circle Henderson NV 89012
herb1000@email.msn.com

MTC-00008287

From: FarhnerB@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:54pm
Subject: MS Opinion

We need a technologist and entrepreneur like Bill Gates. Let's settle this thing and move on, hopefully without disabling the software and costing the consumer more money.

Having lived in the silicon valley for some 20+years, I have confidence that technology will always be competitive.

MTC-00008288

From: EDWARD W REID
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice: For years the competitors of Microsoft have been trying to force it to permit them to use its successful technology, a technology which they themselves could not develop, and in the process tried to viciously destroy Microsoft. Microsoft quite naturally resisted these efforts, but finally an agreement has been reached by most of those involved. However, a small remaining greedy cadre of states and competitors are hanging on for the "kill".

The judge should recognize the motivations of this cadre and end this process with the Agreement for the good of the country

MTC-00008289

From: Vulich@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:56pm
Subject: Settlement

I cannot understand why this case is still going on because of a few states who apparently are not tending their own affairs and are cheating their constituents while they are squandering their time and their state's money while they are away from the real work they should be doing and wallowing in their 5 minutes of fame.

Microsoft has done more for more people throughout the world than any other company in history. Thanks to Bill Gates and Microsoft, and the wise decision I made years ago to buy their stock, I am assured of a decent retirement. I am sick and tired of seeing success being punished in our country and as soon as someone has it the leeches come out of the woodwork to bleed them dry with idiotic lawsuits, etc. PLEASE, let's get over it and let Microsoft progress and continue to do so much good for so many.

Malena Preston
Bothell, WA.

MTC-00008290

From: Bplshrine@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Isn't it about time to let go and let the settlement go forward.

Billy P. Langfeldt, 3115 25th Street,
Boulder, CO 80304-2842 eMail—
BPLSHRINE@CS.COM. Let it GO!!

MTC-00008291

From: Oscar Myre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 3:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello, I find the proposed Microsoft settlement to be unacceptable.

It fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting the illegal conduct, promoting competition in this industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains.

Please don't except the settlement. Thank you.

God Bless,
Oscar Myre
http://omoriginals.com
360.575.9839 (office)
305.422.8285 (fax)

MTC-00008292

From: Fred Fiechter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: Let the Microsoft settlement stand and keep the few special interests with their large lobbying budgets out of the resolution process. Our system of justice and our nation are ready to move on in the interest of fairness and the American economic system. Enough is enough!

Frederick C. Fiechter III
162 Stone Block Row
Wilm., DE 19807

(302)656-6643

MTC-00008293

From: Nick Trikouros
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion this has been a plot by Microsoft's competitors to derail the company. "We can't compete with them so lets get together and sue." What went on in the Jackson court was a travesty. That he is still a sitting judge is a joke. I also believe that this case has harmed our economy by giving the EC an excuse to follow through with their version. I can't prove this, but I feel that they (EC) were emboldened to stop the GE/Honeywell merger. This situation with the states not excepting the compromise is nothing but politics by the (would be Governors/Senators) State Attorney Generals. For the sake of the industry and our economy, this should end now.

Sincerely,
Nicholas M. Trikouros

MTC-00008294

From: Atlas Int'l
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I believe the DOJ has buckled to the very thugs it purports to protect U.S. citizens from. Microsoft has done nothing but bully its way to the top of the technology heap by infiltrating one segment of tech business sector after the other, infecting each with its own brand of assimilation or destruction.

In 'punishing' Microsoft by literally forcing it into a market in which it is yet have a stranglehold (the education market) you are in effect bowing to the power of the 'almighty' MS. This disease of a company needs to be broken up, disbanded or otherwise prohibited from entering and dominating other markets—not forced into ones they've yet to conquer.

Please know that I could easily write volumes on topics ranging from free competition, business ethics, the bastardization of corporate America right down to basic criminal acts and corporate responsibility. But, as you are no doubt busy weeding through hundreds of thousands of such letters, let me just cast my vote of disapproval at the job being done by the government.

Boo!
Bob Holkan
8109 Otium Way
Antelope, CA
95843 (916) 725-4055

MTC-00008295

From: tlcarrhart@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please consider immediate settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case. Only competitors of MS and the various attorneys benefit from dragging it on and on.

Regards,
Tom and Betty Carhart, Houston, Texas

MTC-00008296

From: FRKFRANKK3@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this litigation should stop right now. The settlement is fair, and any delay can only prolong the recession.

Frank Keeshan

MTC-00008297

From: Spilger Philip G (Phil) PSNS
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To The Department of Justice,

As a consumer, I want to see this lawsuit against Microsoft settled. My own personal opinion is we consumers have only benefited from the Microsoft Corporation's innovations. The accusations against Microsoft are ludicrous. 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.

Phil Spilger, 10838 Evergreen Terrace SW,
Lakewood, WA. 98498

MTC-00008298

From: Crlawren34@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This has dragged on long enough. The settlement agreed upon by the U.S. Gov't and the nine states involved is fair and settling this now is certainly in the best interest of the public. We do not need more prolonged litigation.

Settle!
Carol R. Lawrence

MTC-00008299

From: davidhenryart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support a prompt settlement to the Microsoft suit.

David Henry

MTC-00008300

From: rfkilmmer@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing this e-mail to let you know what I think of your attack on Microsoft.

It seems to me that the DOJ misunderstands basic economics. In a free society the market will set prices and standards that they are willing to pay. And, if a company tries to charge too much for their product competition will bring them back to a rational price or in to bankruptcy. Competition is what moves us forward, without it there would be no need to advance because there would be no incentive. Competition is what weeds out the companies that don't have the insight to move forward. But this is not a bad thing. A

company is trying to get a piece of the market share. They do this by getting the best product for the best price to the customer. If a company cannot do this it is not their competitors fault. The market will always weed out those companies that don't make the most out of their resources. More gov't controls are not what is needed. If you look into your history books you will see what that has done over and over again. It has and will crush progress every time. So I hope that America can become the first country to recognize it before it crushes us.

In conclusion I would like to state that each individual knows or should know their economic priorities. Man is not born with the right to have a computer or a certain software system. Microsoft nor any other company owes them anything. If they like the product and have the economic means to purchase it they should, if not so be it. It is not up to the government to decide which company we put our money into.

Thank you for your time
Ray Kilmer

MTC-00008301

From: Dan Warrensford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies/gentlemen:

Reject the arguments of the neo-Fascists who are still attempting to crucify Microsoft—for doing what Capitalists are supposed to do: Use creativity to make our lives better. No one has ever forced anyone else to use Internet Explorer, or any other Microsoft product. All of Microsoft's "competitors" have been free to develop better, more attractive products; none of the "competitors" should be allowed to use DoJ or U.S. Taxpayers' money to attack Microsoft.

Tell each who wishes to use the U.S. Government as a club to "get a life."
Thanks/regards,
Dan Warrensford
40 Uranus Ave. Merritt Island FL 32953-3158 (321) 453-2217; warrensd@gte.net

MTC-00008302

From: Douglas Mayne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly:
Here are my comments regarding the proposed settlement in the Microsoft Anti-trust Case.

1. The difference between Judge Jackson's proposed breakup and the proposed settlement is much too great. This gives the perception that a company can win if it can just outlast those pursuing it. The judiciary should be more stable than the executive, and not appear to flow with changes in administration.

2. While Judge Jackson's behavior outside the court was stupid and a poor example to set as the court's representative, it should not have bearing on the finding of fact. However, if his behaviour is deemed too egregious, then start over from the beginning.

3. Microsoft's behaviour at trial was outrageous and contemptible. Here is a specific instance which stands out: the

infamous Internet Explorer video with James Allchin on the stand. This video was requested by the court and was willfully manipulated to show an untruth. The video was a mockery, and Allchin and others responsible should be held accountable. It should not be just "another product demo" when presenting evidence in a U.S. court proceeding. Also, Gates statements about Microsoft keeping the companies overall financial records using paper and pencil were outrageous lies, considering his statements in "The Road Ahead."

4. Microsoft's agenda is to make money. They have been successful in capturing market share in every segment of the software industry where they chosen to compete. It has been noted that Microsoft's cash reserves can be used to out spend any rival in product advertising and governmental lobbying.

5. Microsoft's business agenda does not complement the nation's desire to secure its computer infrastructure. Microsoft's software vulnerabilities have led to exploitation and business interruption. Any settlement, short of the breakup, needs to address how Microsoft will work with the software community to address this serious problem. The "code red" virus has shown a few infected systems connected to a high speed network can do great damage.

6. Microsoft's business agenda forces an "upgrade path" upon end users to ensure a continuing revenue stream. This is not necessary or rational, especially now that the PC has matured and works well enough for everyday business use. Software should be treated the same as a "consumer durable good," much like a washing machine. Case in point: the comparable prices for Office XP and a Maytag washer. Microsoft's approach is to simply declare software obsolete, and unsupported after a specified date. This is not the best choice for business, as new versions always contain bugs and vulnerabilities. The maturity of Windows NT at Service Pack 6 provides a stable base to build a business on, and appears to have advantages over later, more complex software such as Windows 2000 or Windows XP.

Because Microsoft holds the copyright to their software, they can choose to market it how they please, or withdraw it from the market entirely. This limits consumer choice and is unfair.

In the breakup scenario, I envisioned the "children" competing against one another to distinguish their product. A product offering the most stable and secure platform would have had appeal to business users, and would have been worth supporting through continuing fees for bug and security fixes. Without the breakup, this is an unlikely outcome as Microsoft sees there is much more profit in entirely new versions.

7. Without a major remedy, Microsoft's egregious behaviour will continue. Consumers will have less choice and be forced to pay the monopolist's price. This is the continuing harm to consumers which was a finding of fact.

Thank You,
Douglas D. Mayne
Salt Lake City, Utah

MTC-00008303

From: Malcolm C King

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:15pm
Subject: the good it has done..

Without Windows from Microsoft, I wouldn't have a computer, know what the Internet was nor have a lot of contact with the world of 2002. I am stunned by what the DoJ thinks is wrong with Microsoft. As usual, no one in the real world (non-government) is offended, hurt nor angry with someone who has done a good thing for the majority of Americans. Show me the millions of people that complained about "M" then go after them with all your might. Until then chase the millions of truly bad people there are in America, like the FBI office in Boston.

MTC-00008304

From: laverne(u)jim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Tunney Act should be accepted as law, and the oppressive law suite against Microsoft ended. The court of appeals ruling seems to be fair to all parties. I do not think that further action against Microsoft is in the public's best interest.

MTC-00008305

From: Rrmontesi@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
I believe the Microsoft settlement is reasonable and fair and that it is time to put an end to all litigation regarding this matter. Please add my name to the list of those in favor of the settlement and make my opinion known to the District Court.

God Bless America,
Rosemary Montesi
15 Westway Road
Wayland, MA 01778

MTC-00008306

From: Alys Hinkle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My personal opinion is that Microsoft is the only software company that provided the public with the tools necessary to use the internet. Originally all of the software programs written for the computer; with the exception of Apple and the only programs that were written for Apple had to be used on a Apple computer, therefore if you owned anyother brand of computer Apple software was not compatible; were individual programs, the public had to be a computer wizard or guru to make them fit together, the only way business's could operate was to take individual reports from each software company and put them together by hand, none of the programs integrated. Microsoft's generosity gave the public the tools it needed to use the computer for all aspects of a business operation, from writing letters, to posting reminders on payments due, to business reports that allowed consolidated financial information available for day to day operations of their business.

At the time Microsoft put together the consolidated computer program that a

layman could understand and use, the other computer companies offered only spread sheets, letter writing programs, etc. that an individual had to have the training to put that information together with another report before the information was usable.

I believe Microsoft was a public servant, they refined the reports and programs so that the individual could use them in the manner in which the bookkeeping world had recorded it's information from the beginning. Microsoft allowed the small business man to gain information pertinent to his business with the same speed and accuracy that big business had been able to do, allowing the middle man to operate more competitively.

If the companies bringing the lawsuits against Microsoft had been as wise as Microsoft and offered their reports and information to the public that was usable by the public, before Microsoft they would have gained the same amount of public esteem and been as fortunate as Microsoft.

I feel the suit against Microsoft should be settled, without added penalties, I feel Microsoft has given the people a tool that no one else could deliver, and with their help the economy has benefitted as well as Microsoft.

Alys Hinkle, 290 Adams Street, Lander, WY 82520
307-332-3756

MTC-00008307

From: Elaine Sipes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:20pm
Subject:

It is time that the government get off of Microsoft's back. I think that It is time that the government get off of Microsoft's back. I think that the states still trying to battle this issue are just trying to get a free hand out of cash. Thank God for Bill Gates, and the jobs that he has brought to the Pacific Northwest. It is time for the money grabbers in government to BACK OFF.

Elaine Sipes

MTC-00008308

From: Kupfer, Ellen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:24pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the proposed settlement. As research shows there is a significant gap along economic lines in availability of technology. 82% of the classrooms in richer communities are connected to the Internet while only 60% of the classrooms in lower income classrooms have access. Funds are tight in Wisconsin due to our revenue control law which limits the amount a school district can raise to fund education. In addition we have a huge budget deficit. Education is one area that is being talked about as a source of money to help balance the budget. Many schools need computers and Internet for their students. This would help them tremendously. Life is not a level playing field for many of our students. Their families cannot afford computers at home so school is the one place that they may have access to them and the help they bring. There is a huge world out

there that many would never know without the Internet.

Educators must be trained to use the technology so they can comfortably implement it in the classroom. It is the teacher in the classroom that most influences the student mastery and use of new knowledge. The component of teacher training is critical.

I hope that the court will support the goals as set forth in the settlement. If we truly are to leave no child behind we must give them all the tools they need to be successful.

Thank you for your time,
Ellen Kupfer
KEA, President
CC:weac.org

MTC-00008309

From: kirsten matson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE SETTLE THIS CASE!

ONLY IN AMERICA WOULD OUR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT GO AFTER THE ONE COMPANY WHO HAS DONE THE MOST TO DRIVE THE ECONOMY.

SHOW ME ANOTHER COMPANY WHO HAS CONTRIBUTED TO THE WORLD AS MUCH AS MICROSOFT.

I CAN'T BELIEVE HOW MANY YEARS THIS HAS BEEN ON GOING!
SINCERELY,
KIRSTEN
MATSON

MTC-00008311

From: Bill Brent
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 4:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the United States Government and the Justice Department to refrain from punishing Microsoft any further. Their actions do not warrant prosecution by the Justice Department under the antitrust laws. They have not coerced anyone. They are being punished simply for being better than their competitors.

Bill Brent
Writer
Portland, Oregon

MTC-00008312

From: Gloria Gottiaux
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should now be settled once and for all.

Gloria Gottiaux

MTC-00008313

From: GriffinF@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my extreme displeasure at the he proposed Microsoft Settlement. It is FAR TOO LENIENT!
Among the settlements obvious flaws are:
NO punishment for past behavior.
NO attempt to make them lose the spoils of their crimes

NOT leveling the competitive playing field enough Without stronger government intervention Microsoft will control the Instant Messaging and Media Player markets using same tactics they used in the Browser markets—UNFAIR BUNDLING.

Read the popular press! EVERY JOURNALIST FROM JUST ABOUT EVERY PUBLICATION AGREES THE SETTLEMENT DOES NOT GO FAR ENOUGH.

Sincerely
Michael A Fitzgerald
Alexandria, VA

MTC-00008314

From: Ralph Weil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:31pm
Subject: Microsoft
Please settle this problem with Microsoft and let us get back to the business of growing America stronger.
Ralph Weil

MTC-00008315

From: Jack C Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

I feel that the justice system is entirely wrong in allowing the legal action against Microsoft to continue. Not only has it taken money from taxpayers and shuffled it into the pockets of the attorneys but the public is suffering as a result of Microsoft not being able to develop new generation products.

PLEASE, stop this insanity and let the many schools profit from the receipt of the free computer systems that Microsoft has agreed to provide!

Jack C. Moore
330 Hollipat Center Drive, #18
Santa Barbara, California, 93111

MTC-00008316

From: Dixon Teter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs: As a U. S. citizen and as a consumer I am served extremely well by a free market. Your continued persecution of businesses and of Microsoft in particular is both economically and morally wrong. Without Mr. Gates brilliant creation: Microsoft, we all would be computing 20 years in the past. They compete by bring us ever more powerful computing tools and at ever less expensive prices. To viciously attack such a company—attacks begun and continued primarily out of petty jealousy, the inability to compete, and partisan politics—has cost the consumer dearly because Microsoft has been forced to waste incredible assets that could have been used to develop even more great products.

Your unwarranted attacks on Microsoft have cost hundreds of billions of dollars in wealth as the result of their causing the Stock Market to lose a tremendous amount of equity—in short you have contributed to the enormous slide in the entire sector of businesses that includes Microsoft.

Do the right thing and just drop it. Do our country and the economy a huge favor. Kindly desist.

Drop the suit without prejudice. This has a precedence in the past with the wrongful IBM suit. Be bold.

Sincerely,
Dixon Teter, Ph.D.

MTC-00008317

From: CRichner@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:37pm
Subject: (no subject)

I would like to write a letter saying Leave Microsoft alone, but please advise.

Carol Richner
A Fan of Bill Gates

MTC-00008318

From: Robert Lantz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Microsoft settlement
Robert J. Lantz

MTC-00008319

From: Joelle Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For nearly four years, this lawsuit has been dragging on. I believe that this settlement is absolutely a good thing and is in the public interest. It's tough on Microsoft, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. As a consumer, I overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for me, the industry and the American economy. Let's not prolong this litigation in the midst of uncertain economic times. The last thing this country needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation. Microsoft has never harmed consumers, all they've done is make great software and be a strong competitor. Microsoft's competitors are trying to waste our tax dollars by competing with Microsoft through the court systems, instead of having the courage to do it in the marketplace. I SUPPORT THIS SETTLEMENT! Let's move on, put an end to this case and spend my tax dollars on more worthy causes. Like ending terrorism!!! Thank you for giving me an opportunity to express my opinion.

Sincerely,
Joelle S. Thompson
San Clemente, CA

MTC-00008320

From: Poppopbax@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:42pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:
Further litigation is wasteful—let all parties involved except the current Judge's decision.

MTC-00008321

From: belob@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe the settlement made with Sicrosoft was fair & equitable. In our opinion, Microsoft has been instrumental in the advancement the use of technology which has led to our long bear market. Let things

stand as agreed, and encourage the other 9 states to drop the matter.

MTC-00008323

From: Kitkhan@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Will you people please do whatever it takes to settle the Microsoft litigation so that technology can continue to march forward in the 21st century. Four years ago I paid \$79.00 for Windows. Today I bought my 4th copy of Turbotax by Quicken—Total cost in 4 years = \$160.00. I consider Windows a huge consumer advantage when I can perform multiple tasks vs. Turbotax, double the money, for a limited capability. I do not believe you should open a case on Quicken, but any idiot who says Microsoft has not been consumer friendly is simply misinformed.

Walter Strain

MTC-00008324

From: Nolan Lameka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

I believe that the current settlement is fair for all parties. The dissident states seem to have political motives behind them rather than economic.

Nolan A Lameka

MTC-00008325

From: jimturke@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle it for drying-out-loud. The only reason the few want to drag it on is the "lawyers" want more case money—they don't give a hoot otherwise.

JKT

MTC-00008326

From: AlSirkin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:53pm
Subject: microsoft

I wish the government would just get this thing over with so Microsoft can keep delivering new products to us computer users and my shares will increase again. Fight terrorists not our best companies.

Alan Sirkin

MTC-00008327

From: d-dmiller(a)shaw.ca
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:58pm
Subject: Justice

I wish to request that the court consider the liberty that has been provided by the US Constitution and reach the only rational conclusion in the Microsoft judgement which is to accept that company's complete innocence. At this critical juncture of history, America must uphold liberty even more vigilantly. To judge against Microsoft would send another chill through business and entrepreneurial spirit in America. Do not eat the goose that lays the golden egg.

Dennis R. Miller
3938 Elsey Lane

Victoria BC V8X 5K1

MTC-00008328

From: MIPRESS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a writer and constant user of computer programs, I am ever so grateful to innovative companies such as Microsoft that have made my life so much easier, to say nothing of how much it has improved my work and that of millions of others. I am appalled at the attempt to tear down a company that has given the whole world so many better ways to operate and to communicate. Give me a break! If you have to spend your time in litigation of American companies, why not pick on the phony sleezeball outfits that target innocent citizens with get-rich and other bogus schemes. I applaud Microsoft and the rest of the world does too, or at least the rest of the "thinking" and hard-working world.

Judith Welsh,
Independent Journalist,
Miami, Florida

MTC-00008329

From: BALAR53@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is past time that the DOJ acted in the BEST interest of the USA and its citizens. The settlement signed off on is more than enough punishment for a case never should have been brought. No other country in this world is destructive to the inventions and intellectual property successes of its corporations. But for the grace of God, the USA has survived the misjudgments (like this one) by its government—that goes for antitrust as well as how we the people have been protected from enemies who would (and did) kill us. Let us not kill our own brilliant ideas anymore.

MTC-00008330

From: BRTSTAR1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:03pm
Subject: settlement

Dear Sirs:

I feel Microsoft should not be penalized for creating a great network that has benefited so many.

Many of his competitors are greedy and want his fame. Let Bill Gates and Microsoft go and let then invent many wonderful things to make life easy and safe.

Sincerely,
Valerie Rogers,
Louisville, KY

MTC-00008331

From: McCarthy, Kathleen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I live in Utah. I was told you were looking for opinions as Utah wants to pursue harsher punishment against Microsoft. My opinion is that my state should not try to pursue harsher punishment. I think they should just go with the current settlement and be done with it.

Spend my tax dollars on pursuing things like violent crimes.

Kathleen McCarthy
Citrix/Client Support
Admin Computing Services
University of Utah

MTC-00008332

From: marv matson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:06pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE APPROVE THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT AND LET THIS OUTSTANDING COMPANY LEAD US OUT OF THE DEPRESSION. EIGHT YEARS OF LITIGATION HAS COST EVERY AMERICAN WHO HAS A RETIREMENT PLAN TENS OF THOUSAND OF DOLLARS. ANY COUNTRY WOULD WELCOME MICROSOFT MOVING TO THEIR COUNTRY. LETS STOP THE LITIGATION AND LET MICROSOFT CONTINUE THE INNOVATION THAT DRIVES THE ECONOMY.
M.L.MATSON
TACOMA,WA

MTC-00008334

From: John Robert Hooten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
January 2, 2002
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN;
Please register my support for the proposed settlement of the Microsoft litigation. While I support the proposed settlement, I thought the entire litigation was absurd and a situation where certain competitors were successful in convincing the government that the government should try to even the playing field when the competition could not win by competition. The litigation should not have been commenced in the first place.

Like so many other so-called "senior citizens" (those over 65, I guess) before the Microsoft Windows program came out, I had no idea how to operate a computer or to even turn it on. After Windows came out, I found that operating a computer was easy for one who knows virtually nothing about computers.

Because of the ease of operating the computer brought about by Microsoft for the general public, the company should be given credit for helping the public rather than attempting to punish Microsoft for becoming successful and bringing the world of computers to people like me.

Do not let anyone convince you that Microsoft has done anything bad for the public because that is not true. The opposite is true. Now that the government and most states have agreed to settle the litigation, the settlement should be approved. The government should go about performing governmental functions and the competition should go about trying to make a better product for the public.

John Robert Hooten
P.O. Box 452
Oriental, N.C. 28571
Tel # 252-249-2015
cell # 252-526-1111

MTC-00008335

From: tomld@msn.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The damage that is being done to the US technical world position by the the lawsuit is terrible. Only the lawyers are making out. I can't believe the greed of the states and companies for not going along with the settlement.

Microsoft has done more for this country than any other technical company in the last 15 years. They should be rewarded for their contributions to the country and world. Please stop and consider how Microsoft software know-how has impacted every area of our lives. Where would we be today in the fields of medicine, engineering, economics, military and many others without the Microsoft. Also, please don't forget the the contributions Mr. Gates has made through his trust funds to various charitable organizations.

Sincerely,
Tom Dougherty

MTC-00008336

From: Lee Moulds
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:

I am disappointed to learn that the Microsoft Settlement may not go through. It has taken four years to reach this settlement, which appears to be fair to all parties concerned. Please do whatever is necessary to bring this matter to a conclusion so that "business" can move forward.

Thank you,
Mildred Lee Moulds,
Phoenix, MD

MTC-00008337

From: james newcomb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Settle it Now!! Enough already. Too much even!! Let's got on with free enterprise, the American way,
Etc. Quit wasting Tax dollars.. Thanks.
FED UP

MTC-00008338

From: dave rose
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Is Microsoft a monopoly? Not in the proper, derogatory, traditional sense of the term. Unlike the old AT&T Bell monopoly, or today's U.S Post Office monopoly, Microsoft did not gain its market share by having the government outlaw its competitors: Microsoft earned its position in the free-market. Give businessmen a break. It is the only way our country will progress. Why don't you attack the trial lawyers with the vigor you attack business?

David rose
5 ellen rd
Marblehead, MA

MTC-00008339

From: J Tanne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:13pm

Subject: Rejection of Microsoft Settlement
Honorable Attorney General, Members of the Department of Justice: I, my family, and many of my friends and business associates are extremely concerned over the lack of fortitude in the offer drawn between the Department of Justice and Microsoft Corporation. The proposed settlement does NOTHING to make repair to the damages done through years and years of unrestrained illegal behavior by Microsoft and its executives and will do NOTHING to level the playing field and bring competition to what was once a thriving industry. Even now as civil suits are being settled, Microsoft is walking away unscathed and in some instances planting the seeds for future market domination. Somehow the mistakes of the 1995 consent decree are dangerously close to being repeated. Please reconsider this settlement and reconstruct it to offer a REAL remedy to the Microsoft situation. Until a remedy which TRULY protects consumers and encourages competition can be reached keep, please the case alive and in pursuit of a suitable and practical remedy.

Regards,
James Tanne
190 N 980 E
Lindon, UT
84042

MTC-00008340

From: Tony Palumbo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:16pm
Subject: One additional Comment

As I've been reading through the proposed Microsoft settlement, I have yet to see (what I feel) is one of the most troubling issues. I refer to the fact that many web sites use Microsoft specific technology that allow only Windows users to access features on their sites.

On Yahoo, there are various stories that are available on Yahoos ON24 service. If you're an Apple (or Linux) user, you're told that only the windows operating system is supported. The other day I was at an auto shopping site and clicked a button to price a car. Once again I received a message saying "Your operating system is not supported by this site" If this type of behavior represented isolated instances, it wouldn't bother me, but it is becoming more prevalent on the internet. As an Apple user, I find this very annoying as well as highly discriminatory.

Basically I'm being told to get rid of my Apple and buy a PC if I want access. The whole concept of the internet is freedom. Microsoft has taken that from many of us I think any settlement should address these issues, by forcing companies (Microsoft specifically) to produce software that allows all internet users (regardless of operating system) to be granted the same access to all websites. I further believe that large corporations such as Yahoo, AOL and others be prevented from offering Widows only services. Only when specific services are available to all, should they be allowed to offer them.

I feel this will go a long way to putting a dent in Microsoft's monopolistic behavior
Thank you for your time
Sincerely,

prosecute one of the most successful and innovative corporations in the US! I therefore feel that the proposed settlement is more than fair and that the US government should find better witches to hunt.

Bill Weirich

Matrix Capital Markets Group, Inc.

11 South 12th Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Phone: (804) 780-0060

Fax: (804) 780-0158

E-mail:

bweirich@matrixcapitalmarkets.com

Web Site: www.matrixcapitalmarkets.com

MTC-00008350

From: BOLENDERJ@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:30pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's get back to innovating and producing by accepting the compromise settlement agreement. Lawyers are the only ones to gain by continuing to yak and yak.

James H. Bolender

MTC-00008351

From: Jim Furlong

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:32pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Can't we get on with things and settle. It's obvious to me that the States holding out for a bigger settlement all have business interests in seeing Microsoft hurt further (ie Utah, Oracle). Tell those states I wouldn't buy any of their winey products, just because they can't compete without a tilted playing field.

Please urge them to settle or you will throw them back to ground zero and dismiss all gains agreed to by the other states.
jimfurlong@hotmail.com

MTC-00008352

From: Steve Lussier

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:29pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I believe that the current Microsoft settlement is fair. Further action by the Federal Government as well as the 9 states who continue to fight Microsoft only serves to weaken an industry already battered by foreign competitors using unfair trade practices, an economic recession, major downturn in capital spending as well as other factors. Let's not turn the US's future competitive advantage in software and all-into today's electronics market dominated by Asian COUNTRIES and manufacturers. I'm the owner of a small business and the less Government interaction / intervention- in business (Federal-State-Local) the better off EVERYONE is.

Steve Lussier

President

Technico Inc

Warren Ohio

MTC-00008353

From: Alfred Petermann

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:31pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's about time that this matter is put to rest. For almost four years, DOJ has danced with industry advocates that are trying to succeed in the court of law because they fail daily in the enterprise markets. The people vote with their wallets and they support Microsoft products. Just imagine if the government were to improve its products annually, increase its service and features and then charge less every year for it. Will never happen, that's why government proponents are so desperate to derail Microsoft. How much damage can you guy do to our economy?

Alfred R. Petermann

SpiritMed

MTC-00008354

From: ronnie harris

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:36pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

microsoft settlement should be labeled "microsoft witch hunt"... microsoft has done nothing out of the ordinary for modern business practices...if microsoft is to be the goat for modern business procedures then every other big and middle sized businesses should be closed down...if this is what the witch hunters really want-then they are a bigger danger to our country than all the "outsider"...stop picking on the engines of our economy and let them compete with each other without government intervention...
thank you.

MTC-00008355

From: Sam Brown

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:39pm

Subject: just leave micro soft alone

THIS THING THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DOING TO MICRO SOFT IS A DISGRACE TO THE FOUNDING FATHERS OF THIS COUNTRY. I RECOMMEND THAT YOU PEOPLE JUST LEAVE THEM ALONE AND DROP ALL THE THINGS THAT ARE BUGGING YOU

EVERETT BROWN

MIAMI OK. 74354

MTC-00008356

From: AlexZakson@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:39pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Computing technology changes very rapidly. (I know I have been in computing for 40 years.) Dominant companies that do not keep up, or drop the ball find themselves in oblivion. You cannot blame the demise of DEC, Digital, Univac, NCR, and others on Microsoft.

Please Let Microsoft innovate. It's very important to computing. If others cannot keep up, penalizing Microsoft will not give them an advantage; it'll just hold the whole industry back.

Sincerely,

Alex Zakson

MTC-00008357

From: Foxisland3@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:41pm

Subject: RE: Microsoft Settlement

I am in total favor of the government settling its claim against Microsoft. In my opinion, I feel it was a bogus, costly, unjustifiable law suit. It would behoove the government to spend taxpayer money on more critical issues than going against a successful company that has done nothing but bring prosperity to this country. Someone in Washington, DC got greedy and a little sidetracked with special interest groups in its pursuit of Microsoft. It's time the Democrats worked for the good of this country and got off the political merry-go-round it so intently works to nourish.

Cheri Landers

MTC-00008358

From: David Stanley

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:40pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand the need to finish this case and move on, but should we do it without resolving anything? How many times does a company need to be taken to court for the same type of actions and each time be told to stop doing it? You're like the parents who say "No", but never back it up. No one learns from someone telling them, "Stop, and if you do it again, we're going to tell you to stop again!"

With Windows XP and the .NET strategy, it should be fairly obvious that Microsoft does NOT intend to stop anti-competitive practices. The .NET strategy alone is a complete step toward total domination on the internet. I can't imagine a world where Microsoft rules the net. This company can't even protect it's on servers from hackers and we're going to let them control commerce on the net?

If Microsoft had climbed into the position of being the dominant one because of better products or better business practices, that would be one thing. But, from the start, this company relied on lies and bullying to get where it is, and we just tell them to quit. Over and over again. As the world becomes even more dependent on the computer, we are only allowing Microsoft to completely monopolize the situation.

When you control 90% of the world's computers, you control competition. I don't care how competitive the tech world is, you can't compete with them.

When Microsoft integrates products into their operating systems, only Microsoft wins. Most users, and this is their own fault, see that program there and use it because it's already there for them. Why go out and get competitors products if you can get it free from Microsoft, even if it is an inferior product? It's like NBC trying to run ads on CBS, it's not going to happen and Microsoft knows this.

The problem also is that Microsoft knows that the government will not do anything about it. Why stop what got you to the top, if there are no consequences?

Thanks for your time,

David Stanley

MTC-00008359

From: Joanne Murray

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:42pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

We believe the settlement is fair and timely. With the present economic situation in the US, it is time to settle and get on with other issues that are more important right now, like homeland security and national defense against terrorism.

Sincerely,
Joanne & Jay Murray

MTC-00008360

From: dan dengel,m.d.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The lawsuit against Microsoft should be settled via the Tunney Act. Let's get on with our economy. There's been enough damaging litigation which is NOT helping the consumer!

Daniel M. Dengel M.D.

MTC-00008361

From: rdour
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft suit should be settled as quickly as possible with little damage to the Company. Microsoft has made a major contribution to American industry's productivity, and provided the home user with valuable tools.

The suit should never have been brought against the company.

Robert Dourian
9215 Shoshone Ave.
Northridge, Ca., 91325

MTC-00008362

From: Fergers@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern. As a strong supporter of Microsoft and the free Market system of the United States of America, I can't believe that in the year 2002, we still have 9 states still going after Microsoft. Don't these Attorney Generals have any thing else to do with there time. Maybe they should try getting a life instead of making a career going after Microsoft. If I were the governor of the 9 Attorney Generals I would fire all of them for wasting the peoples money. Maybe they should do there Job and go after real criminals instead of protecting Microsofts competitors like Sun Microsystems and that idiot larry elison from oricle who everytime you see him on TV bashes microsoft. I would love to know maybe 5 or 10 years from now when these Attorneys leave office who the ex Attorney Generals work for or represent in there practices. Would it be a surprise or not to see them hook with one of these Companies. Only time will tell. Maybe someone should watch them as hard as Microsofts Competitors watch Microsoft when they leave office.

Sincerely
John Redgrave

MTC-00008363

From: SUE HAMILTON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom It may Concern
Please leave Microsoft alone. They have done wonders for our country. Do not stifle their new innovative spirit! How can this be a monopoly, when Bill Gates and company have done everything from square one. The did not buy out or take over any other company; as the oil companies are doing. Please let them alone and let them go about their business of making our lives easier.
Sue Hamilton

MTC-00008364

From: Sam Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:47pm
Subject: just leave micro soft alone

THIS THING THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DOING TO MICRO SOFT IS A DISGRACE TO THE FOUNDING FATHERS OF THIS COUNTRY. I RECOMMEND THAT YOU PEOPLE JUST LEAVE THEM ALONE AND DROP ALL THE THINGS THAT ARE BUGGING YOU PEOPLE. I RELIVE THAT WITHOUT PRIVATE ENTERPRISE THIS COUNTRY IS GOING TO GO DOWN THE TUBES.

SO GET OUT THE BUSINESS OF TRYING TO RUN EVERYONES BUSINESS. START TO FIX THE HIGHWAYS OF THIS GREAT COUNTRY AND GET OUT OF THE BUSINESS WORLD BUSINESS.

MTC-00008365

From: Gary Herbert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:50pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Further litigation by either the Justice Dept. or by the states is like a dog chasing cars. There is nothing to be gained! The settlement is fair to all parties. The competitors have had their day in court and now it's time to move on.

The consumer is having it's say by continuing to purchase Microsoft products.

Gary Herbert
herbert@madnet.net

MTC-00008366

From: Rossulus@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:51pm
Subject: (no subject)

Enough hassle has been given to Microsoft. The ruling was fair and for all concerned this legal nonsense should cease.

Jane Ross

MTC-00008367

From: Mumsy37@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Department of Justice:

Please let Microsoft get on with their company business. Enough is enough. I feel all of us need to get on with the business of this country. I am hopeful that Microsoft and others may develop systems to help us ferret out the evil people who are trying to kill us and destroy our country. They can't do this while fighting for their very being, let alone the cost of lawsuits. I hope you will do whatever is necessary to encourage the states still trying for more punishment to cease actions.

God Bless America. She needs everyone to join the fight and not be fighting each other. Thank you.

Janet Munson
Corpus Christi, TX

MTC-00008368

From: Joseph McCallion
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlepeople,
I HOPE IN THE INTEREST OF ALL CONCERNED THAT THIS WHOLE ISSUE WILL BE PUT TO REST. I FEEL THAT THE ATTORNEYS GENERAL OF THE VARIOUS STATES WHO WANT TO FURTHER THIS CASE SHOULD BE REPRIMANDED. IT IS TIME TO END THIS TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE AND MOVE ON. MICROSOFT HAS BEEN AN INNOVATIVE COMPANY AND SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED FOR ITS SUCCESS. I OWN A SMALL AMOUNT OF MICROSOFT STOCK AND HAVE BEEN HURT BY THIS SUIT BECAUSE THIS ACTION HAS DRIVEN DOWN THE PRICE OF THE STOCK. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

SINCERELY,
JOSEPH McCALLION

MTC-00008369

From: trialawyer@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I support the Microsoft Settlement with the Federal Government. This costly litigation should end with this fair settlement. The cost is to the America People as well as to Microsoft.

Sincerely yours,
Jonathan M. Murdoch-Kitt
3217 Chamberlayne Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23227-4806

MTC-00008370

From: coolcraw@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:57pm
Subject: DOJ:

DOJ:
Why aren't these State attorney generals at the airport?? These are the real criminals. If you want to take on a monopoly, take on OPEC.

C> Kapikian

MTC-00008371

From: Jeane Harkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this now the way it has been proposed. The current proposal seems very fair to all parties concerned. At this time we should be concerned with other problems on the home front not this one.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jeane

MTC-00008372

From: Denny1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Gentlemen:

Free enterprise was attacked by the Clinton Democrats when they filed charges against Microsoft. A company that has done more to encourage the economy than any other organization in our lifetime.

If there had to be a settlement, giving to schools, equipment needed to advance the knowledge of young folks, is terrific. Mr. Gates is truly a giver and this just adds to his consideration of others.

Denny DeVries

MTC-00008373

From: DearKata@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:01pm

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I'm totally IN FAVOR of Mr. Gates & Microsoft & its innovative & creative products to help better our lives. LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE to use its time to continue to do this.

Please do not waste their time in court in the name of "justice" ... it is NOT justice to stifle the minds of brilliant people working for a brilliant company producing goods which we all buy to enhance our endeavors. This IS a free Country ... so let them be free to continue to innovate.

Thanks,
Kata Patton

MTC-00008374

From: MARK JADEED

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:03pm

Subject: microsofy

To whom it may concern, We feel that the current settlement between Microsoft and DOJ is fair. We hope that this would end the dispute and would give a chance for our high tech economy to recover and lead the world the way it was before litigation.

sincerely,
mark jadeed

MTC-00008375

From: Janet Tashima

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:05pm

Subject: msft settlement

I live in silicon valley. I feel a lot of the companies who have made this action against microsoft have just had inferior technology and they want to use their political position to have the government help them be competitive. I do not think that is the role of government. The companies that have the best tech will win, and that is the best thing for customers in the long run.

I also own a lot of other tech stocks and I feel that the justice dept action against Microsoft started the downturn in the tech econ and the stock market. All one has to do is view the charts of the tech stocks. I think companies such as Oracle and Sun are so blinded by their jealousy of Gates, that they are willing to let the whole tech econ suffer. They seem to not even care if their own companies have taken a major hit. I guess why should they care, they are not just a worker in their company and they are billionaires even if the stock takes a tumble. They do not want to acknowledge that a multi million dollar action against one tech company is harmful to tech in general. It is

time to move on and get rid of the excesses of the past administration.

Yours,

Janet Tashima 408-243-8424

MTC-00008376

From: LTP3801@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:04pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a citizen grateful for innovative and useful products bringing tax revenue at home and abroad, I hope the settlement tentatively arrived at regarding Microsoft will be upheld and the matter finally brought to conclusion so that the time, energy and resources of Microsoft AND the government can be more usefully employed.

There are competitive forces working in the economy and the time has come for them to be the determinants.

Very truly yours,
Lydia T. Pfund
Highland Beach, Florida

MTC-00008377

From: NMorgan296@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:05pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I urge that steps be taken to ensure that the negotiated settlement with Microsoft proceed to conclusion without undue delay. The settlement is the best resolution of the litigation and any steps to derail the settlement should be strongly resisted.

Neil and Debbie Morgan

MTC-00008378

From: Carole Joy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:38pm

Subject: Lawsuit

I am 100% in favor of microsoft being able to make and keep control of their own products. I think Microsoft invented it and should make the profit for it and be able to retain it as their own product. Other companies can make their own products.

Carole Joy

MTC-00008379

From: geno284@juno.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:08pm

Subject: Microsoft

I AM 100% BEHIND THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT AND WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO PASS THE LAW AND STOP HARASSING A COMPANY THAT IS THE VERY BEST AT WHAT IT DOES!

EUGENE T. YOUNG
23 CHAPEL HILL DRIVE
ROCHESTER, NY 14617

MTC-00008380

From: Heidar E-Mail

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 5:58pm

Subject: microsoft litigation

Dear Sirs,

I would like to register my opinion and frustration that there continues to be delays in reaching a full settlement in the Microsoft case. It is long overdue that we put this matter behind us and move on.

Continuous harassment of this company only serves to impede its progress in giving us better technology and this acts as a drag on the U.S. economy. So, settle and move on. We have better things to do than this.

Helgi Heidar

MTC-00008381

From: Keith Steensma

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:10pm

Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust

I am a shareholder of both Microsoft and Compaq stock. And as such, I should be very interested in seeing Microsoft operate (and make profits) un-hindered by any barriers. The fact is the what is good for Microsoft (and the other companies, like Compaq, that rely on Microsoft) is good for the nation.

The is definitely not how I feel. I was a small businessman during the late 1980's and all of 1990's and felt the impact that (the infamous) WalMart had in our community. What was good for WalMart was not good for me. Eventually, we closed the store because we couldn't compete. My business was impacted by WalMart, but it was also impacted by the actions of Microsoft. Our business had supported Atari, Netscape, and IBM, and depended on the 'alternatives' that these companies offered. Needless to say, as these companies failed in there quest to be an alternative, our business suffered. I believe that Microsoft has acted improperly. I have read all of the documents (concerning this case) that have been released by the courts. I was stunned to read some of the actions that were taken (by Microsoft) to 'make sure' a certain company or product failed. I believe that Microsoft needs to change the way they do business. And I don't believe that this will happen unless the company is severely sanctioned and regulated. I believe that the agreement that the government has reached with Microsoft is a joke and is an insult to my belief in my government. Please look at all the aspects of this case and arrive at a more 'real' settlement of this case.

Keith Steensma
Jacksonville, Arkansas

MTC-00008382

From: warren

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:11pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi. I am writing to express my displeasure at the proposed "settlement" between the Dept of Justice and Microsoft. Not only does it NOT halt the illegal, anti-trust activities of Microsoft, but in some cases actually promotes Microsoft (ie. allowing them to flood the schools with free software).

Hopefully the unfairness of this proposed settlement will be recognized and dealt with accordingly by the courts.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my point of view.

—Warren Friedman
Fairfax, California

MTC-00008383

From: miburt

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:10pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off of Microsoft's back. You have already spent too much of the taxpayer's money in trying a bum cause. Quit wasting our money and let Microsoft continue to give us better products for less money as they have in the past. Find some more important things to do.

Doris & Burt Shearer

MTC-00008384

From: Michael E. Warren
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is reasonable and that continued litigation serves no purpose except to increase legal fees and burnish the reputation of political office seekers.

Indeed, although Microsoft may effectively have a monopoly on certain software products, they have gained this by producing quality products at a reasonable price to the great benefit of the general public. I have made it a point to use the software of many competing companies before migrating to Microsoft products, and unfortunately found them to be lacking in effectiveness.

Microsoft has succeeded largely because they built a better mouse. I hate to see competition stifled, but I also hate to see the government stifle innovation.

Where were all the DoJ lawyers when Kenneth Lay and his team were taking the public on a very expensive ride with Enron? Maybe if Bill Gates and company had been as effusive with political donations as they have been with charitable donations, Microsoft might not have had to face this purgatory.

Mike Warren
Gainesville, FL

MTC-00008385

From: Joanie Garborg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the court to accept the settlement reached between Microsoft, the federal government and nine states. I believe that the settlement is just and fair. This case has dragged on too long already and this is the best way to resolve it.

Joanie Garborg

MTC-00008386

From: Park31825@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I strongly believe the settlement against Microsoft recently is just and fair. Let all accept it and get on with our lives

Mr.I.E.Park
2417 Vining St.
Bellingham, Wa.98226
360-734-1589

MTC-00008387

From: Eric Lanser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The anti-trust laws are of dubious constitutionality. They are more a-kin to a

"government of men" than to the stated American ideal of a "government of laws." They do NOT treat all equally before the law (i.e. the successful). Finally, the laws violate the rights of the successful in favor of any mistaken and short-sighted voice of the "consumer interest." The anti-trust laws' dubious constitutionality is one of the primary reasons why they ultimately hurt consumers more than help them.

Ignoring the question of the rights to dispose of one's property in any way one wishes, another issue is at stake as well. The very existence of Microsoft and would-be corporations like it is greatly hindered by the presence and enforcement of the anti-trust laws. If Bill Gates had not ever existed, the world today would literally be a very different place. I'm not speaking of any sort of "It's a Wonderful Life" scenario here, but one of even greater importance. One where a single man has affected billions of people in a greatly positive way. Bill Gates provided the world with a vastly more efficient and effective platform than any other in existence. American people, and American corporations responded by purchasing it in vast numbers. Without Windows, the computer age would have, at best, been delayed a number of years. Although alternative platforms do exist, nearly every major company in the United States (and the world) uses some version of Windows on its machines. An office-place without computers would seem a strange site today, but it would be much more common without Bill Gates' actions.

Among the many successes of Windows is its integration of multiple applications smoothly and effectively. Incorporating Internet Explorer into windows served as a terrific convenience to purchasers of windows. It saved consumers not only the money to buy the program but also the shipping time of some alternative browser to their house, school, or business.

The entire reason Microsoft is being victimized by the anti-trust laws is because its business practices have been so successful, it products so vital, and its impact on America and the world so great. Microsoft should be held up as a model to emulate and Bill Gates as a hero and innovator of our times. By punishing the successful precisely because they have done what they have done in the most efficient, innovative, and profitable ways is beyond impractical; it is immoral.

The direct implications of penalizing Microsoft would mean one of a number of things (or some combination thereof): a. Layoffs at Microsoft; b. Higher prices for Windows and other software; c. Fewer innovations in the software field. Any voice of the "public" or "consumer interest" should not overlook the simple fact that a hefty fine on Microsoft will NOT come out of Bill

Gates pockets (nor should it), but ultimately out of the pockets of the "public" or consumers themselves. Even if no fine is involved, losses in profit (not to mention the costs to Microsoft for defending itself at trial) will have the same affects on prices/labor/innovation. In the long run, if Microsoft is penalized for its successful business

practices, it will forever be an example to future would-be innovators. Without Bill Gates and his would-be equals, no stimulus package in the world would be able to propel this economy or any other at the rate it has been growing since the early nineties. Without innovation in the computer field, or any other, the standard of living of the United States would stagnate, productivity would cease to rise, and every human being in the United States would suffer the consequences—from the highest paid CEO (who would see his portfolio crumble and his own business stagnate) to every factory worker (who would cease to have increases in pay do to rises in productivity).

Most of all the consumers would suffer. They would have far fewer quality products coming to market. The new products that would, against all odds, come to market would be at higher prices and/or of lower quality than they would otherwise be. Once again, I urge any speaker for "the public good" or the "consumer interest" to take a look at the ultimate (and even immediate) consequences of penalizing the successful for doing exactly what they do best, providing the public with innovations, improvements, and quality products at low prices. The whole spirit of the United States was that of a nation in which great minds and average minds alike could live and think as they pleased—a symbol to the world of what the human mind and human self-interest could do for man and the world if he were left free.

MTC-00008388

From: keithgarborg@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I urge the court to accept the settlement reached between Microsoft, the federal government and nine states. I believe that the settlement is just and fair. This case has dragged on too long already and this is the best way to resolve it.

Keith Garborg

MTC-00008389

From: Patricia Andrews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It seems to me that the case against Microsoft has gone on long enough and that it would in the nation's best interest to finalize the settlement. With everything that is going on in the world, why don't we free up the bright minds of our country to focus on improving all of our lives as I feel Microsoft has done and continues to do. If the competitors of Microsoft spent as much time and money on their ideas and products as they are spending on this long, drawn-out litigation, they would probably be more successful in the business world.

Pat Andrews
145 Scottsdale Square
Winter Park, FL 32792
Phone: 407-718-5184
Fax: 407-644-9951
E-mail: patandrews38@hotmail.com

MTC-00008390

From: Judy Tallman
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 6:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Folks,

I strongly believe that the proposed settlement is fair and just to all parties. I highly recommend that the settlement be approved. It is time for us to allow Microsoft get back to the business of developing software. The first judge could not have been computer literate or he would not have made some of the comments if what was printed was indeed what was stated. For anyone like myself who has been using computers since mainframes and 300 baud modems were state of the art, many of the charges against MS are totally ridiculous.

I have nothing but admiration for Mr. Gates both in his business practices and in his personal life. I checked the charities that MS support and they are very thoughtful and oriented towards helping children and schools especially. To me, this whole fuss seems to be all about lawyers trying to get more MS money for themselves.

Let's please let MS supply the kids with computers and get on with business.

Happy Trails,
Judy Tallman
Dancing Horses, Inc.
www.dancinghorses.com

MTC-00008391

From: Bryan DeBois
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: Please allow Microsoft to settle with the United States!! This judicial farce has gone on long enough, and wasted far too much of the tax-payers' money. It is high time that the Department of Justice give a vote of confidence for the consumers and their ability to think for themselves, instead of allowing large Microsoft competitors to whisper in justices' ears. We are on the brink of a new year, under a new administration, it is time to let it go.

Sincerely,
Bryan DeBois
debois@uakron.edu
Senior, Computer Science Major
The University of Akron

MTC-00008392

From: Melvin Henderson-Rubio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For the record, I need to state that I am a long-term Microsoft employee (over 15 yrs). Obviously, I have been aware of the current case filed by the DOJ and number of states as well as the settlement reached with DOJ and several states.

It goes without saying that I have never fully grasped the justification for the case nor similar cases filed earlier along the same grounds. I am well aware that our competitors have been and will continue to use the legal system and public option to try and accomplish what they have failed to in the marketplace, develop and market some of the best software in the industry.

As taxpayer, not only in my residing state of Washington (which I'm glad to see our

Attorney General opted not to join in on the case) and as a US tax payer, I fail to understand what the DOJ and states see as the benefit to consumers and the use tax dollars to fund such investigation, beyond a reasonable review. What did and what do these states really think they are doing to assist their citizens? As a consumer, if I do not want Microsoft products pre-installed on my system, I can remove them and replace with other products. Similar to what happens when I purchase a car. If I do not like the radio I pay purchase one after market and the same goes for wheels or tires. There is a huge after-market for these items. Similarly there are options in the high-tech industry, but the vast majority of consumers are okay with an "industry standard." Currently it's Microsoft, in the early days of the pc, it was Apple, and someday it will be someone else. If you look at history, first it was the Chinese, Greeks and Egyptians, then French, Dutch, Spanish and British who ruled the world. In recent times, the Russians and now the US. History takes care of things.

As a consumer and watching the growth of the pc industry for more than 15 years, Microsoft along with industry partners such as: Intel and major pc companies (including Apple to some degree) have done more to stimulate the pc industry and economy overall than any other sequence of innovations in US or for that matter, contemporary world economy. I equate that Microsoft (along with Intel) has done for the pc and high tech industry what McDonald's has and continues to do for the "fast-food" industry; Disney for the concept of amusements and family entertainment; Starbucks for the coffee industry and CNN for 24 Hour News.

Yes, Microsoft has been extremely aggressive when it comes to getting it's product into the marketplace, but not any more than a sports franchise looking to win the Super Bowl or NBA Title. Just image had the DOJ and states outside of Illinois and/or Texas and California opted to oppose the Bulls, Cowboys or 49'ers from winning as many world titles as they have.

It should not be the role of the government to pick and choose winners and losers, nor overly support the lobbying efforts by competitors to try and level the marketplace. Over the years Microsoft has seen numerous opportunities and markets to pursue and set clear-cut objectives to enter those markets. I do not recall Microsoft asking the DOJ or various states Attorney Generals to keep displace or slow-down the efforts of: Lotus (1-2-3) or Word-Perfect or other industry leaders. Microsoft has not always been successful, there was Microsoft Bob and the failed merge with Quicken. Numerous current Microsoft and industry standards took several attempts, such as: MS-DOS; Microsoft Windows to become industry standards; the Microsoft Mouse was major undertaking and the Microsoft Office Suite took years to become the standard.

As a consumer, I can go into any store and with Microsoft Windows being the world-wide standard; I have 10's of thousands of applications, games and accessories to choose from. Prior to Microsoft becoming the standard (pre-Ms-DOS days), there were no

where near the selection. Each app or game had a few choices, because developers and distributors did not know or what to risk developing and distributing for an operating system that might not be well received. Microsoft has without a doubt created and huge high-tech industry (again, long with key partners such as Intel) and stimulated the US economy more than any other company in US history.

It is somewhat ironic that a number, if not most of our competitors usually solely develop and support their applications to the Microsoft Windows standard. The vast majority of their developers use the Microsoft Windows standard, so do their techs support folks and sales and marketing forces. Without such a dominate operating system, our competitors would have to decided and divide their resources into 2-3 different focus areas. The same applies and more so related to the development of independent applications and services.

Not agreeing in the first place the lawsuit has merit, I am in agreement with the proposed settlement. Students and teachers, especially in lower-income areas will need to make sure they are prepared and able to compete in the marketplace as well as various careers. For the foreseeable future, Microsoft products and services will remain the world-wide industry standard (that is not to say that some other company will not displace Microsoft).

CC:Melvin Henderson-Rubio

MTC-00008393

From: Johnson, Daniel 1.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I recommend that the Court require in its remedy, in addition to the stipulations already provided (located at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm> and <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9500/9549.htm>), that: Microsoft be required to include compliance with relevant industry-standard, publicly available interconnectivity protocols and file formats in all software products, and provide these as the installed defaults. This does not forbid Microsoft from offering enhanced protocols as well, as options, but to foster competition. Microsoft must be required to make publicly available all technical details of "enhanced" or customized formats and protocols so that competitors can ensure interconnectivity.

Microsoft be required to demonstrate compatibility of OS and software with these standards. Microsoft must not "extend" any independent formats, protocols or standards unilaterally. Microsoft be not permitted to engage in deceptive marketing practices misrepresenting the strengths of MS software and OS's and the weakness of competitors'.

Industry groups exist for many standards; these tend to be dominated by leading vendors. With regard to this Action, it is important that Microsoft and its client firms not be permitted to dominate standards groups' membership for a period of years. Microsoft should be required, for a period of several years, to seek extensions of these standards only as part of industry consortia and that it and its client firms are forbidden dominate numerically.

I understand that these may seem to be too broad; it is not, for all "connectivity technology is "middleware." Details and rationale for why this action is appropriate to this case follow below. This recommendation is essentially an enhancement of Section III. E.

Respondent:

Daniel L. Johnson, MD
Red Cedar Clinic, Ltd.
Mayo Health System
Menomonie, WI 54751
johnson.danl@mayo.edu

Respondent's background:

Profession: general internal medicine since 1978
Experience relative to this case: I've been a user of microcomputers since 1980; an "occasional" amateur software developer of word processing software 1982-1988; I have monitored the microcomputer and medical software arenas, as a consumer and an interested spectator, since 1983. I have experience with Apple computers and IBM PC's, and have used all versions of MS-DOS or PC-DOS through PC-DOS 7.0, Windows 3.10 through Windows XP, and Linux OS from Red Hat 5.0 through 7.2 (the current version). I am a knowledgeable non-professional with no vocational stake in software or operating systems.

Limitations:

I do not have the time to document the factual basis for the observations and conclusions I offer below, due to the demanding time constraints of my job as a physician and due to other personal commitments. I regret this, and would simply point out that this factual basis has been well documented within industry publications (often indirectly, however) and on the internet. None of my judgments are based on private information except perhaps some of my knowledge about excess costs to the health care industry due to the effects of Microsoft's monopoly on desktop operating systems and software.

Reason for responding:

I am concerned about the continued non-competitive situation in the microcomputer software industry because I have observed that Microsoft has used its market and public relations power destructively; to stifle competitive innovation, to indirectly hinder production and sales of needed custom-built software, to destroy, in several ways, many small companies whose expertise and software tools have not been replaced; the result has been to place inefficiency burdens on consumer businesses generally.

It places inefficiency burdens on consumer businesses in two ways: First, the severe security flaws in Windows operating systems and Microsoft's Outlook and Word software (which also have monopoly strength in the their markets) have slowed operation of the Internet, cause repeated system crashes that harm companies' businesses, and expose confidential personal data via software cracking.

Second, Microsoft is using its monopoly position to raise license fees and restrict license terms in ways that create harmful fiscal burdens on companies dependent on their OS and applications, burdens that would not exist if there were actually competition. This is creating financial

inefficiency in the business sector generally, and in health care in particular—because we are finding that software vendors, whose software has run well on non Microsoft platforms, are wholesale porting this software to Windows out of fear of being left outside the monopoly, resulting in uncontrollable increases in license fees and in hardware costs to users. It is useful to contrast Microsoft's use of its monopoly markets and Intel's. Intel also enjoys monopoly power, but it has not been able prevent competition: first Cyrix and now AMID have been able to provide satisfactory alternatives to Intel (although some would argue that Intel as done its best to destroy both competitors, with significant although incomplete success).

The COMPETITIVE IMPACT STATEMENT says: "On May 18, 1998, the United States filed a civil antitrust Complaint alleging that Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft"), the world's largest supplier of computer software for personal computers, restrained competition in violation of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. ?? 1-2..... The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, which found that Microsoft violated both Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act The Proposed Final Judgment will provide a prompt, certain and effective remedy for consumers by imposing injunctive relief to halt continuance and prevent recurrence of the violations of the Sherman Act by Microsoft that were upheld by the Court of Appeals and restore competitive conditions to the market." I am convinced, based on my extended observation of the computer industry in this country, that the proposed Final Judgment will NOT provide a remedy that is effective, certain or prompt in restoring competition to the markets in which Microsoft has a monopoly position because it does not adequately take into account the manifold and pervasive means that have been used by Microsoft to achieve and maintain its monopoly position.

Rationale:

First, the remedies only address middleware (because the Complaint addresses middleware). Unfortunately for prospect of a remedy that is either "certain" or "effective" in restoring competition to the desktop computer industry, middleware is only a small though important factor. It will not be possible to restore competition by addressing middleware alone. Microsoft has successfully created for itself monopoly positions in operating systems for pc's email programs word processing programs spreadsheet programs browsers ("middleware") other less "significant" market areas By "monopoly position" I mean that potential competitors can survive only by offering software that mimics the operations and functionality of Microsoft software; Microsoft continually changes their software's specifications and file formats to prevent this, and to make their own earlier versions incompatible with files created by new versions, forcing users to abandon the software both of competitors and of Microsoft in order to be able to interchange documents efficiently.

Microsoft does not have monopoly positions in server operating systems

database software programming languages mail service internet protocols file/directory management customized software This does not obviate Microsoft's monopoly position in all the other software areas that it already dominates.

Microsoft understands that the most important key to complete dominance of the software industry is by controlling "connectivity"—sharing of documents, images, email, data, and directories. I will not expand this response with details; I will simply say that Microsoft is attempting to gain control of every area that it does not now dominate; the only area that seems relatively safe from monopolistic control right now is large databases. In every other area Microsoft has in place either technological programs or marketing programs that have some reasonable likelihood of controlling markets or technology or both.

As I have observed the evolution of the desktop-computer market during the last 21 years, it has been rare for Microsoft to gain competitive advantage by itself producing a functionally or technically superior product. MS-DOS was a badly designed operating system that happened to enjoy the imprimatur of IBM and the advantage of open computer architecture. Microsoft purchased the leading email software vendor; it waited for the word processing market to mature, then imitated the best of what was available from multiple competitors, and made Word the "best" by preventing competitors from learning how to make their own software work well with upcoming versions of Microsoft operating systems until Microsoft had completed its own work on Word, guaranteeing that the competition would always be "behind" on the dominant OS. It did the same thing with Excel, its spreadsheet program.

It was not able to do this with Netscape, and so it behaved in a variety of destructive ways that are well documented in the trial proceedings. In general, I can identify four ways in which Microsoft has stifled competition: by purchasing its competition by inviting its competition to consider being purchased, examining their software technically, and then duplicating their software engineering while abandoning the proposed acquisition on one or another technicality. through a consistent pattern, since about 1990, of false and misleading advertising that inflates falsely the strengths of Microsoft software and denying its faults or limitations while falsely slandering the strengths of competitive versions and emphasizing their faults and limitations. By claiming to adopt industry standards when offering software for which "connectivity" is important, but actually departing from those standards in the implementation, meaning that the output of these programs is not actually "portable" or exchangeable. (By "actually" I mean that it is not feasible within pragmatic limitations of time, effort, and money, not that it is conceptually impossible.)

I may be argued that these actions of Microsoft have not always been successful, but these instances of failure do not imply that Microsoft has failed to leverage their

monopoly position; moreover, it has attempted to do so in every conceivable way. The effects of this monopoly, as I've noted above, are financial inefficiency and operational inefficiency. Microsoft is now using its monopoly position to squeeze its business licensees (users) financially by raising license fees, requiring software upgrades, limiting user rights and otherwise restricting licenses.

In general, it is true that Microsoft operating systems, in comparison to other operating systems (Unix versions, Linux, OS/2, Macintosh, BeOS) are more prone to crashes, are more susceptible to security breakdowns and breaches, and do not run as efficiently on hardware (computers), entailing financial inefficiency for users who must purchase additional servers and spend more money on energy. My understanding is that in general, Microsoft operating systems require about twice the expenditure for electricity and for computers as alternatives. In addition, software vendors are burdened with the inefficiency of having to convert software to Windows because of the real threat to their businesses from not having Windows versions.

Microsoft will argue that to restrain its practices is to stifle technological improvement. It will point to specific instances in which its software performs better than other choices. But the existence of such specific instances of superiority does not imply that its software is generally superior in performance or in design; furthermore, even if this were true, Microsoft's practices effectively destroy competition and enhance its monopoly powers; this defect is more important to efficient commerce than the relatively small technical superiorities it points to. Restoration of competition.

In my judgment it will not be possible, by any fiat a court is capable of issuing, to "promptly" restore competition to the market, as the Competitive Impact Statement proposes. At most, the court may be able to hinder Microsoft's destructive practices sufficiently to permit genuine competition to emerge by establishing a competitive environment. Because the future of computing lies in interconnectivity of machines and exchange of data and communications, the only way to free our commercial society from monopolistic domination by Microsoft or any similar entity is to mandate that in all its operating systems and software applications, Microsoft supply, as defaults, file formats, directory handling, encryption methods, data-handling protocols, and other technology important in interconnectivity that are publicly available and conform to consensus industry standards.

Conclusion (reprise): Thus I am recommending that the court require, in its remedy, that: Microsoft be required to include compliance with relevant industry-standard, publicly available interconnectivity protocols and file formats with all software, and provide these as the installed defaults. This does not forbid Microsoft from offering enhanced protocols as well, as options, but to foster competition, Microsoft must be required to make publicly available all

technical details of "enhanced" or customized formats and protocols so that competitors can ensure interconnectivity.

Microsoft be required to demonstrate compatibility of OS and software with these standards.

Microsoft be not permitted to "extend" any independent formats, protocols or standards unilaterally. Microsoft be not permitted to engage in deceptive marketing practices misrepresenting the strengths of MS software and OS's and the weakness of competitors' Industry groups exist for many standards; these tend to be dominated by leading vendors. With regard to this Action, it is important that Microsoft and its client firms not be permitted to dominate standards groups' membership for a period of years. Microsoft be required, for a period of several years, to seek extensions of these standards only as part of industry consortia and that it and its client firms are forbidden dominate numerically.

MTC-00008394

From: Warmenup@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:20pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

As a consumer please note that i agree that a settlement in the Microsoft case is good for both the consumer, the industry and the American economy.

Please get on with it.
Thank you
Meredith St Pierre
Boca Raton, FL

MTC-00008396

From: Billie R Cox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:27pm
Subject:

It is beyond my understanding why the government wants to waste the money It is beyond my understanding why the government wants to waste the money of the tax payer to try to destroy Microsoft through senseless litigation when Microsoft has done so much for the economy of the United States by creating jobs.

Billie Cox

MTC-00008397

From: Stefan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:29pm
Subject: Thoughts on MS settlement

Dear sir or madam:

I am a U.S. Citizen, a long-time computer user and am appalled by the Department of Justice's proposal to give Microsoft a monopoly in education by allowing them to donate Windows-based computers, the bane of computing, to poorly-funded schools in the country. This proposal is a shame and travesty of justice. Microsoft has acted illegally time and again, thus, it clearly is not just nor in the public's best interest to reward their illegal and predatory behavior with such a largess. While I am not an Apple Computer stock holder, I favor the counter proposal submitted to the Department of Justice by Apple's CEO Mr. Steven Jobs.

Sincerely,
Stefan Ingannamorte
Apopka, FL

MTC-00008398

From: JNWGOLF@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please be advised that I believe that the settlement agreed to between the Department of Justice and Microsoft is fair and reasonable to the consumer and is in the public interest.

It is time for everyone involved to get on with being concerned about innovation, creativity, and doing constructive things to help stimulate the economy. It is necessary for this matter to be resolved for the benefit of the consumer, Microsoft's stockholders, and for all the companies that do business with Microsoft. Needless to say, I encourage the Court to approve the settlement agreed to between Microsoft, the nine states, and the Department of Justice.

Jerome N. Weinberg

MTC-00008399

From: Max Burford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft case

It's my feeling that the Microsoft case ruling by the court of appeals should be final.

Quite dragging it out.
Max O. Burford
burford@ccountry.net

MTC-00008400

From: Geo and Steven Mayes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The government should have stayed out of this in the first place. Microsoft should be able to do business without being manacled by the government.

George Mayes
Lamay@quixnet.net

MTC-00008401

From: Rees31@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the proposed government settlement with Microsoft which I think is fair to all concerned. Microsoft is a significant investment in my personal retirement fund which I will need to supplement social security when I retire in

March, 2003.
Rees Himes
31 Sylvan Road North
Westport, CT 06880

MTC-00008402

From: Steve (038) Pam Lock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies/Gentlemen:

We are extremely hopeful and pleased that the Microsoft case may finally be settled. We feel very strongly that it is in the best interest of both the economy and the country—especially in light of recent events—that this settlement proceed to completion.

In this critical time we feel the DOJ should turn its attention and spend its taxpayer funds on the security of this country. We feel

spending any more of tax payers money or DOJ time and energy on this case would not bring any further benefit to us the consumer or to our country.

Thank you for your time in reading this and we continue to be hopeful that this matter will finally come to a close.

Sincerely,
Steven and Pamela Lock
1580 SE Pioneer Way
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

MTC-00008403

From: Ying, Xingren
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the case! U.S. economy and HiTech cannot afford this endless lawsuit. Let's compete in the market not in the court. Even Microsoft competitors can kill MS in the court. But the consumer will be the loser also. We will pay the higher price to buy the software and the leadership of software industry will transfer to other country.

So, please settle. We just want Microsoft behave better, not to kill it.
Xingren

MTC-00008404

From: Chance Yohman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Is it unjust for a company to share a large sector of a market? This is one of the questions before the United States Department of Justice right now concerning Microsoft and the software market. If Microsoft does a good job at what it does, then undoubtedly it will gain a large share of the market just like it has. Its time to end this attack fueled by petty jealousies of other software competitors and our federal government's fear of letting individuals do their own business. Let Microsoft be and let the market dictate who comes out on top. One of the many citizens who this country belongs to rightfully,

Chance E. Yohman
East Waterboro, Maine
THE GEEK SHALL INHERIT THE EARTH

MTC-00008405

From: james k davies
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To all those concerned:

It is my hope that the settlement, which has been reached in the issue of the Department of Justice (and some state suits) and Microsoft, will be found by the District Court to be fair, complete and comprehensive. From my perspective, that of a consumer who is dependent on the trouble free, low maintenance, smooth cross-application performance of my operating system (Windows) for a business software function free of problems, it is not realistic to deny Windows users this settlement and move on in the world of software development and innovation. Please do not be put off by my use of the word "innovation." It is the most descriptive and exciting word in the world of technological development.

I am weary of the denial of the existence of other software operating systems, systems which have developed contemporaneously with Windows, with varying levels of success—DOS (which IBM decided they didn't want), IBM's OS2 (a dreadful, cumbersome, and generally non-performing system), Apple's MacIntosh (priced out of my market—by Apple, not Microsoft), Unix (too expensive and too technical as it was developed for the scientific and engineering markets of which most of us are not members) and Linux (until very recently not performing in the cross-application market (through no fault of Microsoft's) most users require and still not 'up to snuff' for this user.

Until there is something better than Microsoft's Windows—and it's browser—I suggest we stop punishing Microsoft for being the best.

Elizabeth B. Davies

MTC-00008406

From: DwightNancy James
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

We want you to complete the Microsoft Settlement. The agreement is too stringent in our view, but the US Govt has spent entirely too much time and money on this inquisition already. There are many more pressing matters needing our tax dollars. Please do not allow the opponents of the settlement drag this out any longer.

We have always felt that Microsoft has served our needs properly and have never felt used or abused.

Thank you.

Dwight and Nancy James
10124 Sharon Spring Dr
Fredericksburg, VA 22408
(540) 371-4625
cc: Congressman Frank Wolf
Senators John Warner and George Allen

MTC-00008407

From: Chris Aveni
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/3/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

It is of my opinion, and many other Americans of sound mind that Microsoft has suffered ridiculous penalties as a result of over zealous attorneys and sour competitors. Please name me one other company in this country that exports as much as Microsoft in which keeps our trade deficit from soaring. Without Microsoft in our economy, we would not only have a much more devastating trade deficit, but an economy that would be much worse off than it is today. Also keep in mind that Microsoft has brought technology allot further than any other company has over the years. Microsoft did try to stifle competition, and they should be prevented from doing so in the future, but it is know time to get off their backs and all get back to business. The proposed settlement is overly far to the competition.

Christopher J. Aveni
Technical Analyst
AremisSoft Corporation, Manufacturing
Division

E-mail: chris.aveni@aremissoft.com
Internet: http://www.aremisoft.com/

MTC-00008408

From: CACUSN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir—

Just a quick note to let you hear my opinion on the subject settlement (Tunney Act). I would really like to see litigation ended immediately. I believe the settlement is fair as is and further fighting in the courts will do nothing for me as consumer and everything to further fatten the pockets of lawyers and a few wealthy plaintiffs. I do not wish to see my tax dollars wasted in further litigation against Microsoft and request that DOJ move to accept the settlement as it stands. Thank you.

Chris Carbott
11508 Boathouse CT
Bowie, MD 20720
301-805-6987

MTC-00008409

From: ANTIQUESFM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer and a stock owner, I am satisfied with the settlement which has been reached.

MTC-00008410

From: Larry Steinbecker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I would like to take this opportunity to speak forcefully in favor of Microsoft regarding the DOJ's legal actions against them. Unlike the monopoly previously held by AT & T, and currently held by the U.S. Post Office, Microsoft did not gain their dominant position by outlawing competitors; they outperformed them, thus *earning* a dominant position.

I speak directly from experience as the owner of a computer software firm when I say that Microsoft has done this country a great service in delivering a single dominant operating system. Since my company only has to write software for a single environment, it is able to deliver higher quality products and offer lower prices than if it had to write software for numerous, incompatible environments. Our 2,000+ customers are the direct beneficiaries of this fact to the tune of tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars. This same fact holds true for every producer of software that runs on Microsoft platforms, multiplied by each of their respective customer bases.

Further, every one of Microsoft's customers, by having free access to a web browser, was measurably and positively impacted by the fact they did not have to spend an additional \$30—\$100 in order to browse the web. True, Netscape was hurt by this action, but the benefit to the country as a whole was immense. Every Microsoft customer saved \$30 to \$100 by not having to purchase a separate browser. Each of these millions of users were then able to save that

money, or use it to purchase other goods or services that they would not have otherwise bought.

Remarkably, Microsoft has been painted as the "bad guy" for making business more difficult for their competitors. Never mind the fact that every action taken by every business in every field is done precisely to benefit their own company at the expense of their competitors. Every advertisement, feature, and service provided by a company negatively affects their competitors' ability to compete with them. And yet we are to believe that Microsoft is evil and conniving for not wishing to bestow bounty upon its competitors, nor make life easy for them.

The DOJ's actions thus far have further cost the economy untold billions. It is not a coincidence that the stock market plunge began precisely on the day that the judgment was announced against Microsoft. Since that time, the stock market has lost nearly \$1 trillion in value as investors became worried that the tech sector, our most productive market segment, was going to come under persecution and micromanagement by U.S. Government. The DOJ's actions have not just eviscerated Microsoft's value, but the retirement and savings accounts of countless citizens who gladly owned Microsoft and other tech stocks.

It should be obvious to anyone of even limited intellectual resources that Microsoft, while having a dominant position, can only do so if they continue to outperform their competitors. Microsoft has stumbled in particular areas, such as personal finance software, on-line services and even server operating systems. In every case the market has gone to their competitors (Quicken, American On-Line and Linux) quickly, efficiently, and without government intervention. This same migration will happen if Microsoft ceases to offer the best operating system at the best price.

Microsoft's envious competitors are largely driving this case. They are seeking to gain in court that which they could not achieve in the marketplace. But it is time for the DOJ to stop acting as the special-interest arm of the government for these competitors; instead the DOJ should act in the interest of the countless citizens benefited directly and indirectly by use of Microsoft's products and ownership of Microsoft's stock. I strongly urge you to settle this case with the least possible damage to Microsoft, and to let America's most productive company alone in the future, to benefit of our country.

Sincerely,
Larry Steinbecker

MTC-00008411

From: James F. Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement is good for the consumer, the American economy and the public interest. I urge you to settle this case immediately and not let a few dissidents continue to block a reasonable settlement.

Sincerely,
James F. Miller

MTC-00008412

From: Abe Shapiro

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

We are in favor of the present settlement. We think continuing the litigation should be stopped.

Abe Shapiro

MTC-00008413

From: Robert Feeney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:05pm
Subject: Settlement Suit

Dear DOJ,

Microsoft Corporation like yourselves and me are still evolving. This evolving in a harsh and competitive electronic universe has shown us the best and the worst of Microsoft. Still, I believe it is in our best interest to leave MSFT intact and not break up the company.

Sincerely,
Robert Feeney
707-863-8898
707-863-8899 fax
707-491-0737 pager
rfeeney@interx.net rfeeney@interx.net

MTC-00008414

From: Lonnie Malaska MIS CD(038)C
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With respect to a document,
re: "Utah Attorney General is pursuing harsher punishment..."

And, a following response,

re: "The Judge in the Microsoft case ... will decide whether additional (or different) remedies are appropriate..."

As an Systems Administrator working with microsoft products has been both, positive and negative. But, the Antitrust Case needs to be resolved. I have personally noted that Microsoft is taking over other software vendors ideas and thus their product, due to the 'ownership of the only viable computer OS on the market to-day'.

Other vendors can't possibly compete with such a giant, I think our

Fore Fathers addressed this issue.

Lonnie Malaska
1795 E. South campus Dr.
Salt Lake City, ut 84112
Lonnie Malaska
Campus Design
University of Utah
lmalaska@campplan.utah.edu
ph: 801-581-3136
fax: 581 6081

MTC-00008415

From: Warren Hoffman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a citizen, a Microsoft shareholder and a retired engineer of AT&T, I hope you can come to a positive solution for Microsoft in the ongoing litigation. I think that Microsoft has been the most progressive software provider, a leading worldwide organization. I feel that we will see great progress for the United States computer and communication fields that will surpass whatever we have seen up to now. Please keep Microsoft's software leadership intact.

Warren L. Hoffman

MTC-00008416

From: Virgsal@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although I think Microsoft does have dirty hands in this affair, the settlement they have proposed seems fair to all parties concerned. It is in the interest of our economy to finalize this mess and get on with business. This is a very fast changing industry and their competitors who are spending so much to fight them would do better by putting their money where it could be used to innovate! There are still many open avenues to explore!

Thank you for your time!
Sally McQueen

MTC-00008417

From: k7rdn@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is fair & some of the States involved also agree, it seems foolish for States that don't want to settle to hold out. It's been a couple of years already-enough is enough!!!

I think M/S did great things for the average Joe with home computers & really don't see how they forced anything on people that didn't want various programs.

I am 79 yrs. old, always thought I was of average intelligence until I got a computer about 6 yrs. ago (I never cursed or talked to myself before that). I just wish I was 70 yrs. younger as my grand-kids (all under 18) really catch on compared to people my age.

Thanks for letting me spout off.
Fred Murrell
K7RDN (HAM RADIO CALL)

MTC-00008419

From: Sid Ghosh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, Justice Dept. lawsuit against ha very little merit. Microsoft indulged in the same business practice as any other reputable viable business enterprise would do. Just that Microsoft became successful- may be very successful.

I think DOJ should reach a legal settlement with Microsoft and move ahead, without further punishing a very innovative US Corporation.

Sid Ghosh

MTC-00008420

From: Auguste Schwab
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Gentlemen/
Mesdames.....

I believe that the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case is fair and should be approved.

It is important to realize how much Microsoft has done for the technology sector not to mention what they have done for the average American citizen. Without them, we would be years behind and prices for hardware and software would be far higher than they are today. Microsoft has made us

the world leaders in the field. Everyone else had the opportunity—but Microsoft did it. Were they aggressive? Yes, but it served us all well. A shrinking violet in this industry does not do us any good.

A billion dollars worth of hardware and software for children would be a godsend and would provide them with knowledge they can put to good use in their adult years. It will help the economy and the reputation of the United States immensely in the long run.

Do not be misled by special interest groups which object to this settlement for their own benefit.

Sincerely,
Auguste Schwab
6281 Evian Place
Boynton Beach FL 33437

MTC-00008421

From: (00B0)(FFFF)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen/Madam

Let us not derail an already fragile economy. History does repeat itself as

George Bush Sr. found out abruptly-ITS ALL ABOUT THE ECONOMY, stupid! See, I softened my stance at the end of the statement..Keep those middle class jobs flourishing and good things will happen...

Dave Mckay

MTC-00008422

From: Paul DeMar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think the proposed settlement would be fair to all parties involved. Its time to settle the case and move on.

Sincerely
Paul DeMar

MTC-00008423

From: c.g.kazinsky@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:14pm
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.

MTC-00008424

From: Joe Doyle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:18pm
Subject: Settlement

I am all for the Microsoft settlement.
Joseph J. Doyle

MTC-00008425

From: LELAND ERICKSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:17pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Just settle this case now as is——don't waste any more time and money'

MTC-00008426

From: JAMES .F. OVERSTREET
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:18pm

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I THINK THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT WITH MICROSOFT IS A FAIR SETTLEMENT AND IS CERTAINLY IN THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST AND IS CERTAINLY IN MY INTEREST. WHILE I AM A CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THE STATE'S ATTORNEY GENERAL DOES SPEAK FOR ME, BUT FOR SOME SPECIAL INTERESTS, WHICH ARE INTERESTED IN HAVING THE GOVERNMENT DO FOR THEM WHAT THE MARKET HAS NOT.

ESPECIALLY IN THESE TROUBLED ECONOMIC TIMES IT IS TIME TO REMOVE THE SCHAKLES THAT HAVE SLOWED MICROSOFT DOWN. GET THIS THING SETTLED ALREADY!!!

SINCERELY:
JAMES F. OVERSTREET

MTC-00008427

From: Paul Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

As a concerned citizen, I would like to express my opinion that the settlement reached between the DOJ/9 States and Microsoft is fair and should be accepted.

This entire Microsoft litigation is a terrible waste of taxpayers money. It should come to an end as soon as possible. There are a lot more pressing issues we have today.

Thank you for accepting my opinion in this matter.

Paul J. Allen
17000 Red Bird Road
Winter Garden, FL 34787
407-656-0934
redbird@mpinet.net

MTC-00008428

From: Norman Martinusen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This matter should be settled promptly. The settlement others accepted was tough but fair to all concerned; and should be accepted by the other parties which have not yet settled.

N.J. Martinusen

MTC-00008430

From: Daniel Bontz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is time to settle this issue and stop spending the tax payer's money. I am currently living in Florida and do not understand what Florida is not agreeing to the Government offer.

I believe it the offer is a good offer and the matter should be settled now.

Thank you for considering my opinion.
Daniel L. Bontz

MTC-00008431

From: John Moore
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/3/02 7:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to comment upon the proposed settlement between the United States Department of Justice and Microsoft.

Since the company has been found both to be a monopoly and to be misusing the power inherent in that position, it would seem that any final result of the public's money and effort spent reaching this point should accomplish three things at a minimum: halting the illegal conduct of the company, promoting and restoring competition in the industry, and depriving the company of the gains it has accrued through its illegal conduct.

The proposed settlement fails to accomplish any one of these three goals. In addition, the Court is aware that the original suit arises because of a difference of opinion regarding the effect of an earlier consent order. The wording of the proposed settlement appears vague to this software engineer. Even one unschooled in the law can spot huge holes which would permit Microsoft to evade the apparent intent of the document. From past behavior, this would likely lead to continued illegal activity. As an example, the proposed settlement allows Microsoft to define the "Windows Operating System." This means that it will be unfettered from employing the method of "bundling" additional functionality into the OS to attack future competition, just as it has attacked Netscape, Real Media, Apple Computers' QuickTime, and a near-endless list of others.

There is no economic incentive for a software company to expend the research and development time necessary to create a new application if its functionality can be bundled into Microsoft's definition of the "Windows Operating System." At the trial, Microsoft did not contest that it could define the operating system to include a ham sandwich if it desired. This is not appropriate and needs remedy.

The government's proposed agreement does provide that Microsoft cannot penalize some manufacturers if they offer to sell the application of a competitor. Unfortunately, it does permit Microsoft to offer inducements to a manufacturer to exclude competitors' products. It seems that under the proposed settlement, it would be illegal for Microsoft to—as an example—sell Windows to a manufacturer for \$30 per PC if it didn't use competing software, but charge \$100 if the manufacturer included competitors' products. On the other hand, nothing in the proposed agreement would seem to stop Microsoft from charging everyone \$100 for Windows, but offering a \$70 inducement if no competitor's products were used by the manufacturer. To someone who is not a legal scholar, this appears to be the same thing. It would undoubtedly have the same result—and would not restore competition.

A just settlement would not only prohibit penalties imposed by Microsoft to stop others' pro-competitive activities, but also prohibit it from offering any inducements which lead to the same result: exclusion of competition from other software companies. As a professional software engineer, I can assure you that no settlement will truly promote competition unless it fully addresses what are known in the field as Application Programming Interfaces (most frequently abbreviated "API's"). In the past, Microsoft has used its control over operating system

API's to extend its monopoly. These APIs are not engraved in stone; they change. In the past, they have been deliberately changed by Microsoft to hamper other companies. Some of them were not even disclosed publicly until experts found that Microsoft applications were using "secret" OS calls to accomplish results that were otherwise impossible.

Likewise, I see nothing in the proposed settlement which will limit Microsoft's typical philosophy of "embrace and extend." This exercise of power, only possible to a monopoly, allows Microsoft to "embrace" an open and publicly-defined internet protocol and "extend" it—adding functionality that makes it work properly only with Windows clients. To allow for competition to exist, a Monopolist Microsoft should have to fully disclose all protocols and protocol changes to foster interoperability.

The proposed settlement will accomplish nearly nothing with regard to API's and protocols. Full disclosure is not mandated, and Microsoft will see any vagueness in a light that serves the company's interest. This is a highly technical area, but a solution is available and workable. No API is placed into the Windows Operating System without a purpose. There are documents inside Microsoft that detail what the API is supposed to do, and how it is to be used by programmers. To achieve full disclosure, all that need be done is to publish this information publicly—perhaps on the internet. API disclosure should not be limited to the Windows Operating System, but should also include Microsoft Office. Although this suite enjoys over ninety-five percent market share, it has not been addressed in the proposed settlement. This will allow Microsoft to evade the settlement's rules by simply moving functionality from Windows to Office, or offering special terms for Office that would not be allowed with Windows.

If an API should change during the development process, all the company should have to do is post the details of the change within a reasonable number of days. It would be possible to completely automate the process so that when details of the changes are placed in the proper electronic "folder" for internal sharing among developers those changes would instantly disseminate to the Web. This will not require any access to any part of the Windows source code, but it will level the development "playing field."

Another element of the proposed settlement is allowing Microsoft to retain the gains it has obtained through its browser monopolization. As a warning against future misconduct, I feel a just settlement would require full source-code disclosure of Internet Explorer. Since the PC interface seems to be migrating from the desktop to the Web browser, failure to do this will simply allow Microsoft to continue to do with Internet Explorer what it cannot do with Windows itself.

I will close by bringing up a point which worries me greatly. The original decree contained a prohibition against Microsoft from taking knowing action to disable or adversely affect the operation of competing

application products. This seems to have totally vanished from the proposed settlement. Microsoft has done this sort of thing many times in the past. Unless this anti-competitive behavior is addressed by the Court, I fear this business practice will continue. Indeed, having gone to trial and been convicted, I feel that the proposed final settlement is nothing less than an invitation to continue "business as usual." It fails to provide even a meaningful penalty for failure to comply. The only penalty I see is an extension of the term for two more years.

Lacking any further penalties, why would Microsoft even care whether it chose to ignore these so-called "restrictions" for five years or seven?

I urge the Court to reject the proposed final settlement.

John Moore
1970 Fisher Trail, NE
Atlanta, GA 30345

MTC-00008432

From: JANH1999@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:33pm
Subject: microsoft settlement.

As a consumer I feel that Microsoft's products have made my life easier. I have felt from the beginning that this suit is an attempt by Microsoft's competitors to use the DOJ to "get back" at Microsoft. The DOJ under Janet Reno, allowed itself to be manipulated into prosecuting this case. Thankfully, the DOJ under Mr. Ashcroft is not buying into this farce. The States Attorneys Generals who continue to block a settlement seem to be doing so to grab headlines. If I lived in one of these states I'd make it a point to vote them out.

MTC-00008433

From: Raymond Browning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in support of Microsoft.
Those people trying to block the settlement are just after the money, PLAIN and SIMPLE. Its not about the consumer, its about money.

Raymond Browning

MTC-00008434

From: JPiscioner@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a Consumer, Taxpayer and Shareholder I am opposed to any further litigation regarding Microsoft, it seems to me that we are penalizing a company who has developed the competitive edge in its industry and the competition is crying wolf. I would think that enough resources have been spent on both sides to move this litigation alone to closure, for the benefit of the consumer and the taxpayer.

MTC-00008435

From: Aila M. Horan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:
It's time to get this whole politically inspired, Clinton-initiated Microsoft travesty

over with. Take the settlement and get busy on more important matters.

Richard F. Horan
9442 Clocktower Lane
Columbia, MD 21046-1817

MTC-00008436

From: jrod(a)mindspring.com
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 7:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mam/Sir,

As a graphics designer, I make my living using computers. Therefore the issue before us affects me in a uniquely personal way. The recent decision by the U.S. Department of Justice to allow Microsoft to remain intact even after a Federal judge ruled that they were indeed a monopoly and guilty of anti-competitive practices boggles my mind. This decision confirms to Microsoft that they are totally free and able to take up the whole personal and business computer market without anyone even lifting a finger in opposition. First it was Netscape and other smaller computer companies/makers. Who is going to be next? Are they going to destroy LINUX and the GNU free software movement because it's such a thorn in their side? Current memos floating around Microsoft that I have read confirm that Microsoft is getting ready to wage war on LINUX. Does everybody have to be running Microsoft products and pay them accordingly for that company to be satisfied? It seems that is so.

Frankly, enough is enough. I refuse to stand by and allow a large conglomerate of a corporation like Microsoft to exclusively engulf the computer market and destroy the freedom of choice that I have today. The freedom I have to buy and purchase my own software (Microsoft's .NET strategy is trying to change all that with web based "subscription" fees). The freedom I have to switch out components of my machine without having to report them to big brother (the new windows activation features in XP become void if I change a certain number of hardware components). Microsoft does not care about my freedoms as a computer user. They only care about my pocket book. If we just stand by and watch, they will take over every gate to the internet and computing world, and then set up a toll booth and charge us fees for use.

So I implore you to please not back down to the Redmond giant in a feeble settlement. To Microsoft, money is nothing. Charging them with a fine for their corrupt practices and nothing more allows them to continue in their march toward total domination of the computing world without any resistance. Stand by your decision to not approve the DOJ's decision, and please fight for a win that would allow us as citizens and computer users to remain free in our choice of what we can and choose to do with our computers. Thank you for your time.

Jason Rodriguez
Graphics Artist/Designer
797 Whitehurst Landing
Virginia Beach, VA 23464

MTC-00008437

From: bgates
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/3/02 7:46pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
 TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

We never felt there was any crime committed by Microsoft in the first place! What did they not want to do? They didn't want to share their system & their knowledge with their competitors???? That was the big criminal conspiracy??? Yes, they are an extremely large company; yes, all of their systems intermingle & co-mingle beautifully. Should Microsoft have stopped innovating & subsequently stopped growing?

The other companies which try to keep Microsoft in the courts all the time would be better off if they spent their time trying to develop some new & innovative systems & playing the game fairly. We have never heard of any company that gives other companies the secrets of their business practices & allows them access to their innovative methods which (sad to say) earn money for THEM, and lessen the profits of their competitors, HAVE YOU? AND—We still don't understand how the states got involved and were even given monetary settlements for their supposed abuse at the hands of Microsoft. We hope the settlement with the 9 states ends this case. There has been an exorbitant amount of money spent on this case & the time expended by high paid, valuable employees of the Justice Department could be better spent bringing to justice REAL CRIMINALS such as terrorists, murderers, rapists, gangsters, robbers, etc, etc, etc. PLEASE CLOSE THE CASE!!!

BILLY & ELIZABETH GATES

MTC-00008438

From: Ron Sadler
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Its enough!! Lets get our economy moving again. This has had a very negative impact on all technology issues.

Ron Sadler

MTC-00008439

From: Sandy (038) Jeff Melin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:48pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Gentlemen,

May it please the Court: that I, as a non-techie computer user both at home and work for the last 12 years, recognize the benefits of Microsoft's products as superior in delivering utility and function to both the average and advanced business user. I also recognize the superiority of other vendors products in casual at home, the arts, and design applications.

As a senior citizen, and lifelong student of business and economics; I find it abhorrent that an innovator, the likes of which have been penalized before for similar achievement and creativity—would again be brought to its knees by the least common denominator of our society—success! What has happened to the American Dream? Do we really want to squash the incentive to excel and achieve?

Jeffrey N. Melin
 Carmel, IN

MTC-00008440

From: Carol Sandt
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice:
 I am writing to register my opinion that the Microsoft case should be settled as soon as possible and not be further litigated. I base my opinion on the fact that the federal government and nine states have already reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. I believe that this settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I also believe that this settlement is good for consumers, industry and the American economy.

Carol H. Sandt
 382 River Road
 Pequea, PA 17565 USA
 717-284-2881
 csandt@psu.edu

MTC-00008441

From: Kevin Kendrick
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While I commend the US government and most of the states in reaching a settlement agreement with Microsoft, I believe that the process and the costs are out of line with the value the citizen/consumers have received. This is not where we should be spending our valuable resources.

I do not see how this "U.S. settlement" helps me and definitely do not see how the "holdout states" settlement is significantly better and worth the wait and expense of getting it. It is the job of the government to protect the consumer (not the competitors) against harmful practices. I am hard pressed to believe that consumers like me need the help of the government in deciding if we are getting the value out the product for the price. We vote with our checkbooks and companies respond by adding more features or reducing the price in line with the value they are delivering. As for the response of the competitors, they should be responding in the marketplace and not in the courtroom.

I am a user of Microsoft products and have enjoyed all of the additional features they are constantly adding to make the product easier and better to use. I call these improvements and am well qualified to determine if I should purchase the product that offers the improvements. Microsoft remains diligent in providing what the customer demands and is spending what it takes to deliver the technology to the customer at a great prices.

Let's get on with it and settle the case. It's dragged on too long. Let's spend government resources where they are needed, in helping people that need help.

Quit wasting our money and SETTLE.

Sincerely,
 Kevin Kendrick
 Kevin Kendrick
 1305 Lombard Street #6
 San Francisco, CA 94109
 t: (415) 922-3078
 m: (415) 572-4447
 f: (419) 793-7306

e: <mailto:k-j-k@pacbell.net> k-j-k@pacbell.net

MTC-00008443

From: Texpop@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:58pm
 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.

Note that Microsoft has been very helpful financially and technically to one of its arch rivals, Apple. Microsoft has maintained Word and Excel software on Macintosh, even though they probably have not made much money for their effort.

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!
 James R. Lloyd
 514 Whitewing Lane
 Houston, TX 77079
 texpop@aol.com

MTC-00008444

From: Arlene A DiRocco
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 7:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Special interest groups and politicians who want some free publicity are attempting to derail the settlement agreement. September 11 is what we should be focusing on and the security of our nation and its people. Please finalize this and get it over with.

Arlene A. DiRocco
 10 Old Colony Road
 Burlington, MA 01803

MTC-00008445

From: KBOOM62@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let Microsoft alone the only reason they were persecuted is that Microsoft was a big target for Fed employees who didn't have anything to do. God Bless Bill Gates & Microsoft & Windows did you ever have to navigate a computer using keystrokes?

Dan Keith

MTC-00008446

From: GYPSYB2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In full support of the recently reached Microsoft settlement, I wish to express my opinion. This is a reasonable and fair agreement and will be to the advantage of all concerned and most especially, the public. I am a voice of many seniors and am most grateful that this settlement has been reached, though I have no personal reason other than the enjoyment of the Microsoft programs.

Sincerely,
B. Eaton Rhea

MTC-00008447

From: HAROLD WEISSENBURG
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:02pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please settle. Just like the VCR, we need a standard and Microsoft has nearly provided that.

Now lets get
Apple to merge!
Harold W. Weissenburg
(halw83@msn.com)

MTC-00008448

From: Nationgate@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,
As a citizen of the United States, I believe that our gov't. has already wasted millions in their worthless pursuit of a company that has done more for technology and the economy than one could imagine. Any "settlement" should avoid any and all types of financial punishment.

MTC-00008449

From: Robert Carlson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please lets get this thing behind us. Microsoft has done wonderful things for this country. Let the litigation end and force the lawyers to go find other work. BnB.

CC:VRBush5056@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00008450

From: Barb (038) Chuck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:12pm
Subject: class action law suit against microsoft

It is my opinion that the U.S.G. is spending a lot of time trying to find a dead horse. The several states that are pushing to get a verdict friendly to them are just plain greedy. They

(the states) hopped on a band wagon to get "free dollars". The thing that one must do at this point of time is say that they will suffer no more expenses, fire their lawyers and say that is enough. Not being a lawyer it is apparent that the USG has recovered many dollars through income tax and other methods.

thank you.

MTC-00008451

From: Paula Hettler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please bring about the end to this lawsuit as soon as possible. I believe it is best for all involved.

Paula Hettler
1208 Nyssa
McAllen, TX 78501

MTC-00008452

From: Marion Dye
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have never been so upset in my life over the wanton waste of money for this whole lawsuit.

Why should anyone be penalized for being intelligent and industrious, and making things happen. It's a shame that someone has to sue because they came a 'day late and a dollar short' to compete. Where was this 'person'(s) in the beginning?? They could have started this whole thing too. They had every opportunity.

But no, they would rather whine & moan that they can't compete—go figure? For the service provided, and being a consumer, I don't feel that Microsoft has been unfair to us. We revel in the 'new' world they have provided for us.

I would hope that this 'rubbish' is over—let the competitors compete for a piece of the pie.not sue!

I thank you for the opportunity to add my voice to the 'outcry'.

Sincerely,
Marion Dye

MTC-00008453

From: JIMRUNTOM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:18pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Just dropping you a line asking for the government to stop attacking Microsoft and use our general tax revenues toward more productive purposes. Get politics out of free enterprise.

thank you,
JIM Thomas

MTC-00008454

From: RRodg43063@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

I have never written to the government about anything in my 49 years. However I felt compelled to send a brief email message about the Microsoft settlement. Considering the other crisis this country has been hit with in recent times. I feel the government has

spent enough of our tax dollars on a witch hunt. The time has come to finally settle this matter and move onto more pressing National concerns! Please put me in the column of the Microsoft suit be settled, final answer.

Yours,
Robert Rodgers

MTC-00008455

From: Regchuck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:20pm

As a deeply concerned and productive citizen I urge the court to accept the settlement proposed in the Microsoft case. The advances made by our country by virtue of computer technology has allowed enhanced prosperity across the nation. Competition put us there, and it must not be curtailed simply because others feel threatened. Every business feels threatened by competition, and that leads to enhanced creativity and well serves our public interest. One look at the marketplace leaves the undeniable impression that any person or company with the guts to get out there and compete, is allowed to do just that. Witness the number of computer oriented companies that existed when Microsoft came about, versus the staggering number successfully competing today. That would not be the case if the field were anything but level. The proof, is looking us in the eye. I consider this case to be fairly considered, but unrealistically brought to court when viewed in the bright light of cold truth. The expense to the taxpayer has been great enough, and the settlement remedy fair.

Charles M. Asbury
Attorney at Law
Sacramento, California

MTC-00008456

From: Walt Haas (www.xmission.com/haas)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:

I oppose the settlement negotiated by DoJ in the Microsoft case. I support stronger protections against continued criminal conduct by Microsoft as requested by the nine dissenting states, including my own State of Utah.

Walter O. Haas
717 Ninth Avenue
Salt Lake City UT 84103

"Linux is a cancer"—Steve Ballmer
"First they ignore you. Then they laugh at you.

Then they fight you. Then you win."—
Gandhi

MTC-00008457

From: Frakestate@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:22pm
Subject: the settlement

Bill Gates and his Companies have advanced computer technologies beyond anyone's imagination. Leave him run his companies his way and we'll all profit.

Victor S. Frake
frakestate@aol.com

MTC-00008458

From: Larry Greene

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:25pm
Subject: Microsoft lawsuit
Attorney General Ashcroft:

Please drop all anti-trust suits against Microsoft. Microsoft has done nothing wrong. Microsoft is simply popular and deserving of success. Bill Gates is an American hero. Anti-trust laws are anti-business and should be abolished. If monopoly busting is a goal of the Department of Justice, then go after the true culprits: Amtrak, the U.S. Postal Service, public education, and Indian casinos to name but a few.

Larry Greene
127 Rt. 2A
Preston, CT 06365
860-887-5350

MTC-00008459

From: Suresh C. Rastogi, Ph.D.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer, I strongly agree with the Microsoft Settlement. This is in the interest of progress and freedom to bring to the consumers the best products at the reasonable prices.

Suresh C. Rastogi, Ph.D.

MTC-00008460

From: Wes Farmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I strongly support the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I believe we, as a people, have many more important things to do than stifle innovation.

MTC-00008461

From: Russell Yuma
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I was not in favor of litigation against Microsoft in the first place. Now that a settlement has been proposed I believe any further litigation should be terminated. The States against settlement are wrong in asking for further restrictions on Microsoft and are extreme in their thinking. They do not understand competitive business and are in fact hurting the consumers they say they want to protect.

There should be no more consideration for further litigation. All this will do is damage the economy and not help consumers in any way.

Do you hear consumers complaining? I think not and believe consumers are satisfied. So, let's put an end to all this action against Microsoft.

Russell Yuma
PO Box 165
Oakland, OR 97462

MTC-00008462

From: Meredith Raney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
1/3/02

Dear DOJ Sirs,

It is my understanding that the purpose of the anti-trust laws is to protect the consumer and only the consumer. As far as I can tell, the only entities even alleged to be damaged in the Microsoft case are a few whining competitors of Microsoft.

I have seen no evidence presented that any consumer has been damaged by Microsoft, so leave Microsoft alone.

Please, just do your job and enforce the law as written to protect the consumer and don't worry about a few companies who can't run with the big dogs.

If the consumer starts getting hurt, we'll be the first to let you know. Then, and only then, should you jump in and enforce the law.

Sincerely yours,
Meredith Raney
2488 Burns Ave.
Melbourne, FL 32935 Phone (321) 254-5481

MTC-00008463

From: ThrumHall@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:36pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern,
I think the DOJ settlement concerning the Microsoft settlement is fair. Keeping the company intact is in the interests of all. However oversight needs to be taken for a period of time collecting any instances of not following the points of the settlement. These should be documented and any serious non-compliance of this matter should cancel the settlement. Microsoft has been given a chance to work out this matter and should take advantage of the settlement and work fairly in the marketplace.

Ted Maligranda
82 David st
South River
NJ 08882

MTC-00008464

From: Dayna Nichols
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the Department of Justice stopping any actions it is pursuing against Microsoft. The stock has plummeted and numerous investors like myself have lost a lot. I feel if the government had not pursued Microsoft, the stock market, technology stocks, would not be in the condition it is in. We can thank Bill Clinton.

If Microsoft has done something so terribly wrong, then why is it every government agency and business uses Microsoft products to run their computer systems? I am a Federal employee and everything we use at our agency is a Microsoft product. All laptops, desktops and shared workstations are run by Microsoft.

I'll bet if some took a look around the Department of Justice your computer systems are all Microsoft based. How about email? How about work processing programs? How about calendar systems? How about spread sheet programs? Should I continue? What about companies like Intel? What about their processors? What other companies use their processors in as many computers?

Drop what you are doing, let them get back to business. Microsoft is producing the best computer software in the world. Let them continue.

MTC-00008465

From: Hollis Scarbrough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the Department of Justice to discontinue all litigation against Microsoft. I was totally opposed to the government's role in the action taken against Microsoft. Microsoft should not be penalized for being a success.

MTC-00008466

From: Randy Hackney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

RE: Public comment period for the Tunney Act. Leave Microsoft alone; let the settlement agreement stand without further litigation being allowed. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Don't let the lawyer lobby keep this alive for their benefits in fees; nor allow the competitors who want to use Microsoft to defeat the public interest in encouraging innovation.

Judy Hackney
Voter, District 1 of GA

MTC-00008467

From: TESTA558@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I found the settlement being by far in the interest of all us consumers and the entire economy. In settling the case forthright we will be able to focus on a much higher priorities: security, waging this war and restore our economic growth. At time like this, I repeat; The Nation at war and with a collapsing economy, this settlement will be definitely in the interest of all America.

Sincerely,
Anthony Testa

MTC-00008468

From: Stuart Holden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was pleased to hear that the Microsoft Antitrust case had settled in Federal Court, but then disappointed to hear that the states (including my own—Connecticut) were continuing their own cases. In my 25 year career I have used many software products from a variety of vendors—Borland, Symantec,

Oracle, Microsoft, Lotus, IBM, Sterling Commerce, MicroPro (WordStar), Red Hat, Aldus, to name a few. I have found Microsoft software to be the most intuitive and easy to use software; the commonality across its products has saved countless training dollars.

While Microsoft could be viewed as a monopoly, it can also be viewed as a provider of products which work together in a consistent fashion. Doesn't anyone

remember "IBM Compatible" which "meant buy it, see if it works and doesn't stop anything else from working".

The courts should get out of the marketplace and let consumers decide with their wallets.

Stuart Holden
Shelton, Connecticut

MTC-00008469

From: Nancy T. von Hohenleiten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

MTC-00008470

From: Larry (038) Sandy Bancroft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:50pm
Subject: overzealous greed!?

All we heard for years is how Microsoft created unfair competition. Now, we seem to have governments that aren't happy with the results. Maybe we need to check out what is driving them. It seems to me that the states & the federal government can't get enough corporate dollars that consumers pay for.

The Tobacco & Microsoft settlement for instance, has shown state governments that if they tie-up corporate America in the courts long enough they will get free dollars. In Illinois the state in 2000 sent out refund checks to tax payers from the tobacco settlement. Small as they were, the state said not to worry we have plenty more dollars coming from the settlement. Of course the money was spent faster than it was coming in now we have budget short falls. Yes not all of our budget blunders could have been foreseen but the point is that money was for smoking related illness that the state will be stuck with in the years to come.

But then again who pays corporate America? No the consumer. Now is the time to say to all states & the usdoj, sign on to the Microsoft settlement are be left out in the cold without a dime. Microsoft has offered a fair settlement to all but some never seem happy. Don't get me wrong it's just not the states that aren't happy many inefficiently run companies are just as unhappy. They want more in the way of free handouts too. America was built on hard work by both cooperate & labor. The freedom to take an idea make it work & be so revolutionary in a industry is the American dream. Take the settlement with all the perks just let Microsoft have the ability to continue innovate. For that matter let all companies have the right to innovate.

Sincerely
Larry Bancroft
Shareholder

MTC-00008471

From: Bill Richardsn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As usual the Hatch justice system and the DOJ allegations are misguided and inappropriate. Would you also defile the sanctity of all Intellectual property as monopolistic and predatory? How in a world with freedom to innovate can you be so blatantly non-objective? Would you also expose the formula for Coca-Cola and

Colonel Sanders 11 Secret Herbs and Spices? If so what freedom to innovate would I as an Internet software developer have to protect my interests? Because I find a market and take advantage of it am I predatory? Is the effervescent struggle between Coca-Cola and Pepsi the next target for your insane jealousies and obvious favoritism for Sen. Orin Hatch ?s and Time Warner's Quest for more dollars and favoritism because their product is without Office applications and without a viable desktop graphical operating system? Coca-Cola and Pepsi came out of their rift better companies because of a system we treasure here in this United States "free enterprise". Would you make Ford put in Chevy engines because Ford in using it's own engines is predatory and unfair. Is any thing called a "free enterprise system" fair? No it is predatory and unfair. That is the basis of capitalism. If the shoe were on the other foot for Hatch he would be gloating and all puffed up like the banty rooster he resembles Concerning Microsoft and Netscape, Ford and Chevy had the same problems as did Coke and Pepsi, Where Coke had a 90% market Pepsi had none in comparison, they remarketed and repackaged their products and bought some other popular come latelays Mountain Dew and so forth to enhance their market base to compete, then Coke had to do the same thing. Ford and Chevy continually made different styles of automobiles to appeal to different strata of the market. You must be blind to the times when competition was paramount and the devising of new strategies be came what stuff men and women were made of, competition proved the playing field and then leveled it, due to those fresh ideas and innovations of those individuals. (Harley in the Chevy design of the 50's that gave Ford it's impetus to innovate, in example)

You people need a reality check.
William "Bill" Richardson
Cheif Operating Officer
Richcorp, Inc. <<http://www.richcorp.net/>>

MTC-00008472

From: SusanHobbs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:51pm
Subject: Please add my support to the settlement that the Justice Department has now

Please add my support to the settlement that the Justice Department has now offered Microsoft. I believe it is in the interest of the American economy and in the interest of innovative freedom to support this settlement.

Sincerely,
Dr. Susan A. Hobbs

MTC-00008473

From: richardlaughlin@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:50pm
Subject: America Punishes Success

Dear DOJ,
Individuals and businesses continue the struggle against Federal Government. The economy does not grow; rates of return are down to low single digits; and the high tech industry is on ts back.

The punishing tax rates in the USA and the abuse of the legal system by greedy lawyers just holds America back.

I enjoy Microsoft products. For what little I pay for them, I receive tremendous value. Why Oh why do you let Microsoft's competitors—with their greedy lawyers—abuse the legal system to try to punish Microsoft for being successful? We consumers are not complaining about Microsoft's products or prices!!!

Please please stop punishing Microsoft and lets get the economy rolling again.

Very truly yours,
Richard Stouts
P.O. Box 4378
Pahrump, Nv. 89041-4378

MTC-00008474

From: Yemm (038) Hart Ltd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:51pm
Subject: Settlement Comments

Hello DOJ:

We are a small 2 person business, selling special building products in the US and Europe. We could not have had the success we have had without the benefit of integrated software from Microsoft. Business is difficult enough, and we have little time to invest into the workings of our computers or software too, however we must. We have found that there is more of a chance for integration errors when there is more than one type of software. So we appreciate the Microsoft Windows, Explorer and Office software all working together, almost seamlessly.

We have followed the case hoping Microsoft's advisories would not prevail. The settlement as we understand it is fair and will benefit many young people who otherwise may not get the chance to learn and interact with such an essential tool as a computer and good software. I would hope that the DOJ could divert its assets devoted to this case towards seeking out foreign and domestic terrorists because that is the most serious issue we in the civilized world face today.

Sincerely,
Stephen W Yemm, Yemm & Hart Ltd

MTC-00008475

From: Roentman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 8:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Because of their dominant position in the computer operating system market I the consumer can walk into any office or home and do some constructive work immediately. If the market consisted of plethora of competing OS's that would be nearly impossible. My life is better, easier and much more productive with the essential standardization that has happened largely due to market conditions. I have owned computers with different operating systems and while theirs is far from perfect, the fact that it is the same whether at work or in a cyber cafe in UlanBator, Mongolia has improved my computing life not harmed it.

Christopher Stahler
Wenatchee, WA

MTC-00008476

From: Hite, Peggy A.

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/3/02 8:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 RE: My opinion regarding Microsoft's Antitrust Lawsuit Although Microsoft's domination of the market could be perceived/interpreted as undue control in the market, the packaging made the end product far easier for users like me who want one easy, complete unit (software and all) ready to be used. If I had to make more decisions up front about issues such as whether to use internet explorer or netscape, I would not have known what to use. By virtue of choosing a windows product, I wanted a compact, streamlined, ready to use package of software—without having to spend hours deciding which of this and which of that, when I wouldn't have understood the choices anyway.

Because of Microsoft, we are all more savvy than we would have been without their readily available packages to get us started. They should not be punished for making an entire system more user friendly.

Peggy Hite, CPA, Ph.D.
 2304 Linden Hill Rd
 Bloomington, IN 47401

MTC-00008477

From: Mplgf2000@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please to all conmmcerned: settle tjis matter and let's get onto positive matters and stope wasting money.

Good luck.
 Robert Gregoire
 Rumney New Happshire

MTC-00008478

From: John S. Hartley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:54pm
 Subject: Stupid Clinton
 CC: RFC-822=Finflash 1-2-02.UM.A.
 1154.142@commpartners....

Dear DOJ,
 You people can and do screw up more things than you take care of or at least it seems. I believe it was really the Clit-tongue administration. Leave people alone, Microsoft does more good that we benifit from directly as consumers than any other company, when it comes to computers. I dislike the government enough without you people messing around with my computer and software at home. Say hello to Mr Ashcroft for me, I have trust in him.

Regards, God Bless America &
 George Bush
 John
 (jhartley3@msn.com)

MTC-00008479

From: Elvinscow@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 8:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Early settlement is in the consumer's interest and it should be implemented as soon as possible. Microsoft has done more for the technology and consumer than any other company. This litigation non-sense should be finished once and for all.

CC:Elvinscow@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00008480

From: crussell4
 To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
 Date: 1/3/02 9:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the current remedies are totally inadequate to protect the consumer.

I have thought for years that the monopolistic and predatory business practices of Microsoft required the splitting of the company into an OS company and an applications company. In that way, all application developers are on an equal footing...Microsoft vs independents. As we found out in 1983 with the break-up of AT&T, the development of telecommunications technology flourished. Further remedies may be appropriate in this age of the internet and other future possibilities.

Above all, Microsoft must not be allowed to flood schools with software as part of this settlement. It would be tantamount to the government promoting the MS monopoly.

Chuck Russell in Great Neck

MTC-00008481

From: R. C. Dobson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I cannot believe that we/our government is still chasing after Microsoft's dollars-and that is what this witch hunt is about more than just "justice".

Why didn't we look into the anti-trust area regarding Cargill taking over Continental Grain? At least we don't have to use computers and we could always buy an "Apple". I'll bet virtually every meal eaten in the U.S. has a food directly or produced from grain that Cargill/Continental Grain has touched.

Leave Microsoft alone and call off the 9 + or—states individually pursuing their own agenda. Microsoft may have bent the rules, but Sun or many others would have likely done the same if they could have. I remember when you were never sure of the compatability of programs. Microsoft has done a great service in standardizing many applications. (Now if Windows always operated just as it is supposed to, but I digress.)

Thank you,
 R. C. Dobson, Ph.D.
 R. C. Dobson, Ph.D.
 215 Starbright Court
 Wellington, CO 80549
 cell: 970-215-7173 res:970-568-3991
 e-mail: robert—c—dobson@yahoo.com or
 largeanimalconsulting.com
 fax: 970.568.3992

MTC-00008482

From: JCapFox@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:03pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe that the proposed settlement is just and fair. It is good for consumers and industry.

Dr. and Mrs Joseph Fox

MTC-00008483

From: E. H. John Johnson

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Ladies and Gentlemen:

I believe that consumers should have equal access to application system providers other than Microsoft. If this is accomplished, then I believe the judgment should be accepted so that all the uncertainties that are affecting Microsoft will be eliminated and the company can go forward for the benefit of consumers and, also, its stockholders.

E. H. John Johnson

MTC-00008484

From: MJS4835665@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Re: Tunney Act
 Dear Court of Appeals:

I very much support the Tunney Act as currently written (1/02/02). As a Professor of Management at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, I have long felt that Microsoft has been unfairly attacked in their business practices.

Since they are willing to accept the current conditions under the Tunney Act let's bring this situation to a quick resolution.

For the record I do not own stock in Microsoft or have anything to do with the company.

Best wishes,
 Marc Schniederjans
 5901 S. 72nd Street
 Lincoln, NE 68516
 E-mail: MJS4835665@aol.com

MTC-00008485

From: TXExperiment@cs.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am an a middle aged female of average intelligence who has been watching the Justice Department go after Microsoft for what it considers 'unfair and predatory practices' for several years now. I have heard both sides speak and I must say that while I believe that Microsoft did use practices that some may consider questionable, (There are also many who believe that WalMart, Intel and several others have done the same thing.) they were also improving the lives of many average Americans who would not be able to sit at their computers today and point and click to go wherever they want.

Before the Windows operating system became the industry standard, the average person, was not able to use a computer at all. Therefore Microsoft has helped bolster not only itself but also all the hardware and software manufacturers out there, including those who have come out publicly against them. I have heard more than one CEO of a large company make the claim that without Microsoft's innovation their job of running their company would have been made more difficult. Most of us don't even remember that this whole lawsuit began with a disgruntled company wanting to charge a premium price for what Microsoft wanted to give away free. (Netscape) Somehow this takes most of the meat out of the claim that Microsoft's practices are bad for the

consumer. It may not be too healthy for the companies wanting to make money, but such is our wonderful free enterprise system. Only the strong will survive and Microsoft's very survival over the last years certainly is testimony to their strength among consumers. Yes, it may seem unfair that computer manufacturers have to pay extra to Microsoft to install Windows, but so would the consumers. They would probably rather see the consumer pay the extra money for Windows, which most will gladly spend. Windows is a licensed product and therefore it should cost manufacturers to install it. They should also keep in mind that computers would not be in as widespread of use and therefore bolstering computer company profits, if it weren't for their ease of use with the Windows operating system.

The Government also employs monopolistic practices in many of its daily operations. I pay many taxes for things that I don't even know about and yet the Justice Department has not once suggested that the current systems be examined.

I recently had an unpleasant experience that convinced me even more that Microsoft has done only good for the average computer user. (I'm saying average now, not educated.) Our home computer was the victim of a virus which totally wiped out Windows. We were trying to use MSDOS to save important files and found it too frustrating and ended up reformatting our hard drive just so we could reinstall Windows. I am only one consumer, but I know that I speak for many when I say to the Justice Department, "LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE AND LET THEM CONTINUE TO DEVELOP PRODUCTS WHICH MAKE

ALL OF OUR LIVES (INCLUDING YOURS!) EASIER."

Thank You for giving me the opportunity to voice my opinion. I love being an American...GOD BLESS AMERICA!!

MTC-00008486

From: Stan0613@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I've followed the US Department of Justice litigation against Microsoft for several years. It is my opinion that the US Department of Justice should not pursue further litigation against Microsoft.

Microsoft is a large benefit to the United States and the world today. They are innovators and market creators, and they have created more jobs than any other corporation in today's economy. The corporation has allowed small investors to become financially independent by creating individual investment opportunities for them.

More importantly; Microsoft has pioneered, developed, and led the market in a very successful technology that has allowed the United States to lead the world in data processing and machine communications.

How can the US Department of Justice think this is preventing competition? Microsoft has created opportunity for competition. This corporation has standardized the industry and fostered

growth through excellence in design engineering. Competing corporations would have fractured industry standards which would have raised prices to the consumer and stifled growth.

If competing corporations had a better idea, a better mouse trap so to speak, and had been able to succeed in the market place, in real market place competition, they would have been the first to stifle competition. That seems to be the problem. Competing corporations were not able to compete in the market place and have resorted to influencing government litigation to stifle Microsoft.

This is my opinion and I thank you for allowing me to express myself.

Stan Foster
211 Robin Lane
Panama City Beach, FL 32407
850-249-2110
stan061336@aol.com

MTC-00008487

From: Paul J Richards
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement q

Please tally my vote in favor of not imposing any penalties on Microsoft or its creator, Bill Gates. An American hero who has the talent and ability and drive to create a better mousetrap should be rewarded, not punished. Our present day technological capabilities with personal computers couldn't exist without the products developed and marketed by Microsoft. Whatever rewards Mr. Gates has garnered from his contributions to our way of life are well earned. On his way to improving our lives, he has created untold wealth for untold thousands of others including the very individuals who are actively trying to promote the suppression of Microsoft and its superior products. Our nation has no business trying to downgrade the production of capable companies for the benefit of competitors who don't have the talent to do equally well. We need every bit of forward progress that people of ability can provide. Punishing Microsoft and Bill Gates is the equivalent of jailing Columbus, gagging Newton and Copernicus, burning Galileo's books or prohibiting Einstein from publishing and teaching. This country is great because of people like Bill Gates and our reaction should encourage more like him and not grind them down. Should we prohibit Microsoft from tying Internet Explorer into Windows? Should we prohibit a furniture maker from putting a fourth leg on a chair because his competitors don't know how to make a good fourth leg? Let Microsoft go; turn it loose and America will be better for it. When the competitors develop truly advanced innovations, Microsoft will not be able to hold them back unless our own government contributes to their suppression. Thank you.

MTC-00008488

From: David Clarke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

It is my belief that a settlement should be made between Microsoft and our State and Federal Governments. Innovation is good for all concerned and Microsoft has been instrumental in providing this not only in our country, but throughout the world. It is my opinion that we put this behind us and move forward instead of backwards.

Sincerely,
David Clarke

MTC-00008489

From: EdandReva@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We agree with the settlement and hope that it will be executed.
Ed and Reva Potter

MTC-00008491

From: Ian Joyner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is guilty deserving suitable punishment. The current settlement with them is not suitable punishment.

Ian Joyner
Expert shortcut tip: Dump Windows; get OS X; fire MCSE certified time wasters. XP—eXtremely Pathetic!
i.joyner@acm.orghttp://homepages.tig.com.au/ijoyner

MTC-00008492

From: Norfly@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:17pm
Subject: MSFT settlement

I feel a settlement should be made as soon as possible. Included should be a clause disallowing further litigation whatsoever in the future. This settlement would also help get the economy going again since all the effort being expended to destroy MSFT can be directed to the common good.

NF

MTC-00008493

From: Chetan Desai
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to appalud the Department of Justice in dealing with Microsoft anti-trust violations and reaching a fair settlement. I understand that most of 9 states that continue to pursue additional penalties are politically motivated and driven by Microsoft competitors and/or greed in trying sue a big corporation with deep pockets. If there is a legal way to do this, I would urge you to separate yourself from the nine states that will not settle for anything less then destruction of Microsoft. BTW, I am software engineer and truly understand the areas where Microsoft has been wrong and where Microsoft has been an aggressive competitor who went a little too far into the illegal. However, the remedy (several proposed are downright un-American and crazy) sought by some of states are equivalent to a death sentence for stealing an item from a retail store. Best Wishes to the Justice Department and keep up the good work!!

Chetan Desai

2042 Pinecrest Drive
Morgantown, WV 26505
(304)292-0683

MTC-00008494

From: Robert Kossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop the frivolous lawsuits and get on with life.

MTC-00008495

From: Ted Keese
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to stop punishing American Corporations for being successful. Microsoft products have been reasonably priced and of exceptional quality. I am very disappointed that the government is wasting time and money pursuing this matter. There are much bigger problems to solve in this world than trying to figure out how to punish people for providing products consumers want and are happy with. It is time to get over it!

Sincerely

Ted Keese

500 Forestdale Drive
Atlanta, GA 30342

MTC-00008496

From: MLMoehle@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is in the best interest of the public at large to proceed with the settlement that has been agreed to by Microsoft and the DOJ. It would be a mistake to prolong the litigation when there is an opportunity to reach a settlement now. The opposition has had their day in court—now it's time to move on with the settlement at hand.

Melvin O. Moehle

MTC-00008497

From: JERRYTCFO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:26pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I FEEL THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND I SUPPORT THE COMPANY FOR THEIR MANY INOVATIONS WHICH HAS REDUCED THE COST OF COMPUTER THROUGHPUT.

SINCERELY

JEROME L. SOBEL

MTC-00008498

From: warren stewart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:29pm

Subject: As a free person of the world I implore you to keep As a free person of the world I implore you to keep the world free. People do not have to but the product of any company if they choose not to. Microsoft may have bought some companies but the owners did not have to sell them to Microsoft.

Do not split up Microsoft as it might stop ALL new inventions becoming worldwide and only the very privileged might get them. I reiterate. Please do not split companies up. If a company does wrong, the other

companies in that field do not work with them or the public boycotts them.

Keep microsoft the way it is.

Thank You

Warren stewart Perth

MTC-00008499

From: larry@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:35pm

Subject: Comment on Microsoft Settlement
According to Microsoft, their number one competitor is Linux and other open source software. Most people agree. The proposed DOJ settlement is supposed to make API's and protocols available to other developers. However, the current proposed settlement has a loophole that would deny to Linux access to Microsoft proprietary protocols and file formats. An agreement which which excludes Microsoft's main competitor is almost completely empty.

File formats and network protocols should require approval of an independent review committee such as the IETF and be made available to open source developers. Open protocols and data interchange formats are an essential part of the Department of Defense's Joint Technical Architecture (JTA—see <http://www-jta.itsi.disa.mil/>). Proprietary protocols are at odds with the both the JTA and the need to have competitive sources available for military communications equipment.

Larry Doyle

Software Architect—Small Unit Operations Situation Awareness System (SUOSAS) A program of the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) program

ITT Industries
Home address:
314 Stone Rd
Hazlet
NJ 07730

The opinions expressed are my own and are not necessarily endorsed by ITT Industries, DARPA or the DoD.

MTC-00008500

From: Bob Giese
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone. Only the lawyers are getting rich. Where would the P.C. be without Microsoft?

Robert Giese

MTC-00008501

From: R Patrcik Scanlon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Can you folks please get this thing settled. I think that what is on the table is fine. I have no interest in this other than it is time to move on. I think that Microsoft's competitors are trying to derail.

R. Patrick Scanlon

MTC-00008502

From: The Washingtons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly urge you to impose a harsher penalty on Micro\$oft for their illegal activities. I don't believe they take seriously the findings of the court and are not acting in a manner consistent with halting their illegal conduct and promoting competition in the industry. The court should be insistent on depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains, not extending their monopoly into the education field.

Craig Washington
Happy New Year

MTC-00008503

From: Bill Rice
To: billg@microsoft.com@inetgw
Date: 1/3/02 9:48pm
Subject: windows xp

Dear Mr. Gates

I am a long time Microsoft supporter . . . have bought almost every upgrade version of Windows, Office, FrontPage.etc !!!! . . . I work on as laptop and have a desktop for home, a laptop for my wife, and two desktops for my 2 children. I recently purchased the latest version of everything available.spending over \$750 before the holidays. I have been buying Microsoft products for years . . .

I am ABSOLUTELY APPALLED that the XP operating system requires that I purchase an additional license, for hundreds of dollars, for every PC in my house . . . (this is not obvious on the purchased product, from the retail salesperson, on the Microsoft website, or in any advertisement.I looked! I didn't have my bi-focals and couldn't read the VERY SMALLEST PRINT) I have always supported Microsoft.and have not supported the federal and state lawsuits . . .

BUT . . . I FEEL ROBBED.no salesman warned me that, unlike all previous versions . . . I would have to buy separate, EXPENSIVE licenses for each computer in my home.(I buy a VCR tape.and use it in all my VCRs.) . . . so I am sad to say that tonight I am writing to Judge Kollar-Kotally as well as to all of the states attorneys general . . .

To convey my personal experience.that Microsoft is not playing fair with its market advantage . . . UNTIL TONIGHT, I WAS AN ARDENT MICROSOFT SUPPORTER . . . THERE IS NO CLEAR INDICATION ON THE XP BOX THAT THE UPGRADE WILL ONLY WORK ON ONE COMPUTER . . . I feel misled and disappointed . . . my children use XP at school and I wanted to use the same operating system at home for projects and homework.but to put the operating system on their PCs costs over \$500 and there is no alternative operating system platform.

I think the uniformity of platform created by a broadly successful Microsoft has helped propel significant increases in our national productivity. I now believe that Microsoft is taking advantage of the "little guy," and that this pricing scheme may reflect a portion of what others in the technology industry have been complaining about. I didn't understand or appreciate the problem until tonight.

Thanks for taking the time to review these comments.

Bill Rice

CC:Microsoft
ATR,microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw,
. . .

MTC-00008504

From: Clif Ars
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel strongly that it would be in the best interest of the public and the economy for the "Tunney Act" to go through. I have little doubt that many view Microsoft's domination within the technology sector as a monopoly, but to define a true monopoly the public's benefit and interest must be harmed. As a consumer, I cannot see where I or the consumer base at large has been hurt by Microsoft. We as a nation should realize the part that this company played in the strongest economy growth in history. The jobs, the taxable revenue, and the products that have put this country on the map in the I.T. World. Please take a look at some of these companies at the forefront of this costly litigation and ask yourself, "Is it the consumer that they are trying to help, or themselves?" Is this the cost of doing business in America?

What company is going to be targeted next?
 Thank you

MTC-00008505

From: Rick Becker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the DOJ settlement with Microsoft. I wish my Attorney General could look past his campaign contributions from Silicon Valley and support it also.

Richard Becker
 El Cajon, CA

MTC-00008506

From: Ross Fontenot
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 9:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that you should either accept the agreement by microsoft and the states or drop all charges. If you try to screw Microsoft they will screw you out of millions of tax dollars by taking the offer made to them by British Columbia. Microsoft was just as big as a monopoly as Walmart but no one ever brought charges against them even though charges should be brought against them because they squash their competitors especially in small cities like I live in. That is why I buy everything on the net because I will not support Walmart but I will support Microsoft because they care about their consumers and try to be the best while offering great products. DO NOT stop this by limiting their innovation. If you want to screw someone screw Walmart.

MTC-00008507

From: Keith Beavers
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement.

I sincerely urge acceptance. Lets move on.

MTC-00008508

From: chojnack@swbell.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...
 Date: 1/3/02 10:02pm

Subject: MS Anti-trust and Tunney Act of 1974
 Good Folk—

In accordance with the Tunney Act of 1974 I'm offering my public comment on the MicroSoft Anti-trust case now in it's 60-day public comment period that started on Nov. 28. I have worked with computers and computer software in a wide variety of jobs for the past 35 years.

I do not think that the current settlement is in the best interest of the American people. Microsoft's arguments that browser (et al) functionality is part of the operating system is specious and without any technically provable merit whatsoever. Further, their dominance of the computing field today parallels IBM's over 30 years ago; even the argumentative stance of the corporate legal staff is vaguely familiar to me. And, of course, both companies, at the times of their litigation, made and delivered notoriously shoddy software products.

Please contact me if you have any questions or need more information ...
 Leon S. Chojnacki CBCP

MTC-00008509

From: jerry bergeron
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel this lawsuit has consumed way too much time and expense on both sides...

Leave the settlement as is...

MTC-00008510

From: RMinott@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I have followed this case from the very start. As an educator, parent and computer user. I think the current proposed settlement offer is more than fair. It is outrageous to consider complaints that: A) the computers offered are out of date or reconditioned. ALL computers are out of date within 6 months to a year! If these computers are networked in a school, they are simply work stations. 1. By supplying windows systems, MS is being self serving. If anyone else had offered windows, they would have loved it! NO other company in the history of our country has EVER been asked to supply a product other than their own as part of a settlement! Has the government asked General Motors to supply Chrysler products as a remedy? and Firestone? NEVER! It has always been, fix, repair, REPLACE, supply or refund. The precedent this would create is to ridiculous to consider!

I support an immediate settlement...as proposed by Microsoft.
 Bob Minott

MTC-00008511

From: Joy Staveley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:05pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Dear Justices,

I am a Mac Computer (Apple) User, but I also use Microsoft software. I believe the recent settlement proposal fo the Microsoft lawsuit is fair and in the best interest of the end user—people like me. Microsoft has made

a huge positive difference in the personal and business computer world. Their user friendly, practical applications have advanced the technology of computers faster than one could imagine! It's time to put this lawsuit behind us, and move forward. It has taken a long time to get to this point. Careful review and decision has been made. I would urge the court to follow through and confirm the decision.

Sincerely,
 Joy Iris Staveley, Vice President
 Canyoneers, Inc.
 <joy@canyoneers.com>
 PO Box 2997
 Flagstaff, AZ 86003

MTC-00008512

From: William
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:08pm
 Subject: Please read this letter
 Judge,

I am very concerned about the direction that this case is turning into and its like other case brought before MS. Now its time for MS to wiggle out of this like they have so many other times. MS proposes that they give a billion dollars of there products and services to schools. I am shocked that anyone that knows anything about the software industries can even call this a penalty. This is like putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop (I am sorry for using this old phrase). This penalty is a reward to MS. In years to come they have more buyers of there product and they get to dominate a market that they have battle for many years with Apple.

I propose:

First a billion dollars is a slap on the hands (which is what they want) for MS. You need to get really tough with this people or they are back to doing this again (I my opinion they already are doing this with Windows XP). It needs to really hurt this company and 20 billion is much better. Second have them put some of this money into a trust fund for schools to choose which computer system and software they believe is better. Last and most important if they have wronged other companies they need to pay these companies big dollars or what good does this whole process accomplish? Netscape was my web browser of choice for many years but now its MS explorer. Not because MS did better but Netscape could not compete under the unfair market that existed at the time and ended up selling off to AOL. These people have been robbed of there hard work. MS needs to pay the wrong to these people!

I also believe that MS needs to be broken into many smaller companies but this is now a thing of the past.

Thanks for your time.
 William Davis
 232 So. Washington
 New Bremen Ohio 45869
 william@nktelco.net

MTC-00008513

From: John Manning
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/3/02 10:15pm
 Subject: End Law Suit

MTC-00008514

From: Cagakiss@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Anti Trust Division
Department of Justice

I am interested in saying YES to the recent microsoft settlement. I have reviewed many of the documents in this case and think it a good fair settlement for all parties. Our country and its citizens have been through enough, let it stand. The settlement as it stands would be good for our economy and we can all move on.

Sincerely,
camille mangakis

MTC-00008515

From: RDL300619@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case. Do not let a few disgruntled staes and competitors prlong this case. For the good of the worldwide economy, settle the case as agreed upon with the government. With any decision there will always be a certain segment of the population that will not agree, but the good of the country should prevail.

MTC-00008516

From: Audrey Klein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please hear my voice..This is America..We have the freedom to Innovate..We are a proud capitalistic society. Don't take away our Freedom.

MTC-00008518

From: DANLDP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to have my comments in this e-mail considered when making the final judgement in the Microsoft settlement. If you want to consider damages, my governments' actions against Microsoft have damaged many consumers much more than Microsoft's alleged monopoly could ever have. The plunge the stock market took can be related, in many respects, to the governments lawsuit against Microsoft. Millions of stock holders suffered damages when stocks they held plunged in value because of the perceived threat to the technology sector of the stock market. It wasn't just Microsoft stock holders either, many technology stocks were affected by this lawsuit.

Microsoft operates in one of the most competitive and dog-eat-dog businesses ever know to man. It has to constantly be inventing and researching and developing new and innovative ways to help consumers. The fact that Windows was put in many computers was a plus to help standardize a new , and to many people, baffling industry that changed the way the world goes about its everyday tasks. It made the learning field much more level and less confusing, there by familizing many millions of people with a brand new industry.

The public will not be served by prolonging this lawsuit. It stifles the positive

energy of this nation that can be used in much more productive ways.

Please for the good of all concerned, let's get this settled and move on.

Thank you,
Linda Pershall
PO Box 1922
Wenatchee, WA 98807

MTC-00008519

From: Rick Fontana
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Lets get our economy moving again I support Microsoft and theire ability to create new jobs and opportunity through their technology.

MTC-00008520

From: JaneM112@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope that the government allows Microsoft the additional four months to prepare their case. As a computer instructor, I think Microsoft has given the consumer the easiest way to use a computer with Windows. My students who use Windows become self-sufficient much more quickly than those who use other programs. The bundled features and products which all work the same way, make learning simple and quick. The legal arguments from other companies are self-serving, ignoring the good of the consumer.

Jane Mason

MTC-00008521

From: Tim Semple
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You know where the real monopoly resides? At the American Bar Association, with its legions of parasitic, bloodsucking lawyers ensuring that the taxpayer-funded legal system is responsive to their self-centered whims. Why don't you Dept. of Justice people go after monopolists like that piece of trash David Boie (or whatever his name is - i.e. the shithead who did Al Gore's dirty work in Florida, and who a dim bulb in the DOJ decided would be the perfect lead counsel to unfairly slander and malign Microsoft while being paid with my tax dollars). The courts have been subverted so that the Spences, Baileys, Cochrans etc. etc. can plunder filthy lucre from people who actually work for an honest living.

But all the lawyers in the Justice Dept. are blinded by their allegiance to the American Bar Association (monkey see—monkey do) and walk in lockstep to its every whim. The ABA—now that's a monopoly that is screwing over the American public and someone ought to do something about.

Did you know that the post office stopped issuing stamps with lawyers on them? No one could figure out which side they should spit on. Sincerely yours, someone who is disgusted with the DOJ's meddling in the internal affairs of that American success story known as Microsoft,

Tim Semple
North Pomfret, Vt.

MTC-00008522

From: JIMW2348@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough !! It's past time to put this issue to rest. It appears that big money is buying AG's from some states. There can't be any satisfaction in the justice system being a part to their game. A decision was made and accepted by the majority. Majority rules, declare the Microsoft case closed.

Thank You,
Jim Worsham

MTC-00008523

From: Bill (038) Lou
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ystueta Construction
106 Patrick Henry Lane
Madison, Alabama 35758
January 3, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I write this letter to show my support for the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. The antitrust dispute lasted for three years, and it is now finally over. America can move on to improving its economy.

The settlement is offers a fair resolution to the settlement that will benefit all parties involved. The terms not only call for Microsoft to restructure certain aspects of their licensing and marketing, but call for them to disclose information about certain Windows interfaces. This not only allows other computer manufacturers access to various Windows features, but also makes it easier for them to install non-Microsoft software. This agreement can only help promote the competitive market, and can only help our IT Sector grow as a whole.

Microsoft has been distracted from its mission by litigation for long enough. I support the settlement, and I support letting Microsoft get back to being the IT industry leader that it can be.

Sincerely,
William Ystueta

MTC-00008524

From: PEGGY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Leave Microsoft alone, Please!!!!

MTC-00008525

From: cheryllreed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a life-long resident, registered and regular voter, taxpayer, and business owner in the state of Ohio, one of the plaintiffs in this case, I strongly urge that the proposed

settlement be made final and that this lawsuit is brought to a long overdue end. I have communicated my strong objection to this suit to Betty Montgomery, Ohio's Attorney General, numerous times since this all began. In my opinion, this lawsuit was NEVER in the public interest. I believe the recession we are now in was directly caused by our government's intrusion in intellectual property rights and an industry for which they have no understanding.

As a small business owner, I have watched as other businesses in my community have either been driven out of business completely or seen their businesses severely damaged by this economic situation. To do anything less than settle this case by making the proposed agreement official is nothing less than economic treason.

Microsoft software has revolutionized the way we do business and established the United States as the world leader in technology. It's time to let them go back to doing what they do best.

Cheryll Reed
1231 Richland St.
Maumee, Oh 43537

MTC-00008526

From: Bobbie Bamford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an American citizen and taxpayer, I would like to have you settle immediately with Microsoft. NO MORE LITIGATION IS NECESSARY...Please quit spending my hard earned tax dollars on this and get your priorities straight. Like: terrorists, drug smuggling and users who are making our country weak as they have blown their brains on drugs, murderers and rapists.

This is supposed to be the Land of Opportunity. I feel Bill Gates is only exercising his rights.

Sincerely,
Bobbie Bamford
Shelton, WA

MTC-00008527

From: Campbell McCarthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:45pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
To: Those Concerned

This is just my personal opinion, but I find it upsetting that the states and the Federal Government's Justice Division can sue a company for being successful. To win, to succeed, to have a good product, to overcome competition, and to make money is what business is all about. By very definition of the word "business" this means a group of people joined together to present a product or service for the intention of making money. Placing restrictions on Microsoft operations is anti business and unamerican.

Campbell J. McCarthy
2199 Astor St. (Apt.# 202)
Orange Park, FL. 32073-5601
tel. (904) 541-0060

MTC-00008528

From: Ruth Seelye
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 10:51pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I have found other companies, similar to Microsoft, to be as competitive as they. In fact, my new computer was installed with Netscape, which I did not want, and it crowded out everything else.

Finally,

I found a way to delete it Microsoft has been innovative in a way which our country must encourage to stay ahead in this changing world. This litigation saps funds and restricts on-going research and development. Please, let this case be settled, so that Microsoft can get back to doing what they do best—creating, innovating, and enriching our lives.

Sincerely,
res@olypen.com

MTC-00008529

From: NOSLEGOF@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:04pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Msdmes/Gentlemen:

As a retired local judge I find the vendetta waged against Microsoft, essentially by competitors unable to effectively compete in the marketplace, a terribly sad commentary on contemporary business and social standards. Our Founding Fathers would be aghast at the persistent energy-consuming intrusion into a firm which while certainly has been "raking it in" has also contributed mightily to the welfare of consumers and our country generally. The Microsoft saga has not been a Teddy Roosevelt Trust-Busting replication. Instead it has been an incidious mischievous intrusion by a well-meaning, democratic government into trying to poison the incentives for creativity.....the very thing that has made this wonderful country so great. Ask yourselves....."Would not other countries be overjoyed to have a Microsoft in their midst?"

I urge you, please, to terminate this foolishness practiced against Microsoft and direct your energies in areas that will truly will afford benefit to our citizens.

Thank you.

Robert G. Fogelson, Taylortown Road,
Montville, NJ 07045 973-334-4427
CC:MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00008530

From: S.A. Hepps
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:07pm
Subject: Enough already! Stop the continuing greedy legal babble. The American people

Enough already! Stop the continuing greedy legal babble. The American people are sick and tired of this stupid lawsuit!

MTC-00008531

From: dino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:14pm
Subject: On the settlement

MTC-00008532

From: Richard H Freel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:18pm
Subject: MICROSOFT Settlement
Four years is long enough! Too long in fact!! All the suits against MicroSoft should

be thrown out. MS has done more for the computer revolution and the national economy than anyone who is complaining about them.

Let them get back to business!

MTC-00008533

From: Jeanette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:19pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

why can't this be over & done with so microsoft can get on with the business at hand i think it's gone on long enough & let microsoft do what it does very well 'that is create bigger & better programs.

Have a great day or night !!!!!!!

MTC-00008534

From: Kelly V.B.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my concern for the consumers, businesses and for Microsoft. I feel that it is high time for this persecution of Microsoft to come to a resolution. I feel that Microsoft is an outstanding example of what an entrepreneur can achieve in these United States of America. Microsoft has help to move this country into a wonderful new era.

I am pleased to hear that a fair resolution is on the negotiation table. For the sake of the consumers and for others who would like to improve our way of life, allow Microsoft the freedom to keep pushing ahead without further fear of persecution.

Thank you,
Kelly Van Blokland
1362 NW Front Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

MTC-00008535

From: Herbert Hurd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:22pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTELMENT
I WISH I COULD BUILD A BETTER
MOUSE TRAP. SO DOES THE OPPOSITION!

MTC-00008536

From: Ann Jackson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I don't know what we'd do without Microsoft products. Please stop the litigation and leave them free to innovate. I think the government is making a huge mistake and the court should stop for several reasons, one being unemployment. Let the people get back to work. Mr. Gates has given millions to education and other causes. Why break Microsoft up?

Sincerely,
Annie Jackson

MTC-00008538

From: Kathleen Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lets get this settled with Microsoft. It is important to consumers and to our economy. I find it hard to believe this was ever about protecting the consumer. This consumer has

been hurt and the economy of our nation has been hurt. Microsoft should be applauded for it's economic growth of the American economy.

Sincerely,
Kathleen E. Johnson

MTC-00008539

From: MARCENE HENDRICKSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer and user of Microsoft I am satisfied with the settlement made with the Justice Department.

Please do not pursue any further.

MTC-00008540

From: Anna Jeannet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:51pm
Subject: SETTLE !!!

To Whom this May Concern,

I personally think the WHOLE attack on Microsoft has been unfair and unjust. They are an excellent company, have excellent products—and they certainly do not force anyone to be their customers. After all, isn't opportunity what our country all about? Should excellence be allowed to be destroyed by the jealous and reduced to mediocrity?

This whole ridiculous situation has gone on too long. And the attorneys have probably made out like bandits as usual.

SETTLE WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY—
-and turn yourselves to important worldly issues. Further, I feel that Microsoft should be re-imbursed its legal fees by its attackers.

Sincerely,
Anna Jeannet

MTC-00008541

From: Domingues, Tony
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

The recent decisions have been fair, though I believe that it shouldn't have started in the first place.

I have seen Microsoft improve the quality of the operation System and offering what the consumer wants. This problem with other companies like Sun and other companies should try and make better software.

So what if Microsoft makes Internet Explorer as part of the operation System, at least they are offering it in the package and not making the user having to search for a downloadable copy of it. Like Netscape's version 6 browser which was outright Pathetic and slow, but Microsoft produced Internet explorer version 5.5 and 6 that followed and it was great as a standard browser. With XP for example they offered the ability to watch DVD's, in the past you would have to purchase some software just to watch DVD movies. In the End we have to face it, it is their operation System; they should be able to do what they want with it, people should be concentrating in Improving and competing instead of whining when their product is already a failure.

Other companies should take example of Intel and AMD, years ago everyone also thought the Intel was the evil Monopoly Empire, AMD and other companies also

whinged, but look today, Intel is no longer the main Stream. What happened in this example was the AMD competed and also produced a superior product going against Intel's chain.

I think that it should all end now and everyone should just move on and concentrate on the real problems facing the country, instead of Bitching on small issues. Remember that Microsoft is pumping Money into the American Economy, which currently almost faced a recession. I just hop at the end of the day everyone could just move on instead of whinging.

Regards
Tony Domingues

MTC-00008542

From: craig butler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 11:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time for the federal government to step aside and allow one of our country's most dynamic companies of the 20th/21st century to get back on track and move forward. Too much time and money has been wasted over the past few years. I am hopeful the settlement is finalized.

Thank you.
Craig Butler
Danville, KY

MTC-00008543

From: The Shaw's
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ,

Please don't spend any more of my money (Tax dollars) on litigation against microsoft. Take the deal and lets get the economy moving again.

Jason Shaw

MTC-00008544

From: Richard Cote
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my judgment that the whole Microsoft fiasco has gone on for far too long. While the proposed settlement may not be satisfactory to everyone, it has one distinct advantage. It will put an end to this ill advised litigation which I believe has played a large role in the downtrend in our markets, and especially in the technology sector. What is it about hard fought competition that seems to grate on certain members of the community?

While Microsoft may be far from perfect, as I know from experience with all of the various iterations of Windows, it has opened the world of computing to the world, and always at what I would consider to be a reasonable price. It's time to get this behind us and let the world of business and industry get back on track. Please end this litigation and accept the proposed settlement.

Anything less will be an invitation to a further deterioration of our economy, and more possible damage to Microsoft, one of the bulwarks of our technological superiority in the world.

I write this as a retired lawyer and business executive who has never been involved with Microsoft except as a customer and stock

holder. But then, I own more stock in Sun Microsystems, so I am not prejudiced in either direction, except to say that as a result of this ill advised adventure, I'm on the losing end of both stocks.

Sincerely yours,
Richard P. Cote
2008 Calle Candela
Fullerton, CA 92833
714-871-3841

MTC-00008545

From: mark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Case

Summary: Microsoft is not the predator. It has used violence against no one. It is the victim. Leave the peaceful Microsoft Corporation alone and apply your smears and name-calling to some one who deserves it: those damn terrorists who brought down the WTC. This would truly be a historic act of justice. ***

Here are my views on the Microsoft case: Some years ago in 1999, I turned on my television to witness the frightening spectacle of one of Janet Reno's henchman giggling like a terrorist who had just blown up an American embassy. The source of his pleasure-and my displeasure-was his apparent "victory" against a giant "predator" that had "hurt" competitors and "exploited" consumers. Who was this "predator"?

An anarchist who tried to overthrow the Puerto Rican government? A "pro-lifer" who firebombed an abortion clinic? A "murderer" wanted in sixteen states?

No, the so-called "predator" was American businessman Bill Gates and the Microsoft Corporation, creator of the world's best-selling personal computer operating system: Microsoft Windows.

Is Microsoft a "predator" as the Department of Justice insinuates? A predator is someone like Adolph Hitler who kills people in concentration camps, or a member of the mafia who hunts down a neighborhood businessman for not obeying his wishes. A predator is someone who *initiates* the use of physical force. Microsoft has pointed a gun at no one. Clearly, a far stronger case for predatory acts can be made against the Department of Justice—who seeks to violate Microsoft's rights by taking control over its property—than for the make-believe "predatory" acts Microsoft is accused of.

Is Microsoft a "monopoly"? Not in the proper, derogatory, traditional sense of the term. Unlike the old AT&T Bell monopoly, or today's U.S Post Office monopoly, Microsoft did not gain its market share by having the government outlaw its competitors: Microsoft earned its position in the free-market. All real monopolies are the result of the government giving a business a "monopoly"—exclusive control of a given market by outlawing the entry of competitors. Free competition is not some

Marxist, egalitarian, "perfect" ideal where all competitors end up with an equal market share of a given industry. Whether in sports, or in business, the whole point of competition is to beat your competitors-even to the point of having them going out of business. Bigness should not be confused

with monopolistic; size is not a criterion of wrongdoing; success is not a crime.

Did Microsoft halt "innovation"?

Innovation is the process of discovering a better way to do things. No private business can stop other companies from innovating except by out-innovating them, or by buying them out (in the which case the buyer would want the acquired company to innovate even more). The only way to halt innovation is by the threat of physical force, which is a legal power that only governments possess.

Did Microsoft "twist the arms" of its competitors? This sloppy metaphor is a vicious lie. Only the government has the legal power to twist-and even break-arms. The only "twisting" Microsoft engaged in was the legitimate practice of setting the terms of sale for its property. By what stretch of the imagination, does the Department of Justice conflate "arm-twisting" with Microsoft's refusal to license its products to vendors who do not accept its terms? This is not coercion because if a vendor refuses Microsoft's offer and walks away (and he is free to), the vendor will be no worse off than if he did not deal with Microsoft in the first place. For a real example of "arm-twisting" see what happens when you refuse to hand over half your income to the IRS this April.

Did Microsoft "hurt" competitors like Netscape by giving away a free Internet browser with its Windows operating system (when Netscape wanted to charge you \$30)? No more so, then when McDonald's bundles its meat patties with a McDonald's bun does it hurt all the bread makers. Such actions may frustrate their competitors wishes, but their rights are left untouched.

Did Microsoft violate the rules of competition? It is the application of the political principle of individual rights to the economic realm of production and trade that gives rise to the rules of free-competition. To determine whether Microsoft violated the rules of competition; therefore, one has to determine whether Microsoft violated anyone's rights. Clearly, Microsoft did not violate the rights (life, liberty, and property) of anyone.

Yet, in the name of "protecting" competition, it is these inalienable rights that the antitrust process ignores in favor of such subjective considerations as the "public interest" (which fails to include the interests of the millions of members of the public who do not side with the Department of Justice), the "consumer interest" (which the Department of Justice has awarded itself the title of official spokesperson for), and "relevant markets" (the government defines the relevant market small enough so that Microsoft becomes a monopoly, even though Microsoft comprises less than 4% of the computer industry). Such "protection" is tantamount to helping a man to see by thrusting burning coals into his eyes.

By allowing judges to sidestep the issue of rights in favor of considerations, such as the "public interest," the antitrust laws effectively grant government the power to violate Microsoft's rights, i.e. the power to take over and control Microsoft's property against use it against Microsoft's interests. Thanks to the antitrust laws once a judge has arbitrarily classified a business as a

"monopoly", the government is given free rein to: plunder of vast sums of money from Microsoft's bank account (through triple fines for so-called "damages"); replace Bill Gates with a government "overseer" who will make the important strategic decisions at Microsoft; force Microsoft to advertise and distribute its competitor's products; compel Microsoft to give up its "trade secrets" and intellectual property to those who condemn it. From start to finish the entire antitrust process is no more than a process of sacrificing successful American businesses—such as Microsoft, ALCOA, US Steel, Standard Oil—on the guillotine of egalitarianism to appease envious competitors. Or, to quote Alan Greenspan, who upon a complete examination of the theory and history of the antitrust laws wrote that ".the effective purpose, the hidden intent, and the actual practice of the antitrust laws in the United States have led to the condemnation of the productive and efficient members of our society because they are productive and efficient."

The truth of the matter is that Microsoft is not the predator; Microsoft is the victim. The real predators are the bureaucrats in the Department of Justice when acting according to the antitrust laws, second-rate competitors-like Sun, Novell, and Netscape—who seek to profit from the government's actions (what do they think will happen when the government under the antitrust laws deems them "too successful" in their "relevant market"?), and the anti-capitalist intellectuals who support them. Businessmen like Bill Gates are the one group of minorities that best symbolize the American way of life: that of a free, rational, moral society.

Leave the peaceful Microsoft Corporation alone and apply your smears and name-calling to some one who deserves it: those damn terrorists who brought down the WTC. This would truly be a historic act of justice

Regards,
Mark Da Cunha
Publisher
<http://www.CapitalismMagazine.com/>

MTC-00008546

From: DEasyone@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I am amore than a little tired of the antics that have been going on regarding the Microsoft litigation. I doubt the suit brought against them has saved me a dime on software. I know it has cost me about \$70,000 in the price of my Microsoft stock. I am 72 years old and I do not need that kind of help. I have been using computers since the TI 44A was considered the latest deck top PC for the home. I have never had to buy anything I did not wish to nor been stopped from buying what I wanted because of Microsoft's marketing. I have tried other operating systems and found them lacking in what I wanted to do. I have since come back to Microsoft because for me they have a better system. Never because I was forced.

I use AOL as a Internet because I have liked it. If I change it will be because I try something else and like it better.

As I see it the people who brought the suit, did it for there own monitory gain and not for the benefit of the public consumer.

It is about time this suit is brought to a close so that things can get back to normal.

Of course the lawyers would like to drag it on for ever. That is how they get there pockets full.

David J.Eason
225 Newport Drive
Palm Springs California
92264

MTC-00008547

From: Susan Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 9:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't see how Microsoft can possibly be called a monopoly. Anyone can use any software they choose.

Microsoft just built the best that is available. I used to use Netscape.....I don't any more but no one twisted my arm. I think this entire scheme is ridiculous and a slam for the entrepreneurial spirit. Why don't you go after the post office, cable company, garbage companies or phone companies? The post office is obviously a monopoly (government operated) and each of the other companies has their own territory in which to operate.....no one else is allowed.

Susan Smith

MTC-00008549

From: EJBrofka@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Regarding the proposed settlement in this case, I feel very strongly that it should go forward as is.

The reasons that this suit was initially filed were poor from the onset. There was a lot of political influence exerted by the previous administration in bowing to some major contributors who just happened to be in competition with Microsoft. Now, after a more enlightened review by the current administration of the previous legal processes that took place, a settlement has been proposed and accepted by Microsoft DOJ. There remains, however, an intense degree of partisan political pressure by Attorneys General of certain states to try to get into Microsoft's pockets. This, in my humble opinion, is the true reason why those states are not agreeing with the settlement. I would like to go on record as stating that I think that Microsoft has been the single most effective driving force in the "computer revolution" of late twentieth century. It, by virtue of its programs and technology, has put the power of personal computing into the hands of the people in a simple, straightforward and eminently usable fashion. Microsoft products, most importantly Windows and Internet Explorer, have enabled the general populace to partake in and to become part of the greatest information flow that this world had ever seen.

I have, from the very inception of the DOJ suit, felt that the suit was unfair, that it was ill-conceived, and that it was totally unnecessary. Microsoft has done nothing

wrong in its actions. They are a good business and have acted aggressively to sell, to enhance and to protect their excellent products. Microsoft has been successful because of those efforts and its products. No one has been or even now is forced to use them. I think that the proprietary information that has been developed by Microsoft for its operation systems should remain just that: proprietary. Those competitors who have "suffered" have done so because of the inadequacies of their competing systems and programs. The truth of the matter is that they need to give the consumer/PC user a better product if they wish to succeed. That's the basis of business success in this country.

On the other hand, the greatest business foibles have occurred wherever and whenever the government has gotten involved in business, productivity and efficiency, areas in which it has no history of proficiency. One just needs to look at some of the government regulations that have been imposed upon business under the mistaken guise of "helping the consumer." A good (and appropriate) example is the "new and improved" water-saving toilet promulgated and forced into use by the previous administration—you know, the ones that use one-third less water, but that you have to flush three times to have them work properly. Amazing! Al Gore and Ms. Browner have earned a very special place in history for that one.

Let this settlement go forward as agreed and approved. Enough is enough. I am a consumer who has NOT been hurt in any way by Microsoft. As a matter of fact, I have been helped to an immense degree, and I personally feel that Microsoft should be honored, not sued.

Edward J. Brofka
2103 Norman Road
Marion, IL 62959

MTC-00008550

From: swingingclub
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:20am
Subject: Microsoft settlement is just and fair
Dear Counsel:

I am please to hear that Microsoft, Inc. has agreed to reach a settlement with the US Justice Department. I do not feel it is in either parties interest to have protracted litigation in this anti-trust lawsuit. As we all know full well that litigation means time and expense of resources for all parties involved and no one wins and hard feelings are the end product.

At the beginning, and it is still my belief that Microsoft did not violate any anti-trust laws. Microsoft is a highly competitive company in its industry similar to Wal-mart. There is no law that prohibits a company from being competitive. When the matter is evaluated on the basis of economic of scales, the dynamics does favor Microsoft because of its unlimited intellectual resources to create and develop new technologies into the foreseeable future.

Microsoft should not be hindered by other companies who do not have the means to compete. Further, it has been wrongfully argued that Microsoft has prohibited other entities from competing in the computer

industry by anti-competitive tactics. Most of the arguments are based on hypothesis which do not take into consideration the dynamics of economics. It can be safely argued that the companies who object to the settlement are less competitive than Microsoft. Those companies do not and will not ever have the resources that Microsoft has obtained through its creative skills.

Factually, each company that has opposed the settlement (Gateway, Inc.) is functioning on a less than favorable financial tread. Gateway has erroneously argued that the settlement will cause harm to the organization because the donation of computers to schools will cut into their business profits. Factually, Gateway financial problems started long before this proposed settlement was conceived.

Someone need to review Gateway's financial sheet. In the financial community, Gateway has not met its profit projections of the last three quarters of last year. Its biggest rival is Dell Computer which is the reason why Gateway is having financial difficulty.

The US Department of Justice should look at the economic impact that a lawsuit against Microsoft will have on the US economy. It will not be favorable. The nine or so state attorney generals that oppose the settlement should also take note of the fact that a lawsuit against Microsoft will most certainly impact the US economy negatively. I will argue that to oppose the proposed settlement is nothing less than a self-serving posture which amounts to greed. It appears that those states are seeking specific money compensation. This suit is unlike a tobacco law suits where human life was taken because of a defective product.

Microsoft has agreed in principle to stop practices which would cause other companies harm in competition. In addition, Microsoft has agreed to assist other organizations in competition. The states that opposed the settlement have not taken into consideration the good will and philanthropic generosity of the Gates Foundation which has given millions of dollars in charitable donations. I would propose that in the event those states who continue to pursue the course of opposing the fair and just settlement of Microsoft has agreed to enter into with the US Justice Department should be cut off from any form of grants or philanthropic gifts by the Gates Foundation and Microsoft.

I would suggest to the Honorable Court to accept the settlement agreement that the US Justice Department and Microsoft, Inc. have entered into on the basis that the settlement is fair and just for America. Protracted litigation should be avoided by any means necessary because it will be a waste of valuable resources.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas P. Johnson, III

MTC-00008551

From: Gary Dawson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let Microsoft alone. The special interest groups are served enough. Let Microsoft continue to give us a good product

at a fair price. The marketplace can decide if the Microsoft is doing the right thing.

GDawson

MTC-00008552

From: Paul Kessler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement, as now agreed to between Microsoft and the Justice Department, should be approved. Microsoft has been persecuted by its competitors. Microsoft's conduct has been beneficial to the consumer. It's products are superior to those of it's competitors and they are using every means at their disposal to hurt Microsoft.

Paul T. Kessler, Jr.
11651 Hidden Valley Rd.
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

MTC-00008553

From: Roy Schweiker
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.
general@po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 1/4/02 12:25am
Subject: proposed Microsoft \$1 billion
payment

Gentlemen:

I am distressed that the government is prepared to accept Microsoft's offer to supply \$1 billion in kind to poor schools as partial settlement. By guaranteeing Microsoft \$1 billion in business at whatever price it sets, you are perpetuating exactly the sort of monopoly you are trying to end.

Instead, make Microsoft give the schools \$1 billion in cash and require that they issue vendor-neutral proposals for bids, which would probably allow the schools to acquire double the computing power. Alternatively, require Microsoft to provide \$1 billion in products valued at actual manufacturing cost, such as \$6 for a pack of CD-ROMs and \$1 for a site license. That way every school and every household in the country would get a free site license with media for Windows and Office. Maybe that is a fair settlement after all. Ro

y Schweiker, Concord NH
roy.schweiker@juno.com
CC:roy.schweiker@juno.com@inetgw,aweber@cmp.com@inetg...

MTC-00008554

From: Lucio DiGiovanni
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I cannot understand why Microsoft is getting most of what it wanted out of this settlement. It seems as though Microsoft is getting off easy, since George W Bush has taken office. From reading the final judgement, How can this judgement be considered fair when Apple Computer and Netscape Communications, Inc have both been adversely affected by the actions of Microsoft. What corrective action can be made after more than 10 years of destructive monopolistic activity?

I believe that consumers have been hurt by not being allowed to decide what browser they could use. I am affected EVERY DAY because I cannot use Netscape at work because my Company has 'standardized' on IE. I have two browsers loaded on my

computer (Netscape and IE) at work because there are certain internal websites that have specifically been modified to work with IE only.

What kind of standard is in IE if it has web content that allows a user to access a URL such as "I:\directory\file". This works OK with IE but does not work on Netscape because it IS NOT A URL by HTML standards approved by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Netscape complains about this error but since most people (Because they were forced to use IE) have no problem with this 'URL' access, it is not considered a problem and people are then confused about what a URL is and continue to make non standard changes to web sites that only work with a NON-Standard IE.

Sincerely frustrated,
Lucio DiGiovanni

MTC-00008555

From: DMiller909@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:28am
Subject: (no subject)

During the past several years I have followed the government/Microsoft case. The competitors of Microsoft applied their pressure and, in my opinion, the situation turned from legal to a political situation.

The Attorney Generals, representing their respective states and constituents (competitors of Microsoft) have set forth the claim that the consumer has been hurt by the activities of Microsoft. Yet, I, as a consumer, would love to know what damage has been caused to me so that I would be able to compare it to the financial damage caused by the shadows this case has cast over the financial market. The AG's pursue their ultimate desire which, in my opinion, would ultimately satisfy the companies they have in their respective States while the investors and the market continue being the victim. Moreover, the economy of our nation has diminished in proportion to the overall effect that the market has suffered.

My wife and I have made investments in Microsoft, Aol, Sun, Cisco etc., hoping to build a future financial support for our Grand-children when it would be needed for their college education. There is no doubt in my mind that numerous other parents and grand-parents have invested with the same thought in mind. And, as long as the uncertainty overshadows the market the multitude of persons invested in the technology stocks will continue suffering the financial loss that the case continues to create by causing ongoing legal demands, by the AG's, that surpass the final determination of the federal government. The federal government and several States have reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft. Why therefor should the marketplace and the consumers be held hostage to the will of competitors and the remaining attorney generals who insist upon additional legal demands. Neither the consumers nor the overall economy needs further uncertainty. It is time to put this matter to rest.

Very truly yours,
Daniel Miller

MTC-00008556

From: RShelton5@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department:

Leave Mr. Gates and his company alone. He has committed no crime; he deserves our praise and gratitude for his work. He has a moral right to his work and his money. Antitrust laws are immoral and design to crush the creative and honest. Cease your attacks on him and his company.

Sincerely,
Ray Shelton
Glendale, CA

MTC-00008557

From: Jack Carroll
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:34 am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Public Comment by John A. Carroll

This comment is on the proposed settlement in U.S. vs. Microsoft, and on the Remedial

Proposals by State of New York et al vs. Microsoft.

THE OPEN SOURCE SOFTWARE INTEREST My interest in the outcome of this case is a consequence of my participation in the open source software community. I'm a long-time user and advocate of the Linux/GNU family of operating systems and related open source applications; also, I'm a stockholder in Red Hat, Inc., a commercial distributor of open source software. Antitrust legislation and litigation concerns not only the direct parties in the case, but the public interest as well. Obviously, the interests of the open source community form a subset of the public interest, because that community is part of the public. However, open source software and its development are related to the interests of the general public in a much closer way. Open source programming is fundamentally about freedom. This body of software is developed largely by end users, for the benefit of end users. Most open source projects encourage anyone to contribute improvements. Also, anyone is at liberty to start a new project and build on the existing body of open software. The most common licenses encourage wide distribution of the fruits of this open-ended collaboration. The nature of the open source community makes it a powerful force against monopolism. It is possibly the only body today able to offer the public serious alternatives to Microsoft operating systems and office productivity applications, and thus effectively counteract Microsoft's unrelenting campaign to preserve and extend its monopoly. In certain parts of the world a growing user base has already begun to abandon Microsoft products in favor of open source replacements. Because of the diversity of this community, it can have no single representative able to speak for all. It is not a business, though it includes businesses. It's not a private club, though it includes a great number of local users' groups. Its most productive components, the "projects", usually don't have even that amount of organization; they're geographically dispersed teams of volunteer programmers sharing source code over the

internet, who prefer to give their attention to the programs they have a need for, rather than and unwanted apparatus of officers and treasuries. University research programs and undergraduate programming classes are involved, and many of the customs and practices derive from the open traditions of academic research. A great deal has been accomplished by unaffiliated individuals. Thus, different members of this community will contribute different perspectives to this public issue. **DEFECTS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND REMEDIAL PROPOSALS** The remedies in the proposed settlement are written around "ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs"—all business entities (section I). Developers and suppliers of open source software are neither mentioned nor contemplated. Indeed, section J paragraph 2 speaks of "reasonable business needs" and "authenticity and viability of its business".

"ISV" is counter-intuitively defined to be a supplier of a software product that runs on a Windows Operating System product -thereby excluding a supplier of a software product that runs on a non-Microsoft operating system, or a supplier of a non-Microsoft operating system. The information to be disclosed to non-Microsoft entities includes APIs, protocols, and documentation for middleware (section D). It does not include user data file formats used by applications. The language of section I could reasonably be interpreted to assert intellectual property rights to any information which is not specifically required to be disclosed; that could be used to restrict the analysis and documentation by outsiders of an application's external behavior, or the use of information they have already compiled by behavioral analysis. That would have profound implications; in effect, it would manipulate the Court into restoring and strengthening an application monopoly which the open source community has already broken. These are not accidental oversights. These provisions are carefully crafted to exclude open source software developers from access to the technical information necessary to make their creations interoperable with Microsoft systems and application software.

Several open source operating systems have fully demonstrated their readiness for the most demanding commercial service. Open source office productivity applications have matured to a point where their relative merits compared to Microsoft equivalents are as much a matter of opinion and taste as objective fact. Star Office / Open Office, in particular, has achieved a high degree of interoperability with Microsoft Office file formats.

Now the struggle between Microsoft and the open source community is converging on offering end users the freedom to migrate their existing document and data files from proprietary Microsoft formats to next-generation open-standard replacements. This migration process relies heavily on "filters", which are utility programs that convert one file format to another. Historically, open source projects have analyzed sample document files to deduce their formatting, so that filters can be written. Once these filters exist, end users can migrate to a different

application package at will without losing their investment in their data. Equally, users of non-Microsoft applications can put their work into formats that Microsoft applications can read and edit. Microsoft's most important weapon to obstruct end-user defection and prevent the emergence of a level playing field is the obscurity of the file formats used by its office applications. If they can continually change their file formats to break compatibility, then deny access to the revised format information by a combination of secrecy and legal measures, they can erect high barriers against migration to non-Microsoft applications, or exchanging document files with users of non-Microsoft applications and operating systems. This is a powerful anticompetitive tactic.

Why agree to share information with certain businesses, but not with open source developers? Because Microsoft has a long history of success in buying out or smothering commercial suppliers of any product that endangers its monopoly position—it has every reason to be confident of its ability to continue the same proven strategy. Those methods don't work against open source developers. These developers aren't carrying the weight of a business, so they don't need revenue—therefore there's no way to cut off their resources. Legal harassment is impractical, because they're scattered through hundreds of jurisdictions with radically different legal systems, some of which are promoting open source software as a matter of national security policy. Their code is released under licenses that make monopolization virtually impossible. Their distribution costs are negligible. Their archives are duplicated and backed up all around the world. And because anybody with a computer and a modem can participate at will, their numbers, productivity, and code quality are far beyond any business's ability to match.

Section B applies only to "Covered OEMs", which are defined to be only the 20 largest-volume OEMs. This leaves Microsoft considerable room to impose discriminatory terms and rates on all its other customers, and thus penalize any behavior it wants to discourage. Smaller OEMs are the ones most likely to respond to end users' requirements and preferences—such as offering customers a choice of Microsoft, non-Microsoft, dual-boot, or no pre-installed software. Section C says nothing about adjusting royalties when Microsoft middleware is replaced by non-Microsoft middleware, or simply deleted.

New York et al's Remedial Proposals offer important improvements. Their section B paragraph 2-ii contains the important phrase "actual volume of total shipments of the licensed products", meaning that Microsoft is paid only for Microsoft products shipped, and not the total number of computers shipped by the OEM including those on which Microsoft products are not installed. This is a critical issue to the open source community, since it removes an economic barrier to offering a choice of software to the OEM's customers—and to offering machines without software to those who prefer to do their own installations or boot from the local network. They do not, however, propose to provide open source developers with the

same external interface information as business entities, nor do they include application file formats among the information to be disclosed except indirectly by interpretation of a definition (section C paragraph 4). Also, in their provisions for interoperability, they discuss middleware but not applications; this effectively protects only suppliers of software that runs on Microsoft operating systems.

They do propose to force Microsoft to open-source Internet Explorer. Other open source users and developers may disagree with me about this, but I don't believe that would be useful at this late date. Open source versions of Netscape and its successor Mozilla are already the dominant browsers on open source operating systems. Nearly four years of work have been invested in bringing the original commercial source code up to the standards of open source projects, so that substantive progress can now be made. Most of the commercially-produced Netscape code had to be discarded and rewritten from scratch. It's unlikely that a development team could be assembled that would be willing to undertake similar remedial work on Internet Explorer. In general, open source developers would have little interest in looking at Microsoft source code. It's the external behavior that's important for interoperability, not the internal design.

They propose to make the porting of Microsoft Office to some non-Microsoft operating systems mandatory. This is interesting, in that it could become a stepping stone for Microsoft users to abandon Windows first and Office later, rather than attempting both changes at once. Several years ago most of the open source community would have been interested in porting Office, but the work on replacements is far advanced now. It's of interest that the latest version of the only non-Microsoft OS which runs Office now is Mac-OS X, which is actually a commercial Unix operating system underneath the Macintosh user interface. Thus, this version of Office uses Unix APIs. Most non-Microsoft operating systems with any significant popularity today are derived from Unix (FreeBSD, OpenBSD, Solaris, HP-UX, AIX, Linux, GNU Hurd, SCO Unix); thus, it would be relatively easy to write the Mac-OS source code according to recognized Unix portability standards, so that it would compile on any Unix platform. However, the language of the proposal is so vague on what the target operating systems would be, that Microsoft could choose BeOS, OS/2, and Plan 9, thus frustrating the intent.

Section L of the Remedial Proposals is of great importance to open source software. Open source software achieves much of the interoperability among its components and applications by adherence to published formal standards. Interoperability between Microsoft and non-Microsoft systems and applications is essential to creating a level playing field. Thus, requiring Microsoft to be truthful in its claims to standards compliance promotes competition and user choice. It is also important that definitions of "standard" and "de facto standard" are provided, since Microsoft has a history of misusing these terms for deceptive marketing purposes.

PROPOSED REMEDIES

1. In section D, "shall disclose to..." should be changed to "shall publish". This would place all software developers on an equal footing, and make crucial interoperability information available to open-source developers working without the financial support of a business. In the same section "APIs and related Documentation" should read "APIs, file formats, communication protocols, and related Documentation"; and "or Microsoft applications to store and communicate user data" should added following "Microsoft Middleware to interoperate with a Windoww Operating Systems Product". This makes explicit the requirement to publish application file formats and network protocols. From the view-point of the open source community, enforcing these two requirements is the central issue of the whole case, and the key to breaking the monopoly once and for all. The requirement to disclose application file formats is implied in the Remedial Proposals' definition of "API", but leaving it less than airtight invites tactical litigation and delay. The burden of any such litigation would probably fall on the State Attorneys-General, because nobody in the open source community has the financial resources to take on Microsoft in court.

2. The Remedial Proposals forbid Microsoft from using agreements or retaliation to discourage OEMs from installing non-Microsoft operating systems alongside Windows and allowing the user to control which system is booted. Microsoft should also be prohibited from taking technical measures against multi-booting. It wouldn't be difficult to modify Windows to malfunction in the presence of a non-Microsoft boot loader, intentionally corrupt or overwrite the boot loader, or fail after partition re-sizing.

REFERENCES

On the history and nature of open source software: "The Cathedral and the Bazaar" by Eric S. Raymond, <http://www.tuxedo.org/esr/writings/cathedral-bazaar> On the licensing of free and open source software: the General Public License ("GPL") by Richard M. Stallman, <http://www.fsf.org/licenses/licenses.html#TOCGPL> On the place of business within the open source community, "Under the Radar" by Robert Young and Wendy Rohm, <http://www.redhat.com/radar.html>

John A. Carroll
77 Musket Dr.
Nashua, N.H. 03062-1442

MTC-00008558

From: Margaret Baecker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 120
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am writing in support of the proposed settlement agreement with Microsoft that would provide technology funds, computers

and software to schools in low-income communities. The State of Wisconsin would benefit from the technology funds. Our state falls below the national average in the percentage of 4th-8th grade students in schools that have computers available in all classrooms. In addition, about one half of Wisconsin Education Association Council members feel that they have adequate training to operate computers and software in their schools. Less than half of these teachers feel that they get technology training, provided by their schools, to integrate technology into curriculum. The additional funding for teacher training in technology would be beneficial for smaller school districts, such as mine, which are feeling the effects of decreased state funding to meet operating expenses. In many cases, there is only limited revenue to provide technology training. Needless to say, computer and telecommunication technologies are important educational tools in our schools. Computer literacy is an educational goal in our schools, providing students with technology skills that are needed to meet the learning requirements for future jobs. No student or teacher should be denied the opportunity to become computer-literate. The proposed Microsoft Settlement is most positive, and certainly would benefit students, teachers, and schools that need technology funding the most.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Margaret Baecker
Independence Public School
23786 Indee Blvd.
Independence, WI 54747

MTC-00008559

From: jim.puckett@idcchina.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies, Gentlemen:

I am writing to support the settlement of the Microsoft case as it stands today. While I cannot even agree with the pursuit of the case in the first case, regardless, it has occurred. First and foremost, Microsoft is not a monopoly.

Microsoft has created the ability for the average person to use the personal computer. Prior to Microsoft's comprehensive programs for work, together with their operating systems, the use of the personal computer was a perilous and cumbersome time.

I have been a user of the personal computer from the early 1980's. At that time, with DOS as the standard, loading a new program was an arduous task not to mention the "risk" you had in merely turning off your computer incorrectly. Missteps in either of these operations could have easily rendered your PC hopelessly "crashed". At that time, an expensive "consultant" was the only resolution to recovery of your PC tool.

Microsoft changed that through its integrated systems. Apple did not do it. Oracle did not do it. IBM did not do it. Microsoft did it. Their system is not perfect. Their "capture" of the market is not perfect. However, they have done nothing that any other visionary company could not have done. This witch hunt of a legal proceeding

is an atrocity and a fierce challenge to the way America has become what it is—the place where innovation is rewarded, and a better mousetrap universally purchased and used by the average citizen. The expert mouse catcher, such as my cat George, will never be interested in the tool that is available to us average users.

Finish this proceeding at the earliest time. Settle this case now. Let Microsoft and the American inventor and visionary proceed with the next great idea that will fuel the American and world economy to new and greater heights.

Thank you.

James E. Puckett
707 Alondra NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
puckettje@aol.com
505 897 1040

MTC-00008560

From: Alan Grose
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement that has been reached is fair and equitable and should be approved.

MTC-00008561

From: Robert H. Fleck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ladies and Gentlemen.....

Please settle with Microsoft. The proposed settlement is fair. This whole case has been going on for far too long. The industry has changed so much since the case was brought to trial that it is no longer important.

Settle and be done with it.....

MTC-00008562

From: Susan Fuller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:59am
Subject: settlement

I am glad the suits were filed. Microsoft was getting out of line. They should not be allowed to dictate how other companies run their business. I feel the settlement was enough to ask Microsoft to pay, and that unless they get way out of line again, they should be left to do their thing, without further penalty. Microsoft is very important to the US economy, and is trying to be a better corporate citizen, as I see it. I believe they have "learned their lesson". Their products are truly getting better, and I buy them happily now, not begrudgingly, like I did in the past, because there was no choice.

MTC-00008563

From: Evangeline Burtch-Farrell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:58am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Will You PLEASE leave Microsoft alone to do what it does best (innovate and create for all of us) and move on to some REAL issues of injustice. Enough already.

E. Burtch-Farrell

MTC-00008564

From: N. Hagan
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case, as soon as possible. It is an ugly remnant of the last (corrupt) DoJ and one that need not continue. The states who oppose it need to be overruled. There is no value to the market, to the economy or to Microsoft's erstwhile competitors in continuing. Microsoft's so-called competitors (and the real impetus behind this suit) will fail no matter how many advantages they are given. Don't use anti-trust law to reward inferior companies with overpriced products that the consumer has long ago rejected, of their own accord.

Innovation is alive and well in this industry. Open Source projects, IBM, Apple, Netscape all are still here and they prosper. Microsoft never stifled innovation, it stopped inferior overpriced companies (Like SUNW) from preying on less sophisticated consumers. How? By giving them *choice. End the insanity now.

MTC-00008565

From: Dave Steele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that the Tunney Act, and resulting Microsoft Settlement, should be completed as soon as possible. It has always been my view that Microsoft has been persecuted for the heinous crime of being ahead of it's time—nothing more. Their ability to outthink and move faster than the competition, and the resulting financial gains, are all they're guilty of. Microsoft has generously agreed to settle, so let's settle and be done with this dirty business.

Dave Steele
P.O. Box 103
Tryon, OK 74875
918 374-2682

MTC-00008566

From: PGMUCCI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:21am
Subject: SETTLEMENT

COMPANIES THAT STRIVE TO BECOME SUCCESSFUL IN SUPPLYING A PRODUCT THAT PEOPLE WANT SHOULD BE REWARDED AND NOT DRAGGED THROUGH COURT BECAUSE THE COMPETITION CANNOT KEEP UP.
PGMUCCI@AOL.COM

MTC-00008567

From: ddp2000@tds.net
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/4/02 1:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the lawsuits against MSFT. Everyone benefits from the great software innovations made at low cost to the consumer. All great businesses have high barriers to entry by competition... that is good not bad.

MTC-00008568

From: Donsmckee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

All charges against Microsoft should be dropped. They have provided goods and

services which consumers have voluntarily purchased. No monopoly can exist in a voluntary, free market.

Don McKee
3165 Sierra Dust Court
Sparks, NV. 89436

MTC-00008569

From: Bill Lesnjak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:37am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Friends,
The proposed settlement is appropriate, fair, and beneficial to all concerned, particularly to the American public of which I write as a member of.

Microsoft's contributions to our society have dwarfed many of others; please, let's settle this matter and go on to the future!

Will Lesnjak,
S-4067 Chicken Hollow Rd.,
Hillsboro, WI 54634
billlesnjak@yahoo.com

MTC-00008570

From: Marc Alexander Toppel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Reader,
I do not know who is reading this, but I hope you to be a rational, freedom loving person—someone who's main goal in life is to retain justice in a world that has become devoid of it. It is with this said that I must describe the reasons why the Microsoft Antitrust Case is nothing but wrong for various reasons.

I know the main purpose of antitrust laws. They are pragmatic at best. They hope to make things better for the whole society. However, we live in a country that was founded on principles of justice, blind of how it might affect others. If habeus corpus was stricken from our constitution, I'm sure the judicial system would be alot more streamlined, but would it be just? If we took away people's inborn right to speak freely, the government would no longer have to deal with opposing viewpoints and more things could be accomplished, but is it right? A dictator could come in and implement a system with which every aspect of our lives were managed for the good of society, yet dosen't that vanquish our right to make our own decisions in life, bad or good? For everything that you do, think not of what the practical implications may be, please think of what is right.

With that knowledge in mind, I must proclaim to you that anti-trust actions fall short of practical. I myself do not have the economics no-how to explain this to you, but I have come across countless essays documenting the benefits of a laissez-faire world. I will leave such things to the more qualified experts. I do, however, stand with the faculties to defend Microsoft morally. They created their products. Consumers decided they liked them. Companies began to recognize this so THEY DECIDED to enter contracts with Microsoft to use their products. Competitors volunteered to compete against Microsoft, yet some failed either because they created inferior products

or they lacked the long term planning necessary to establish brand recognition and reliability. If you'll notice, everything here was done VOLUNTARILY. No one forced anyone to do anything. Customers were free to buy or not buy products. Companies were free to sign or not sign contracts. Competitors were free to create better or worse products.

Do not mess up this free society and force Microsoft to adhere to your beliefs, for if you do, we become one step closer to a totalitarian regime. However, If you drop the case and subsequently remove antitrust laws from the books, we stay that much closer to the place that our fore fathers envisioned so long ago.

Thank you for your time,
Marc Toppel, age 18
mtoppel@mail.utexas.edu
936-441-6575
10 Baron's Place
Conroe, Texas 77304

MTC-00008571

From: Orrilla Blanpied
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs, we wish to preserve the rights of Microsoft to innovate, continue research and development and protect their rights to the development of their original ideas.

Microsoft has contributed revolutionary technology for the huge growth and developemnt of our country !! Protect it !!

O.Blanpied oblanpie@netzero.net

MTC-00008572

From: Dick (038) Bev
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:47am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe this has gone on long enough and most of the lawyers can retire now with this prolonged lawsuit. It is my opinion that the lawsuit be settled once and for all and let the innovative spirit of this product continue. Our economy in the pacific northwest needs this company and the jobs they provide and this country needs more Bill Gates and less lawsuits that have tied up this country long enough.

Beverly Davidson, Taxpayer.

MTC-00008573

From: JBPsyD333@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:47am
Subject: microsoft settlement

I fully support the settlement as reached and believe it to be in everyone's best interests, as both a stockholder and a user of microsoft products.

Dr. Judi Bloom Hauswirth and Dennis Hauswirth

MTC-00008574

From: Joe Testerman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:20 am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement offer proposed in the DOJ v. Microsoft case is more than reasonable and this litigation should finally be brought to a conclusion. I am very concerned that special interest groups continue their agenda of

pushing for the break-up of one of America's largest companies. I find this type of agenda unacceptable and way beyond reason.

Please accept the current settlement proposal and put a stop to this long overrun issue. It's time for America to get back to business and to continue our focus of competing in the new global economy. Thank you for your time and courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely,
Joseph L. Testerman, II
13208 Myford Road #343
Tustin, CA 92782
(714) 832-5851

MTC-00008575

From: Sophie Fox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft Settlement has now been decided and must be allowed to go forward.

The States, especially California, which have chosen to proceed with their suits are just grandstanding. The money they propose to use in this pursuit could be better used to help house and feed the homeless, provide better mental health services, repair roads, etc., rather than being thrown down a rat hole.

It is time that our public officials stop their waste of our money—give up the vendetta against Microsoft—and be prepared to be accountable!

S. Fox

MTC-00008576

From: Halle Doucoupolis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:31am
Subject: microsoft settlement

This is to let you DOJ folks know that as one of the general public I think your behavior towards microsoft is just shameful. The great american dream has absolutely no meaning anymore if you people keep this farce of a lawsuit going. Where in the world does it say a person can't realize their dream, become the richest person in the whole wide world and still be happy? What makes you people think that you are right by trying to tell this person he can't keep the secrets of his success SECRET? That he HAS to remake HIS company to suit someone else just because that other company wants to dig around in his company business. It's not fair, right or American. If this is the way you people treat success it's no wonder the majority of the third world hates our guts. It's no wonder the little guy (like me) can never get ahead. After all what do we have to look forward to?

Maryalice Anderson, A.A.S.; paralegal;
LPN
Halle Doucoupolis, A.A.S.; paralegal; LPN
Amanda Gates
Ameenah Rasheed
DBA:
4Black Women With Voices/Point Inc.

MTC-00008577

From: (u)nasturtium
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern,

I strongly believe that it would not be in the public interest to pursue the current anti-trust case against Microsoft Corporation any further, but rather accept the Revised Final Judgement (dated 6th November 2001). I believe it is a waste of public funds, especially in light of the September 11 tragedy, to spend more on this already tough yet fair judgement.

The Revised Final Judgement, Section IVa, 2a states "Access during normal office hours to inspect any and all source code, books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other documents and records in the possession, custody, or control of Microsoft, which may have counsel present, regarding any matters contained in this Final Judgment." These powers will inevitably be misused in ways to benefit competitors eg disclosure of source code of Windows Platform software, product direction etc. I dutifully suggest this clause be removed in the public interest. Section III, "Prohibited Conduct", extensively covers actions Microsoft may not take against OEMs (defined as "an original equipment manufacturer of Personal Computers that is a licensee of a Windows Operating System Product"). This, I believe is an unnecessary and unfair power. OEM software is sold at a lower price to OEMs, and ultimately consumers. OEM software is released at the discretion of Microsoft (in line with academic and other subsidised versions) and Microsoft should be able to choose its condition of sale, as it will be of economic benefit to consumers. Therefore, it is clear that Microsoft is already bound sufficiently and further actions will result in negative effects for purchasers of OEM software.

Thankyou for your time and consideration.

Please direct any comments to
—nasturtium@bigpond.com

MTC-00008578

From: Vincent Avona
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:36am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am pleased to see that a fair settlement has been reached between the Federal and State governments. I trust we will no longer have to continue waste our tax money and government time on further litigation. It should have never started to begin with. Good luck Microsoft. "Let's Roll"

PS How about putting on the market more software compatible with Mac OS!

MTC-00008579

From: MortEfron@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already. The government has spent millions of taxpayer's money on a ridiculous case against Microsoft and caused the company to spend millions more to defend, which ultimately will cost the consumer in higher prices to cover this litigation cost! Somehow, over the years, the prices of computers have come down due to competition and are now affordable by almost everyone. I don't see how any consumer is being hurt.

Stop this silly witch hunt which is simply costing all of us in the long run. Consumers

are actually being harmed more by the cost of the litigation than by anything done by Microsoft. I believe the government is stifling progress. It is time to stop.

Morton L. Efron

MTC-00008580

From: E.J. Eiteljorge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I'd like to take just a moment to express my opinion on the Microsoft persecution. I absolutely, 100%, completely, thoroughly believe that the DOJ's pursuit of Microsoft is totally responsible for the "tech stock meltdown" of the last roughly two years. The amount of wealth lost by the average American investor, of which I am one, dwarfs even that of Mr Gates, the intended target.

As such, I believe that a hasty settlement coupled with a sincere apology directed to Microsoft, its stockholders and to the average American investor is certainly in order.

Terrance J. Eiteljorge
Heidelberg Hospital
CMR 442, Box 990
APO AE 09042

MTC-00008581

From: David Winarsky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:49am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

This lawsuit against a great American company is ridiculous. The first lawsuit against the Bells did have merit, but in the end the gov broke up the bells and now you have had service.

I work for a Major retailer in the U.S. and sell both Microsoft products and product from their competition, and I have to say that the Microsoft Corp. goes all out and improves peoples lives, by making their technology easy and affordable to use.

These lawsuits need to cease and we, as a nation need to come together and pull this nation together.

Thank you,
David Winarsky
david3668@hotmail.com
Boca Raton, Florida

MTC-00008582

From: Steve S. Scherping
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing you because I am extremely concerned about the current state of the settlement concerning the Federal Government's case against Microsoft's antitrust practices. I feel that harsher penalties should take place. Take as an example, the recent offering by Microsoft as a settlement for the private antitrust cases brought against them. Not only do I believe this offer allows them to continue their monopoly since they will be imposing more of the software, operating systems, and hardware onto users, it also is quite meager since the potential value is \$1.1 billion, when they readily have \$36 billion in readily available capital. In this case, being a monopoly,

Microsoft also controls the value of its products so again it is able to shorthand those involved in the settlement. I understand that this does not directly relate to your case, but it is deeply troubling that a company that is supposed to be punished, in the end will probably come out the winner again. I am not a rogue citizen that has a vendetta against Microsoft. Rather, I am an experienced system administrator that utilizes Microsoft products on a daily basis. In a university setting we are forced into pricing schemes and meager product offerings from Microsoft since our students are not capable of using other offerings since they consistently use proprietary technology and also force developers and manufacturers into sole platform support scenarios. Microsoft continues to test its corporate boundaries by attempting to force users into using their products. They also continue to alter known standards into their own proprietary technology. Please continue your efforts to halt the illegal business practices of Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Steve S. Scherping
Steve S. Scherping
Business: U of MN
Communications Technician
CLA Language Center
51 Folwell Hall
9 Pleasant St SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Ph. 612-626-0013
Gen. Ph. 612-624-6811
Email: scher037@umn.edu
Home: 810 Thornton St. SE, Apt. 1004
Minneapolis, MN 55414
scher037@umn.edu
<http://umn.edu/home/scher037>
<http://www.ssstech.net>
Steve's PGP Public Key may be found at
[http://www.umn.edu/lookup?SET=](http://www.umn.edu/lookup?SET=INSTITUTION=UMNTC&UID=scher037&show=pgp=1)

INSTITUTION=
UMNTC&UID=scher037&show=pgp=1

MTC-00008583

From: Vagabonds2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice,

The Federal Government and nine states along with Microsoft Corporation have agreed to terms of a settlement. Shouldn't we honor that? With the current turmoil in our country, let us ask, "What serves our nation best, both socially and economically?" It seems to me that upholding the proposed and agreed upon settlement is in the best interest of our country and people. What is really to be gained by dragging this case on for months or years. So if you value any input from thoughts of an ordinary citizen of our country, "Let's move on!" Nine states and The Department of Justice and Microsoft have agreed to this proposed settlement. As a teacher, our students know that in a democracy, the majority of votes makes the decision. Aren't we still going by those rules? Let's move on!

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter,

Gary Fine

MTC-00008584

From: SSTARJUDY@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 3:07am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

3056 Rue D'Orleans
 Apartment #138
 San Diego, California 92110
 January 2, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for the settlement that you and your colleagues at the Department of Justice have worked so hard to negotiate in the Microsoft antitrust dispute.

The settlement is good for the technology industry and good for the economy, both of which have taken a serious beating as a result of this unfortunate three-year long legal battle between the two parties. Anytime a settlement is reached, and extremely costly and distracting litigation can be avoided, it is a good thing.

It seems that politics is the motivating factor behind this case and that Microsoft's adversaries will stop at nothing to derail and destroy Microsoft. These groups and individuals do not seem to realize or care that they are hurting the entire U.S. economy in the process.

The settlement ends Microsoft's status as a "monopoly". Since this was the goal of the government in the first place and it has clearly been met, Microsoft should be left alone and allowed to move forward. It is time that our premier software company gets back to innovating rather than litigating. Thank you for the work that you have done on this settlement and for ensuring that no further legal action will be taken against this American company.

Sincerely,
 Judy Ames

MTC-00008585

From: CWest51134@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 3:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MICROSOFT ATR@USDOJ.GOV,

The government should be more informed about the whole Microsoft spectrum and not let politics interfere with any decisions it makes to improve the existence of Microsoft in the entire community of the computer world. Microsoft has a wonderful product in all the versions of Windows and other products in provides to it's customers but there is definitely a cloud of greed hovering over the company's operation. One would think that the sales of their products would produce enough revenue that the tech support would be provided to it's clientele at no charge as many other very successful companies do. Actually for Microsoft to charge for tech support could be interpreted as monopolistic. Once the user goes into Microsoft products it's very difficult to drop Windows and seek a replacement elsewhere.

The exit option is not readily provided to leave a program whenever one wants to. Then there is all the subliminal advertising

that is annoying. The criticism could go on and on but there definitely should be some oversight by some honest, fully knowledgeable and not political authority to give guidance to all computer industry related companies.

Not tell a man how to run his company but when you create so many billionaires off the backs of your customers who actually support you with their sweat and blood is unconscionable. The revenue is not apportioned properly in Microsoft so the blame is at the top, the authority of the company. It is my hope as a long time Microsoft user that the above remarks be seriously taken when it comes time to finalize the settlement.

Sincerely,
 Charles West
 cwest51134@aol.com
 CC:kazdwa@webtv.net@inetgw

MTC-00008586

From: Dorothy G Randrup
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 4:04am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: Please close this case, as a settlement has been agreed upon. It is my strong desire to have Microsoft proceed with the great work they have begun in the past few years.

Hoping for your cooperation, Sincerely,
 Dorothy G. Randrup 3728 E. Balch Ave.
 Fresno, CA 93702-2804

MTC-00008587

From: Steve Glass
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 4:05am
 Subject: gov. bogus lawsuit

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The justice dept. had no business trying to corner the Microsoft Corp. in an illegal, totally bogus, politically motivated class action lawsuit. Because Bill Gates has more brains than any of his competitors is certainly no reason for his competitors to stage a legal frenzy against him. This lawsuit shows the ignorance (and jealousy) of many democratic politicians and Clinton. Heres the best advice you're going to get from the AMERICAN PEOPLE : Drop the lawsuit, apologize to Bill Gates, pay him back for all expenses and then, GROW UP.

Stephen R. Glaze
 Box 1196, Clearlake Oaks, Ca. 95423

MTC-00008588

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
 To: Microsoft
 ATR,remington@webtv.net@inetgw
 Date: 1/4/02 4:25am
 Subject: USPS' Heidi Game

NBC preempted an Oakland Raiders / NY Jets game years ago during a close contest for the network televised family classic, Heidi. The sports world has never quite forgiven NBC for this gaffe, reminding the football fans of the network's "gatekeeper" decision at the time. Heidi French, Wells Fargo's Orange County based HR manager hired me and was responsible for my work assignments during my career at Wells Fargo.

Several times I attempted to relocate back to the Bay Area or Los Angeles with Wells Fargo, due to the continuing family attacks

and corporate hazings / assaults in Irvine. I was constantly denied a transfer, due to political and Norwest Financial / Wells Fargo merger consolidations, and the fact that Wells Fargo wanted all of my family's money and one of their selections as my "mate".

Apparently, the written request for my postal delivery hold at the Aliso Viejo / Laguna Niguel, California Post Office is once again creatively ignored. I have received three pieces of mail today after repeated requests for postal service hold, due to mail tampering. My mail was delivered to my home for two weeks after my written request was presented to the Laguna Niguel Post Office after I discovered mail tampering with my State Of California checks. I time the check delivery through California's automated system that details the date the check was mailed to me.

For one week, my mail was held for pickup at the Aliso Viejo Postal Center (a carrier's processing facility and not a full service post office). After one week, my mail delivery was resumed without my permission, along with other family mail to 62 Trofello in Aliso Viejo, CA.

On Wednesday, January 2, 2002, I contacted a carrier supervisor at the AV Postal Center who found the California check and held it for my pickup later in the day. The supervisor confirmed my request for mail hold yesterday. Today, 01/03/02, I received three pieces of red / pink color coded mail ... the first, a pink envelope from Geico insurance services, the second, an unsolicited Seasons Greetings from an unknown Japanese company named Strawberry Corporation that went public in Japan in October 2001, and an unsolicited red / white colored promotion for Homes And Gardens Magazines courtesy of Spiegel Corporation.

Obviously someone is spending big bucks to pay off government workers and others during the big money struggles of the Microsoft Anti-Trust trial and related royalty issues I have detailed in previous memos. The

USPS can hold my mail just like anyone else! Several additional PAC comics yesterday and today detail the conspiracies. The "Crankshaft" comic spins around a fictional Ohio family and a school bus driving "grandfather" character, Crankshaft, a parody on my father. In the late 1960s my father spearheaded a school bus program in suburban Illinois with major opposition from church/school members. Crankshaft yelled at his daughter for having a cold (she was sneezing in the comic) and running around in "socking" feet. The abuse of the English language is a feature of "Crankshaft". Today the blond haired kid was featured in a jazz band with Crankshaft and family in the audience.

"Crankshaft", the grouchy one, complained about the "Tune"! Knowing my father's agenda and drive to place me in another music performance role (which will never occur) these Ohio crazed authors drew a foreplanned comic thinking I would go back to NBC Burbank and the Tonight Show again this week after the New Year's Eve live show. Actually, after the intentional anthrax?/flu/viral/bacterial poisoning on New Year's Day

(I could feel the immediate effects of the bio attack during my workout at the Sporting Club on Tuesday evening) I decided to "set up" the perpetrators once again, to flush out the game for the "kill".

Several times at Tonight Show tapings during December 2001 I was seated near the keyboard artist and jazz guitar bandleader, Kevin Eubanks. I enjoy any seat in NBC studio 3, and I am especially pleased to hear the music up close & personal. This band is first class! I visited three Nike retail stores, two corporate owned showcases, and ran 5 miles with the Beverly Hills NikeTown Running Club on Thursday 01/03/02, finishing my workout at 24 Fitness Sporting Club Irvine. I am still about eight pounds of accumulated fat away from my previous dimensions.

This addition of weight was NOT, I repeat, NOT from overeating ... intentional family food poisoning / university hushed experiments / subversive governmental people using my tuned athletic body as a platform for their Nazi-like human experiments! Just when my weight returns to about 160#, the "ideal weight for me" and the weight I maintained for years in the Bay Area & San Diego, others spike my food with poisons that block digestion & normal waste passage, causing fat deposits. I have overheard and read several features that explain the invasive and totally non consenting experiments as protein / carcinoma related, as my father's and mother's family has a history of cancers.

My intentions are not to secure a performing musical opportunity at the Tonight Show or other venue at this time. As I have stated in a previous memo to the DOJ, I have attended the Tonight Show and others at NBC Burbank for professional, Los Angeles based public relations. I wanted the Hollywood and Burbank media troops, everyday workers like myself, as well as Hollywood's "moguls" and my competitors to see me in person, not as the Family Ties "Alex" in the blue sportcoat, but as a human that was subjected to some of the most sadistic plots, who triumphed over adversity, government subversion, and millions of dollars of negative PR.

I have been pleased to have worked successfully with over four unique security forces in front and inside NBC Burbank, as well as many of the private and governmental security staff at the Crystal Cathedral, Chicago Stadium, and Qualcomm (Jack Murphy) Stadium in San Diego. Folks, we have to have immediate closure on this long overdue royalty issue, it's really in the billions of dollars, and all of the other related issues from Family Ties, Stephen Spielberg's SKG team, Universal, McDonald's Corporation, Jack-In-The-Box, Nissan, Disney / Touchstone Pictures, IBM, Microsoft, and others. The issue can be resolved real easily, and by authorities through government directed wire transfers and seizures of fraudulently acquired assets.

Transfer my CASH to me NOW! LET ME KNOW THAT I HAVE MY ASSETS AND THEIR LOCATIONS. I will decide how to invest these assets with the guidance of professional investment firms. I do not sponsor anyone's investment of my assets without my consent.

THIS IS MY MONEY!

Thank you for your consideration.
Robert Remington

MTC-00008589

From: Ron Garton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 4:32am
Subject: May it Please the Court
Renata—

The settlement outlined is wholly inadequate. It stipulates behavioral remedies going forward, but addresses no punitive damages whatsoever for Microsoft's continuing illegal actions since the 1995 consent decree. Why? In addition, the terminology 'middleware' is used in such a vague manner, as to render the agreement virtually unenforceable. Microsoft's clear violation(s) of the Sherman Anti-trust law are no less significant than the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1800's in U.S. history.

Clearly, there can be no question as to Microsoft's guilt, and the government's desire to 'close the book' on this action; based in part on publicized statements that indicated it was 'in the best interest of the country and the technology sector', is nothing more than partisan politics. Frankly, to use the events of 9/11 and other current events occurring around the world as a substantive 'reason' to end this action makes me ill to my stomach.

I wonder, if the government compiled a list of 'industry standards' bodies that have been formed over the last 20 years, and analyzed Microsoft's commitment to those, what they would find? As a contributing member to several of those organizations, I can speak from experience, Microsoft only contributed to Standards Bodies (that would've produced cheaper, more compatible software that would run on any operating system, regardless of hardware ...) when it saw an opportunity to influence peddle it's proprietary view of software and operating systems. IN ALMOST EVERY CASE WHERE A STANDARDS BODY MOVED TO CREATE A TRULY MULTI-NATIONAL, MULTI-PLATFORM INTEROPERABLE SET OF SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, EITHER MICROSOFT VOWED TO CREATE THEIR OWN STANDARD OR DETERMINED WAYS IN WHICH THEY COULD USE THEIR "FUD" STRATEGY (Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt) to undermine the effort. In essence, their actions, as noted in the Consent decree of 1995, were in direct violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Law. How then, do we determine as a country, through our 'duly' elected officials, that those activities haven't harmed consumers, sufficient to warrant some form of punitive damages? While the rest of the technology industry was attempting to create the '110V' standard connectivity for software, Microsoft was publicly proclaiming that it ALONE had the power to dictate what standard the rest of the country (and the world) would use for connecting software between computers, operating systems and all manner of digital devices?

Did this fact escape the DOJ in their reasoning process? In my view, the ONLY recourse is to :

1. Break the company into (2) or more distinct operating companies, and require

that all Microsoft Office tools source code be auctioned to a top 20 international s/w company, for the express purpose of porting it to alternate operating systems.

2. In addition, all source code for the Internet Explorer Browser needs to go the same route.

3. All Microsoft Operating System interfaces (API's) and source code must be placed in the public domain.

4. Future Operating System enhancements must pass muster with an Industry Consortium, comprised of a cross-section of senior leaders in the IT industry, not just so-called 'Microsoft enemies'

5. Marketing/Sales activities should be monitored by a 'DOJ' oversight committee, similar in concept to the proposed "governance" body.

6. Microsoft should not be allowed to 'buy' or 'invest' in early stage technology companies until a pre-determined 'moratorium' period has expired, based on the execution date of the amended agreement.

The basic principles of these sanctions will yield significant benefits immediately in 'stimulating' innovation in the technology sector, by forcing more competition and providing investors, consumers and early stage startup companies COMPLETE confidence that the technology that they build/buy, will ultimately be compatible with ANY Web Browser and/or operating system. Companies can then be FREE to compete on the basis of WHO they sell to, WHAT clearly distinguishes their product from the competition with the confidence that they won't suffer repercussions from MS.

Has it gone without notice that the rest of the computing world (specifically, Europe and Asia) have similar views of Microsoft's exclusionary practices?

If Mr. Gates wants to run his business in this country, and remain a citizen of this country, perhaps he should consider the protection he receives from our laws ... laws that he has knowingly violated. If he can't manage his company by those laws, then we should gladly hand him his pink slip, and send him, his company and anyone who works for him, on their merry way to whatever country would like their tax dollars. My sense of it is, this country is much bigger than just Microsoft, and aspires to a higher level of ethics and standards, than those practiced by Mr. Gate's staff. We will do just fine as a country and/or an industry with or without Microsoft and their tax dollars and jobs.

I've been following this case, and this company, for many years. I'm a 25 year veteran of the Computer industry, and I think it time that we as a country (and as a Justice Department), finally stood up to Microsoft and deliver the judgment that has been long overdue. A concerned, informed Technology citizen.

MTC-00008590

From: Robin Mockett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

I am informed that I can comment on the Microsoft settlement by sending an e-mail to your address.

My comment is that the lesser 'punishments' now being imposed on Microsoft are less unjust than the previously-attempted split-up of the company. However, they are still unjust because Microsoft has done nothing wrong and does not deserve any punishment whatsoever.

I am not a Microsoft employee or even very knowledgeable about computers, beyond being able to send e-mail messages (for which I am grateful to Bill Gates and inventors like him), but if I knew more I could probably offer specific technical reasons why punishing his company will hurt the economy and slow the rate of increase in everyone's living standards.

Instead, I will make a simple moral claim that antitrust laws as such are inherently unjust, as explained by Alan Greenspan in essays in Ayn Rand's book, —Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal—. Antitrust laws in any form constitute a tyrannical element within the government, because (1) they impose punishment on people simply for being productive, and (2) they impose punishment in a manner which cannot be predicted in advance, or which depends on subjective interpretations by judges or government prosecutors. Consequently, the decisions of productive businessmen are controlled by the personal opinions of government agents, rather than objectively written statutes. This makes some of the businessmen produce less because their decisions are blocked, others because they are afraid of unanticipated penalties, and others because they choose to make less effort in such a climate. More importantly, it demeans leaders who deserve gratitude from the rest of us.

Yours sincerely,
Robin Mockett, Ph.D.

MTC-00008591

From: Dexter Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:34am
Subject: Fw: Microsoft Settlement
2002-01-04

I am repeating this message in order to ensure you have it for inclusion in the public record.

Dexter Anderson
From: Dexter Anderson
To: Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Cc: Anderson, Dexter
Sent: 2001-12-12 12:25
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
2001-12-12

Comments on the Microsoft Settlement

1. The action against Microsoft should never have been launched during the last Administration, and the sooner it is wound up, without damage to this quintessentially American company, the better.

2. We sometimes seem to have a death wish. As in the AT&T dismemberment of 1983/1984, we have in Microsoft a company that is admired throughout the world, yet some seem to derive a perverse satisfaction from seeing whether they can smash it up.

3. It is one thing to go after a company on antitrust grounds if it threatens to corner the market on a physical resource such as oil or

silver. But intellectual property is infinitely expandable. If Microsoft does not keep investing better intellectual mousetraps, or if the buying public believes it is overcharging, it will quickly lose ground to competitors. The competitive system is self-correcting. There is no need for government to step in. There is need for government not to step in.

4. Microsoft's competitors should fight it in the marketplace, not in the courtroom. It's shameful enough for the CEO of a competing company to come whining to the Department of Justice when he fails to obtain the results he desires in the marketplace; it is downright disgusting to see him crossing the ocean to denounce his countrymen from Microsoft before officials of the European Communities.

5. The bundling charge took first place for absurdity. One may as well tell a car manufacturer not to include tires, or a radio, with his product.

6. The States should have no role in in the Microsoft matter or in similar matters involving companies that are clearly national in character.. The Constitution gives the regulation of interstate commerce to the U.S. Congress. The threat to companies of hostile action (sometimes, as in this case, politically motivated) by regulatory authorities of 50 states unnecessarily raises the cost of goods and services and harms U.S. competitiveness.

Thank you for considering my views.
Dexter Anderson
29 Sherwood Drive
Westerly, Rhode Island 02891-3701
andersondexter@home.com

MTC-00008592

From: Jcarnick@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dept. of Justice,

The Clinton Administration's Justice Dept. started an attack on Microsoft and continued it largely because Microsoft failed to pay off the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is 1,000 x more corrupt and dangerous than Microsoft.

Drop the persecution of Bill Gates. Look into former Clinton Administration and current Democratic operatives.

John Carnick

MTC-00008593

From: Neil H. Kennedy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is too much punishment for Microsoft. This is a world of competition, and because of it we have the software and hardware that we do today.

Perhaps Microsoft has used some less than perfect marketing methods, but what is clear is that they do provide reasonably priced excellent software. To make them split their software applications would hurt the consumer.

I urge you to complete the agreed upon settlement and don't deter Microsoft from continuing to produce the software we all use every day.

MTC-00008595

From: zevy yanovich

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:44am
Subject: Settlement

As a tax payer I believe the attack on Microsoft was instigated by competitors like Sun, Oracle, AOL, and IBM and not by consumers like me. We have enjoyed the benefit of great software products and innovations for our PCs that would have never been possible with multiple operating system standards.

I truly believe the settlement agreed upon the DOJ and Microsoft is a fair one and will let Microsoft to continue to innovate in a way that benefits consumers in the US and worldwide.

MTC-00008596

From: Mark Clifton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to send you my thoughts and comments regarding the Microsoft settlement. I think it is fair and reasonable and should stand as is...it is time to move on and get this economy back on track. Continuing to focus on this case has no value and just creates more uncertainty and unrest. It's time for politics to move aside and let's get this country going again.

MTC-00008597

From: Lee Sherrell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:01 am

To whom this may concern:

Or to whomever may really give a shit about what the little guy thinks.

Over the past year or so that this trial has been going on. I have been periodically watching just what was going on. In some cases, I would have to catch up on certain issues. After reviewing most of the events that have been forced upon the American public throughout the whole trial process. I have analyzed many of the things that have been changing throughout the US and it has put me into a state of fear. Not fear for my life or bodily harm, instead it is a fear of the little guys financial futures. Let's face it! The computer age is here to stay, and in order for the people of this country are to ever move forward in their lives, in a financial capacity, we are no, we must have computer abilities and be to move forward in the world of computing.

Before this thing with OUR government suing Microsoft for being unfair in some of their practices of doing business. The god damned, selfish, greedy, son-a-bitches that were approached by and paid off by the other competitors and some that were not competitors just the heads of billion-dollar corporations that disliked the way that Bill Gates made his fortune. The ones who did not work to make their fortunes, rather inherited them. The elite "Good-OL'-Boys" club. Now I know what I am saying from this point on will be looked at as though I am a nut! All I have to say about that is, PROVE ME WRONG!!

Most intelligent people know of, or have heard of, or personally know of the very thing that I am speaking of. Most the elite "Good-OL'-Boys" club either know or sat

down and figured out a plan to demolish the DOT COMS of America. They knew that most of them were on shaky ground with means to their financial stability. Knowing full well that all they had to do was shake the ground under the DOT COMS and they would crumble. Hell I could see that. Several years ago, I had even mentioned to a friend of mine that was in charge of operations within a DOT COM company that his company had better stick a little more of their money into the more stable investments out there or they were going to collapse. I told him that "you can't balance a bowling ball on a stick forever, something has to go.

This is only the first part a very large puzzle. Now you take and put that part of the large puzzle down and no one sees a picture. So, you move on to the other parts of the picture. The part of the picture is a large part, but not the main part. The main part is in a simple question. WHY? Why did the US government's so called "Justice Department" go after a relatively medium size company (In the eyes of the multi-billion dollar companies.) instead of the other larger multi-billion dollar companies out there that are doing exactly what the "Justice Department" is claiming that Microsoft was in the middle of? There are quite a huge number of them out there. Take for instance the oil companies, any one of them will do. Price gouging the consumers, creating a FALSE oil crisis in order to generate overly abundant profits for a product that is technically given to them by the government. The property that is acquired by the oil companies are sold to the companies for a very, very ridiculously low price. (I know for a fact, because I tried, that the government will not sell me or my friends large government-owned tracts of land for the price that the oil companies paid!) One fine note of interest is that most of these purchases and "gifts" of properties (land) were released to the oil companies during Republican Administrations. Stop and think whom was in office when our "so-called" oil shortage happened in the '70's. Look and see that in the 80's all of the land that changed hands and the countries that were developed by the US tax dollars. Check out just what companies did then and do now either control or have controlling interest in most of the oil rich countries. Take a look at just what is happening now with our present admin in charge. There has been a fight for decades to keep the oil companies out of the Alaskan Wilderness. The oil companies had a relatively small parcel of land up there, but during the Regan and Bush (The older Bush) admins the oil companies kept on building their huge damned pipeline.

Now this Bush admin suddenly came up with the statement that it's for a stronger America and said that he does not care what is thought about it, that the agencies that have been fighting legally to keep the oil companies out of the pristine wilderness areas are all wrong. Then had congress quickly pass a bill allowing the oil companies in there, knowing that it will take years to fight it in the courts. By then it will be too late. The oil up there WILL be produced! I guess it's no big surprise, after all he's an oil man from an oil state as well as his dad. It makes you wonder why the

huge oil companies are not being looked at very close. Hhmmm I wonder?

Another group of huge multi-billion dollar (in some cases multi-trillion dollar) companies that have not been looked at are the Pharmaceutical companies. They have clearly and absolutely done all of the things that Microsoft is charged with and then some. Stopping research on non-chemical oriented drugs such as plants that they could not control the patents on or keep other companies from developing. Buying off the FDA to keep other smaller Pharmaceutical companies from developing drugs that would and did work but could not get the FDA to pass the drugs for consumer use until the larger companies could buy off the smaller companies and control the patent. They would then take those newly patented drugs and shelf them until exorbitant profits could be pulled out of the products.

They have developed drugs that are bad for the consumers and promoted them as safe and developing other drugs to compensate for the damage the other drugs had created, when the whole time they had shelved or thrown out drugs that were more effective and safer for the consumer but were more costly to make or the products used to make the drugs can not be controlled by the Pharmaceutical companies. A very good example of this is in the cancer medicines. One in particular, the medicine used in Chemotherapy, RAT POISON! There is several medicines outside the US which have been developed and has been tested and has been working on thousands of patients for years with tremendous results. In most of the cases the results are far, far better. These medicines will not be let into the US to help save the American consumers from the other medicines out there because the Pharmaceutically controlled FDA will not let them pass the "so called" stringent testing the FDA requires and thus keeping them out of the country. If that can not be seen as restricting trade and stifling competition and controlling the marketplace then the English language had better get a new dictionary started, 'cause we are going to have to learn a brand new language.

I have not even been able to hit the Iceberg let alone see what's underneath it! This trumped up, half-baked, jerk-off charges that out fucking government representatives have thrown out to the American public and have expelled millions of dollars of our hard earned tax dollars, given to a bunch of has-been over-the-hill pretend lawyers whom if you were to ask them directly if they even had a mild clue of just what the American public really wanted or needed, you know the answer would be "Duh!"

They need to take a long, hard look at the other companies out there that are doing the complaining against Microsoft. Oh my god what do you think they would find! Most of those companies are really into the bad stuff that they are accusing Microsoft of. But that will never happen, as we all know. IBM is one of the accusers. If the truth could ever be known they are just trying to get back at Gates for making them look like a bunch of dopes. Gates is not considered one of the "Good Ol' Boys", IBM is.

The government needs to stop all of the bullshit they are doing to Microsoft. Just

finish with the "hand-slap" and move onto the other companies out there that are REALLY working against the American consumer, that are REALLY grossly committing consumer trade issues, that are REALLY and truly not doing the American consumer and the country as a whole. If you were to put all of the charges that are brought up against Microsoft and multiply them by fifty that figure would only be a portion of the charges that could be brought against the other companies that I have previously spoke of.

If the government is going to really work for the American consumers then they need to drop the crap with Microsoft and look at those other companies. They would be doing such an extreme service for American that it would take decades after it was all over to actually figure out just what was done and find out just how great of a country the US had become. Well I think that it will turn out to be just a pipe dream. The people in charge of this whole mess are Republicans and when they listen they can not heard words, they only hear the shuffling sound that money makes. The thought of actual justice will never come about. With everyone that is in the majority in our government has a new phrase written above the scratched out version that was on the United States Constitution. It now read, "By the people for the people, as long as they are rich ... etc. etc."

Written by

MTC-00008598

From: Wetherhold, Kent W.
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 7:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This fraudulent antitrust lawsuit against Microsoft must come to a close immediately. This is nothing more than a leftover Clinton administration attack upon one of America's greatest entrepreneurs. Please do what is right and put an end this atrocity.

Sincerely,

Kent Wetherhold +

MTC-00008599

From: Randy Neal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want this settled and put behind us. Microsoft is a good company and what you have done has hurt our country's economy!

I agree that a monopoly is bad but you haven't proven where any consumer has been hurt. I think this whole action was dictated by companies who can't compete on their own product's merit.

Thanks,

Randy Neal

MTC-00008600

From: LuigiShort@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:17am
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

Dept. of Justice:

Dear Sirs:

I would like to voice my opinion on the current ongoing case against Microsoft. It seems that the case goes on and on, driven by companies and their lobbyists that are

more interested in deriving an income from the suit rather than buckling down, working hard and becoming a true competitor. Also some States see a ruling against Microsoft as a cash cow and help keep the case ongoing to try and reap benefits for themselves with no concern for the effect it has on both the U.S. economy and the State of Washington. The people who keep this case going never seem to bring up all the good that Microsoft, Gates and many employees do for education and charitable needs in this country plus the tax revenues derived for the U.S. and Washington.

WOULD YOU PLEASE BRING THIS TO AN END!!!!

THANKYOU.

Al Short
Bainbridge Is. WA

MTC-00008601

From: Ralph C. Whaley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:44am
Subject: US vs. Microsoft

The right to property is an inalienable right. Microsoft Corporation including it's owners, the shareholders, have the absolute right to the property created in the context of the company. The right to property includes the absolute right to determine the conditions of sale and use of that property. Property rights include setting any price for any product at any time to any prospective buyer with any conditions of use of the product the seller sets. The prospective buyer is free to accept or reject the terms of sale and suffers no violations of his own rights when confronted with the seller's conditions.

The anti-trust laws impose rules of use and sale of property under threat of government force. The government's responsibility is the protection of rights not their violation. These laws are violations of property rights and should be repealed.

Ralph C. Whaley MD
460 S. 5th St.
Barron, WI 54812-1509
Phone: 715-537-3614

MTC-00008602

From: Tom.DaSilva@gidi.it@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:49am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen,

For inclusion in the public record: Microsoft has gained its position through free trade but, the competition has resorted to government intervention. All that the government does it does by force. All the government has it has taken by force. "The simpering rotter who whines that he sees no difference between the power of the dollar and the power of the whip ought to learn the difference on his hide"—Ayn Rand. Antitrust creates not a level playing field but a crime scene. The department of Justice owes Microsoft a conspicuous apology post haste.

Respectfully,
Thomas da Silva

MTC-00008603

From: hglee@hglee.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am of the opinion that the so-called "trial" of Microsoft is an abomination in a country that represents itself to be founded on the principles of individual rights. Microsoft has done more to advance the personal computer age than any other ten companies combined. The premise that Microsoft achieved these great heights through "coercion" is farcical. Take a look around the market today, and you will find that the majority of products are designed for the Microsoft platform because the company is successful, not because they were compelled to at the point of a gun—only the imperial federal government possesses that particular methodology.

If you are truly concerned with public comment and the "public interest," then as a member of the public I employ you to leave well enough alone. There is no calculating the harm that you have already done this company (and how much this has "cost the American consumer"). Back off now, and let Microsoft's productive genius go unmolested unless and until it commits a bona fide crime of some sort.

Please keep in mind that the only legitimate function for a government is to protect its citizens from force or fraud; Microsoft has committed neither. If you want to truly pursue a prosecution that will be a "victory for consumers everywhere," then close this matter and let Microsoft continue to improve the lives of countless individuals—programmers, stockholders, innovators, businessmen, and especially consumers.

If the DoJ is truly interested in "settling" this case properly, I submit that the only proper way to do that is to quit the prosecution, to apologize profusely and publicly, and to pay restitution for the unnecessary for waste of this company's time over the last two years. Only then can the DoJ begin to earn the title of "Department of Justice."

H.G. Lee,
Atlanta, GA

MTC-00008604

From: Jeffrey C. Graber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ: I feel very strongly that the DOJ should settle the Microsoft case as it's currently proposes. It is fair for both sides.

Jeff Graber

MTC-00008605

From: JESSIE AURON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:06am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the settlement is fair to all parties concerned and that the dragging out of this case must be considered unfair to the majority of parties concerned. Microsoft has acted in an honorable manner. Please act quickly to end this.

What is a weed? A plant whose virtues have not yet been discovered.

MTC-00008606

From: Drlik, Scott
To: 'Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 8:11am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to implement the settlement reached in the Microsoft case. Further litigation would be counterproductive. Already, millions of dollars have been spent to reach a decision that has been deemed acceptable by millions of individuals.

As a user of the technology being judged, I was readily able to choose between providers. In fact, I am of the opinion that the lawsuit lacked initial merit. Those millions of dollars spent on this case could very well have been allocated to more needy causes; e.g., education, homelessness, poverty.

Respectfully submitted,
Francis Scott Drlik

MTC-00008607

From: Andrew Sisolak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/3/02 2:44pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT ALL OF THE LITIGATION AGAINST MICROSOFT RE MONOPOLY/UNFAIR TRADE ISSUES BE TERMINATED IMMEDIATELY. THE ENTIRE PURSUIT OF MICROSOFT WAS A MASSIVE WASTE OF TAXPAYER MONEY, BENEFITTING ONLY ITS COMPETITORS AND THOSE INDIVIDUALS TRYING TO MAKE A NAME FOR THEMSELVES. THE MOTIVES OF ANYONE WHO WANTS TO CONTINUE THIS ABUSE OF THE COURT SYSTEM IS BEYOND SUSPECT.

I HOPE THAT THE VOTING PUBLIC REMEMBERS THOSE INDIVIDUALS ADVOCATING THIS LITIGATION AND KEEPS THEM FROM ANY ELECTED OFFICE.

MTC-00008608

From: Rollin45@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a long time PC user, and resident of Utah (one of the states whining about the settlement) I would just like to say that Novell at one time dominated the networking/desktop environment. The main reason they lost this position is their lack of focus and concentration , not some alleged "unfair" tactics on the part of Microsoft.

The local politicians and power structure see this trial as a way to show their "dedication" in defending their constituents. The fact that the local "bull got gored" does not constitute unfair business practice. If Novell had paid attention to the market place, and made their core product better it would still be number one in terms of market share. Microsoft is a relentless competitor, and one must pay attention to the game if one wishes to win.

best regards
steve mackelprang
west jordan, utah

MTC-00008609

From: Steven Henderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the gov't (Justice Department) should leave Microsoft alone. The employees of Microsoft should be free to innovate and

sell their innovations on the free market. It is a basic requirement of man that he needs to be free. I don't see how the gov't should treat the individuals that make up Microsoft any different than anybody else. The Justice Department should try cracking down on computer piracy. That is the gov't should be going after the criminals those that initiate the use of physical force in it's different forms. The bottom line is that Microsoft has a right to earn as big of a profit as it can. Microsoft should be set free.

Steven Henderson
Van Buren, Michigan

MTC-00008610

From: Gary Olson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 8:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally feel the Microsoft settlement is fair. I think the States that are not agreeing to it are looking for some easy money and are not really interested in fair competition. I think that other companies could and will invent software that is better than Microsoft's and when they do there will be a market for it. People will use the software that is best for their home or business situation.

Thank You.
Gary Olson
S78 W26750 Hillview Drive
Mukwonago, WI 53149

MTC-00008611

From: Seven
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:51am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please keep me informed. I am very concerned about the health of the software industry should an inappropriate settlement with Microsoft be reached.

Morley Chalmers
for the 7 Office team
Seven@7Office.com
416/926-9296

MTC-00008612

From: David E Provencher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

It is my opinion that the settlement that was agreed upon should be accepted, and this case closed. This has gone on long enough.....

David E Provencher

MTC-00008613

From: PABrittain@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:11am
Subject: Re: Attorney General John Ashcroft Letter

To whom it may concern,

You may forward the letter to Microsoft that has my name on it. I agree strongly with your letter.

Pat Brittain

MTC-00008614

From: N. Kydonieus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that this is another instance of the US government penalizing the best in men to prop up the lesser men that cannot compete effectively. To do this the US government has to initiate force which is a destructive activity. The American and the global economy has been paying for this travesty of injustice. In order to leave the caves of barbarism and enter civilized existence, we have to ban the initiation of force, not institutionalize it.

MTC-00008615

From: Ron Unangst
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a user of Microsoft products for years and have always been satisfied with their products. I urge you to settle this and let the this country get on with the business at hand. Overall I am very upset with the governments handling of the Microsoft case in the first place. Look around, what about the merger with Warner and AOL? Microsoft and Intel have done more to take this country forward with the PC than anyone. Enough is enough. Settle and move onward. The only ones complaining now are MS competitors.....

Tunney Act
Roland Z. Unangst

MTC-00008616

From: Macksplace@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:37am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

It appears to us that the Justice Department is coming very near to destroying one of our greatest American companies. Microsoft should be left entirely free to invent and innovate to the limits of their capabilities. They should not be forced to share their proprietary information with their competitors. Our recession started with the opening of the "Let's get Microsoft." governmental mind set and action. In athletics we do not force the lead runner or team to slow down or score less for their competitor's benefit!

For your information, we own Microsoft, Sun Microsystems, Dell, Oracle, Texas Instruments, AOL and Gateway stock. We urge you to discontinue and put an end to this lawsuit in a timely fashion for the sake not only of most American consumers, but for the economic welfare of our country as well.

Sincerely,
Alexander M. Thomson and
Florence W. Thomson (Mrs. Alexander M. Thomson)

MTC-00008617

From: Creech, Robert
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 9:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For years now various envious business leaders have been trying to convince government that Microsoft and Bill Gates are deamons. I know that Scott McNealy and Larry Ellison and Steve Case are more charismatic and come across as nice guys but, in my opinion, they are simply vary hard

nosed and egotistical business men. The reason that Microsoft has cornered the market on operating systems has to do with great marketing more than it does nasty business practices. Everyone knows that Apple had a better system so why didn't they prevail? I'll tell you why—lousy marketing. The same exact thing happened when the VHS standard beat out the Beta standard for VCR's. Beta was much better but they lost out. And the other key reason that Microsoft has done so well is because they established sorely needed STANDARDS.

Any company that establishes needed standards will have an advantage. Even though IBM had a very competitive operating system, nobody was interested. Why? Partly because IBM was out of style at that time. But also because the last thing we need in business is another complicated piece of software to integrate—who needs it?

How can you hammer away at Microsoft when any number of other companies enjoy a huge market share in their product line? Please, let's move on to things that are really important to people. I would love to see the AG in Massachusetts spend his efforts making sure that the executives at Polaroid do not squander my pension fund—something that thousands of us desperately need to stay healthy. This AG is really using his office to run for Governor—just like the previous AG did. Microsoft has done the country and the world a huge service and should not be raked over the coals for being better at the software business and their rivals.

Bob Creech
Applications Systems Manager
TAC Worldwide Companies
(617) 969-3100 x294
rcreech@1tac.com

MTC-00008618

From: EVERGPH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:43am
Subject: microsoft

I don't think further litigation is necessary. I didn't feel the government should have gotten involved in this situation to begin with. The only ones benefiting from all this litigation are the attorneys as usual.

j roth

MTC-00008619

From: Paula Rabel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please just settle this case. We have never agreed with it to begin with and would like the litigation to be settled now.

Sincerely,
Bob & Paula Rabel

MTC-00008620

From: jereeves
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe Microsoft's benefits to consumers far outweigh any costs. We urge you to please settle this case as soon as possible.

Jerry & Corinne Reeves

12277 Arrow Point Drive NE
Bainbridge Island WA 98110
jereeves@msn.com

MTC-00008621

From: geekfest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's unbelievable that after Microsoft has been found guilty in two courts the Department of Justice would accept a settlement agreement that was earlier presented and rejected. This case sets a terrible precedent. Microsoft has been convicted and the Department of Justice has decided to let Microsoft determine its own punishment. I'm not aware of any other case in which the guilty party was permitted to write its own settlement agreement.

This approach to resolution generates more problems than it solves. Where is the incentive to obey the law? Microsoft gets to keep its illegally acquired gains. Its competitor's position in the market has been destroyed. It has been found guilty in two courts and will now walk away in better business position than it was before it broke the law. Based on this pattern will Microsoft choose to break the law in the future? Will other corporations do the same? The precedent established by this settlement agreement will not only reward Microsoft for deciding to break the law, it will penalize those companies that choose to obey it, and encourage other companies faced with similar competitive problems to ignore the law in the formulation of their solutions. The consumer will be harmed in the future simply because the threat of future litigation by the government will be meaningless. Microsoft has already been through litigation, been found guilty, and has been allowed to keep everything they acquired by violating the law.

Without punitive damages that make violation of the law an ineffective approach to solving business competitive problems corporations will use illegal methods. The laws intended to protect the market and consumers will get pushed aside by illegally maintained monopolies. Any settlement at the least must have punitive monetary damages that remove any monetary gain achieved by choosing to violate the law. In addition any settlement of a corporation convicted of illegally maintaining its monopoly must include either structural changes in the corporation that prohibit future violations, or a consent agreement that has significant predetermined fines and penalties that can be applied by government regulators (or in this case the oversight committee). The fines and penalties must be large enough to effectively stop illegal behavior before the behavior can damage the marketplace and consumers and they must be applied quickly enough to stop damage to the marketplace and consumers. If Microsoft feels the committee assessment is inappropriate let it go to court to get its money back. Since Microsoft is a repeat offender (they violated their original consent agreement and have been convicted of illegally maintaining their monopoly) it's not unreasonable to defend against the

possibility that they may continue to exhibit illegal behavior in the future.

Since any agreement will have different possible interpretations the only effective agreement will be one in which the oversight committee has enforcement powers. It will force Microsoft to either argue their interpretation of the agreement with the committee chosen to represent the public interest or return to court for a formal determination. The proposed consent agreement does nothing to discourage illegal behavior by Microsoft and sets a precedent that will harm consumers and the market in the future. I urge the court to reject this proposed settlement as inadequate protection for consumers and force a more punitive settlement or conclusion to this case that will send a clear message that laws that prevent the illegal maintenance of a monopoly will be strictly enforced. If the court fails to send this message then the laws may as well be repealed for all the good they will do.

Thank you for reviewing this comment.

Sincerely,
John K. Stevens
P.O. Box 634
Bath, OH
(330) 701-6458

MTC-00008622

From: ABCOB7@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to express my views on the subject settlement.

Go with the Court of Appeals ruling. This case should not be dragged out any longer.

Arthur W. Jacob
7860 Palmer Rd.
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068

MTC-00008624

From: Leslie Ishimi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:03am
Subject: Thanks for asking.

Haven't been following the settlement closely. But Thanks for asking. Haven't been following the settlement closely. But generally I think Bill, Microsoft, and the American public got screwed by somebody who doesn't get the big picture. What you've done has changed the world, daily, for the better, for the last how-many years. Somebody ought to be sucking your toe cheese and saying thank you minute-by-minute. Sorry for the setbacks. They are inevitable when you do something well. And with even a small understanding of reality I have come to accept that even if you're able to clear one don't-get-it person out of the way, there's always another right behind. So tread undaunted as best you can—you are STILL performing an incredibly valuable service to the planet as you chart an extremely difficult journey for all of us. The way we earn a living will continue to change which affects the global economy which, unfortunately, still runs the world. I'm sure as the world shakes out the wrinkles we will all face more circumstances we don't know what to do with at first, but we made it before and we'll just keep working our way through the development of our minds and instincts.

Oh, and remember the words on Henry Miller's tombstone: I outlasted the bastards! lol

MTC-00008625

From: Frank and Miriam Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

I feel it is in the public interest, considering the aftermath of September 11th, to reach a speedy conclusion to the Microsoft case. Prolonged litigation would only benefit the lawyers, a few wealthy competitors and special interest groups, and serve to stifle innovation.

Sincerely,
Frank J. Brown

MTC-00008626

From: Presswalla@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my strong view that the current settlement be accepted so that the industry can go forward without being ensnared further in litigation.

Hoshang Presswalla, P.E., S.E.
President
P.E., Inc.

MTC-00008627

From: batson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:13am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust 'Comment'
Greetings:
What is the closing date to file a COMMENT?
Regarde,
Marguarite
CC:batson@ris.net@inetgw

MTC-00008628

From: Mho8@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:
Please settle this matter soon so the economy can move forward.
Michael Ho
mho8@aol.com

MTC-00008629

From: Frank and Miriam Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
I feel that settlement of the Microsoft case is in the public interest. Prolonging this litigation, particularly in the midst of uncertain economic times, would benefit only lawyers and a few wealthy competitors, and serve to stifle innovation. This case has dragged out long enough.

Yours truly,
Miriam E. Brown

MTC-00008630

From: Cindy(038)Keith Hansen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I am writing to express my support of the proposed Microsoft settlement. I think the case never should have been brought in the first place, and in has gone on for too long. Microsoft has made many concessions in this proposed settlement that I believe are very fair and address the concerns brought during the court battle.

Please don't let Microsoft's competitors continue to use the U.S. government in their battle to destroy Microsoft.

Thanks for your attention.
 Cynthia A. Hansen
 P.O. Box 146
 Snohomish, WA 98291
 CC:keithcindy

MTC-00008632

From: Mike Ward
 To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/4/02 10:20am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I represent a computer technology training company, and it is our business to remain on the leading edge of information technology (IT) to provide necessary IT education to America's corporations. Part of my job is to stay abreast of the rapid changes that take place in the IT industry every day, so that we can be assured we're offering instruction in the latest and most widely-used software packages.

By any measure, Microsoft is a leader in the software industry. But from my experience with Microsoft as a company, they earn that leadership position every day as fierce competitors and extremely good innovators that constantly seek out the needs and feedback of their customers. Their research and development budget is nearly \$8 billion per year, and I believe, second to none. That investment alone shows their commitment to technical innovations that benefit us all.

As I mentioned, I come across industry information on a daily basis that confirms that competition is alive and well for Microsoft products. Two obvious examples are the proliferation of open-source Linux and Sun's consideration to freely distribute their StarOffice suite. And yet, consumers continue to pay for Microsoft's products because they are superior at meeting the needs of the market majority.

Please put an end to the litigation, and let the software industry seek its own level of healthy competition.

Mike Ward
 VP, Technology Services
 ONLINE CONSULTING, INC.—
 LEADING EDUCATION TO IT SKILLS
 WILMINGTON & PHILADELPHIA
 Phone: (302) 658-3018, ext.134
 Web : <<http://www.onlc.com/>> <http://www.onlc.com>
 Email : <<mailto:mike@onlc.com>>
mike@onlc.com

MTC-00008633

From: James Ashberry
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 10:21am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement does nothing except expand Microsoft's monopoly into the education market where Apple and others

still have significant claim. By allowing Microsoft to infiltrate these markets through donations, whilst seeming on the surface to be a good will gesture, is nothing but a mass infestation of Windows based machines into the education sector.

In addition, the figure Microsoft have claimed it will spend will be greatly smaller, as software's retail value is far higher than the actual financial impact it will have on Microsoft. Microsoft should be made to donate the cash to the education agencies within the United States, and the cash should be used at the discretion of the schools and areas involved. This way schools will benefit, have freedom of choice, and Microsoft is made to pay. Allowing Microsoft's proposed settlement to go through is not only folly, but will make a mockery of the US and the US justice system.

James Ashberry
 Internet Developer
 United Kingdom
 jdashberry@mac.com

MTC-00008634

From: jfeege@valdeseweavers.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 10:11am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To: Dept. of Justice

We would like to express our viewpoint on the Microsoft case. We believe that the settlement reached with the Federal Government and the nine states was a reasonable settlement and that it is not in the best interest of the United States economy to prolong the litigation. The settlement reached is in the best interest of all concerned and should be imposed on the remaining states that did not accept the settlement. In short—lets put an end to the endless and counterproductive litigation and allow the free enterprise market to function.

Sincerely,
 Joe Feege
 154 S. Center St.
 Hickory, NC 28602

MTC-00008635

From: JACK ROWE
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 10:19am
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the suit against Microsoft was harmful to the US economy in far greater proportion to any benefit to the public (as opposed to Microsoft's competitors) that was realized. That's not even considering the taxpayer funds spent. It's time to end it and get on to other things. Get the settlement completed now, and see that all parties, and potential parties are included.

Dr. Jack D. Rowe

MTC-00008636

From: GDPESQ@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 10:27am
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

The difficulties associated with young or nascent but exploding businesses, particularly in the field of communications where there continues an ever changing, expanding marketplace of interrelated products and services such that no "snapshot" of a "market" can sustain the test

of short duration, cannot be over-estimated. And attempting to put a noose of control around a growth that will not be contained, even in a constructive way, may be more of a restraint of trade than a protection of the consumer, even competition. We need to enable the establishment of a stable market, before we seek so drastically to control its abuse, something only the marketplace can do, assisted by the normal policing for fraud and the like. For, if we don't, we will only short-circuit the progress in progress as evidenced by the growing pains brought on by new discovery and development. Desk-top operating platforms have been outgrown by the introduction and proliferation of wireless and digital technologies which now enable a portion of the desktop to be carried with an individual, no matter what his or her interest is, thereby making the market for desk-tops something hardly exclusive, which says a great deal about operating systems, the only apparent monopoly Microsoft had, and certainly, by developments since, no longer has. Look at what happened to Compact in view of the Dell approach. Given the path of technology, if its progress is not squeezed by regulatory cut off, the Microsoft advantage will be lost if it does not continue to address innovation and improvement of which its competitors are quick to take advantage. Any solution harming Microsoft's ability to provide better products and services to the communicative consumer, even at the expense of the competition, is no foul so long as the market remains as diverse as it is with the players as plentiful as they are at numerous levels which prevents the monopoly of only a segment, if indeed even that can be defined right now.

Be careful that you don't short-circuit our prosperity in your endeavor to protect a "competition" which may have already succumbed to technological innovation. If the settlement can be read to agree with the foregoing, we think it a good agreement.

A victim of the abuse of competition

MTC-00008638

From: Dwayne Jennings
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/4/02 10:36am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To Whom it May Concern:

My perception is that the settlement between the United States Department of Justice and nine states is in the public interest. The settlement seems reasonable and fair to all parties. More litigation to satisfy some of Microsoft's wealthy competitors is not in the public interest.

Sincerely,
 Dwayne Jennings
 5105 Briarwood Cove
 Milan, TN 38358

MTC-00008639

From: GRADY Tim
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/4/02 10:33am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,
 After reading on the proposed legal settlement with Microsoft, I believe the proposed settlement fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting

the illegal conduct, promoting competition in this industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains.

Microsoft was proven to have broken the law, which makes them criminals. They should be treated as such. My career is in information technology and I have witnessed first hand what damage a company like Microsoft, allowed to perform business as it had, can do to stifle innovation and creativity that benefit us all.

I would like to suggest creating remedies that will be clear, lasting and permanent. Microsoft should not be given wormholes to get past any actions taken against them and I don't believe that Microsoft giving away billions of dollars in software to underprivileged schools is a good idea as that reinforces some of it's tactics that are practiced today.

Respectfully,
Timothy M. Grady

MTC-00008640

From: Rons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Your Honor,
If Ma Bell was still the only phone company, would we have phone innovations like caller ID or cellular and pay only 5 cents a minute? If Microsoft was just another software company, think what innovations in software we might be using today.

Microsoft does not innovate they dictate. Microsoft is a tyrannical monopoly that runs roughshod over the computer industry. Microsoft has shown contempt towards potential competitors and disregard for the rulings of the US Department of Justice.

Microsoft needs a timeout until they learn to play well with others.

Ron Schultz ? President
Space Port User Group
408 Sundown Ave.
Alamogordo, NM 88310

MTC-00008641

From: Harvey J Chiat
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please make every effort to settle the Microsoft case per the comprehensive agreement reached between Microsoft and federal government. It is in the best interest of the internet users that the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling should stand and the case should be closed. I am in complete disagreement with the stand taken by the Minnesota Attorney General and the Attorneys General of the eight other states that oppose the settlement reached.

Harvey Chiat
3812 Drew Ave S
Minneapolis MN 55410
h.chiat@juno.com

MTC-00008642

From: ROBERT FELSBURG
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:02am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Let's settle with micosoft and stop wasting time.

MTC-00008643

From: Wayne Brady
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:05am
Subject: I feel like microsoft has more than paid the price . I wish the USA would settle it !

I feel like microsoft has more than paid the price . I wish the USA would settle it !

MTC-00008644

From: Jay Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:07am
Subject: Lawsuit

I am a Professional Engineer and I use the full slate of Microsoft products at work and at home. I enjoy using their products and I used Internet Explorer. I like the ability to use products that work well together. I have been using PC's since 1984 and know how "lock ups" cause problems by conflicts. I have never had problems with Microsoft products, just other applications that typically caused the conflicts.

I do not believe in the US government suing Microsoft. The problems with our stock market began with the announcement of the first suit. I would prefer that the states and the government drop the lawsuits.

The average person in the lawsuit gets nothing back, the attorneys get all the money. Please drop the action against Microsoft.

Jay Davis
210 E. Weber Circle
Lake Charles, LA 70611
hkhunter@msn.com

MTC-00008645

From: Jereza
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to register my comments in favor of the proposed settlement. I have read through terms of the settlement and feel it is fair resolution of the dispute, and provides sufficient ongoing monitoring of Microsoft practices in the future. I realize that there are competitive interests to whom no settlement would ever be satisfactory, as long Microsoft continues to be in business at all, and we must take this into account when listening to these opposition voices. I ask that the settlement be accepted, because it is in the best public interest to do so.

Thank you,
Sincerely,
Julie Kirk

MTC-00008646

From: David Hicks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government's case against Microsoft, well-intentioned as it may have been, has been hurting the American economy for far too long. The issues the case intended to address are already moot. (Laws intended to prevent excesses a century or more ago are not working in the current economic environment.)

While Microsoft may have gone too far in trying to protect its interests, the market itself is self-correcting. It is also too self-interested

to allow Mr. Gates and company to impose his will on millions of users who may or may not choose to use Microsoft's products.

The only way Microsoft can stay ahead in this highly competitive environment is by developing excellent products. At this point the government is impeding Microsoft in this effort by draining so much of Microsoft's resources to fighting the legal battle. In this case, if the government would just allow the market to function, everybody would benefit.

Sincerely,
David Hicks

MTC-00008647

From: Glenda Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs and Madams:

I feel as little as possible damage should be done to Microsoft. I work at a software company and we program for Windows. Our developers are able to product top quality software because they are working in this one venue rather than for multiple operating systems. We need fewer tools for development and are able to offer great affordability because of our ability to focus on Windows.

Microsoft has been portrayed as the "bad guy" when they simply were more effective than their competitors in a free market system. I can't begin to estimate the money that has been saved by the American consumer as a result of Microsoft's success.

Please do not punish this remarkable company and it's shareholders any more than has already been done.

Their competitors hope only to accomplish using the courts what they could not in the free market.

Thank you for your consideration.
Glenda K. Hill
Greeley, CO

MTC-00008648

From: Deanna Wells
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to pass along my comments on the proposed settlement with Microsoft Inc. I have worked with one computer system or another for the past 20+ years and have found Microsoft to be user friendly and first class in product quality. To continue legal action beyond the current settlement proposal is an abuse of the judicial system by parties wishing to inflict major damage to a capital enterprise. History has shown the damage inflicted to IBM seriously curtailed their ability to bring new and innovative products to the marketplace during the years of litigation by the government. IBM too was a first class and quality product prior to and after the long term litigation by DOJ. I realize the circumstances are different, and today is not the same business environment as the 60s and 70s. But once a decision is rendered and settlement fair and equitable, resolution in a speedy and decisive manner is best for everyone involved.

Let's finish the job and go one with other business. Beating a dead horse wastes tax payers money and abuses our judicial

system. MS was caught wrongdoing. Come to a settlement that can be found agreeable for all parties and let life continue on.

MTC-00008649

From: R J Burns
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would hope that this is the end to this antitrust suit for all parties concerned. I feel that a lot of time and a lot of the taxpayers money has been spent unwisely supporting this antitrust suit to begin with. I also feel that the Clinton Administration brought this suit only to repay favors to other corporations since their products didn't measure up to what we the public want, so this was their way of trying slow Microsoft Corporation so they could regain some market share.

I also feel the Clinton Administration has hurt not only Microsoft Corporation but the public at large for the tax revenues lost just to bring this suit, and anyone that has a 401k account has been affected.

In closing I would like to comment on the nine states in this suit. I don't see that they should be even considered in this antisuit.

Sincerely yours
Robert Burns

MTC-00008650

From: Eldon Erickson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:33am
Subject: court settlement

Microsoft has kept its products at a reasonable price from the very beginning. Their products have been very useful to the home user. As usual the court system drags things out endlessly. Leave them alone to do their thing.

Eldon Erickson
650 SW Lookout Drive
Corvallis, OR 97333

MTC-00008651

From: Duncan D McGregor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It seems to me that this case has been settled in court. Microsoft has been penalized and that should be enough. This company has made the use of computers available to almost anyone for a very reasonable software cost. I strongly recommend that this case be settled on the basis of the courts findings.

Duncan D. McGregor
313 Curtis Road
Chesterfield, SC 29709

MTC-00008652

From: Rjdar12@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:43am
Subject: Continued law suits

Lets continue with the free enterprise system in our USA. Finish up with this agreed on settlement with Microsoft.

Ralph Darnell,
1013 Sudan Dr.,
Corpus Cristi, TX.

MTC-00008653

From: charles stengel
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 11:43am
Subject: microsoft settlement
Isn't it about time you settle with microsoft on the basis established by the courts. lawyers keep coming up with new ways to make a buck for themselves.
C.A. Stengel.

MTC-00008654

From: messmedia@loop.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft should be left alone. Microsoft has not forced anyone to do anything. Microsoft offers a product. One may buy it or not buy it. If not, other computers (Apple, for example) and operating systems (OSX and Linux, among others) are available. Even if one buys Microsoft, one can install browsers other than IE, such as Opera, iCab, and Mozilla.

There is no problem from Microsoft. The problem is envy. Those who would deny Microsoft its success, should examine their own premises.

The principle is: Are force, threats of force, or fraud being used by Microsoft? These are the only means available to violate our rights against our wills. I see no evidence of tort or crime.
Get over it.

MTC-00008655

From: SMOJEV@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ Officials:
Please settle the lawsuit as negotiated with Microsoft. We, the people, are tired of all the litigation that goes on in this country. The DOJ and the Attorneys General in the various states should set an example — and not a "litigious" example. Enough all ready, you made a point and now lets get on with what makes this country great = free enterprise! We need to move more quickly into the tech age and continuous litigation against or within the tech industry is counter productive to a strong, vibrant economy.

Yours truly, John E. Vallance
PO Box 1100
Santa Monica, CA 90406-1100

MTC-00008656

From: Jim Crumley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:54am
Subject: M.S. SUIT

The DOJ suit against Microsoft triggered a multi-trillion dollar meltdown of our economy. Doing far more damage than bin Laden. DROP THIS SUIT NOW AND HELP RESTORE AMERICA
Jim Crumley
610-558-5811

MTC-00008657

From: CLAASSEN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:57am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I understand 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. I believe that the settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Ben Claassen
SCGI
504 486-2317

MTC-00008658

From: RLifsey357
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:59am
Subject: Lawsuit

Dear DOJ:
This lawsuit was ludicrous from the start, essentially a money grab by Microsoft want-to-be companies, and trial attorneys. I have experienced and can never foresee any hardship caused by Microsoft by being a pioneer in the technology field. Hence, the adage, "No good deed in this country goes unpunished".

I furthermore consider the settlement under consideration more than generous from the accused parties.

Thank you for consideration.
Sincerely,
Richard Lifsey
Metairie, LA

MTC-00008659

From: Les Troy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:03pm
Subject: settlement

The "settlement" is unfair to Microsoft, but I am a practical man and I don't think Microsoft is likely to get a fair deal. Any further litigation can only hurt the consumer, the economy, our free enterprise system and thousands of microsoft shareholders. The only ones who can gain are the billionaire executives of companies who don't want to compete in the marketplace on the basis of merit and service to the consumer.

MTC-00008660

From: james.good
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern:
I was asked to voice my opinion of this fool hardy law suit of Microsoft. I think my first sentence tells you. Companies should be allowed to compete in the market place, and not be tied by zealous lawyers and government officials who have no business interfering. The main cause of this suit to my understanding was the bundling of Microsoft Internet Explorer. Well, I have 2 systems with Windows 95 and 98, and both have Explorer on them. I loaded Netscape on both because I like it's operations better. So, where did Microsoft force me to purchase and use their product over Netscape? To me, both were free and in one system part of my package when purchased.

I think that the settlement should be finished, Microsoft should be left to provide the products and services they are known for and the lawyers and government should remain out of the business loop unless true illegal business practices are used.

Regards,
Jim Good
Colchester, CT
Microsoft Share Holder

MTC-00008661

From: Mona Chicks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ and several states is fair, not only to the parties involved but to the consumers who should be given the ability to choose the best software to fit their individual needs.

Mona Chicks
davenmona@msn.com
14015 NE 87th Street, Redmond, WA
98052
(425) 702-9695

MTC-00008662

From: Judibird1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get this over with. The Clinton and Gore Era started this. I am a Consumer and on the Internet ONLY BECAUSE OF MICROSOFT. No one has done more for the technology and our country plus the consumers than Microsoft. Our Stock Market needs MSFT stability. Please get off our only good Stock that make the world turn. Tell Microsoft you are sorry and pay his Lawyer Bills. The Courts should beg forgiveness and the States Attorney Generals that went against our only Gross National Product. I hope every State that continues to try and get money from Microsoft gets paid back. Remember the golden Rule.

MTC-00008663

From: Jon M. Griffith, Assistant Principal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,
I am writing in regards to the Microsoft Settlement. It has come to my attention that you are considering where to focus the funds from the settlement. I would like to briefly explain where I would hope you would direct some of the settlement.

Currently, I am the Assistant Principal/ Transportation Director/Athletic Director but before this recent job change I was District Computer Coordinator. With that job, I can honestly say the funding for technology was scarce. The School District of Spooner is a medium size school district in rural Northwest Wisconsin. The majority of the supporting community is either retired or around the poverty level. Unlike larger communities such as Madison or Milwaukee, Spooner and the surrounding smaller towns are not able to tap into our local industries for help. Most of the businesses are geared towards tourism (such as bars, restaurants and small grocery stores).

In fact the 3rd largest employer in Spooner is our local grocery store. With this background, I would hope that any aid that you could funnel towards rural areas would greatly be appreciated. To compete with schools from larger communities we need to have similar resources. Grants and scholarships are basically our only option. Asking our voters for help is very depressing (we failed our last 5 referendums these past

10 years). The funding would help us upgrade, build infrastructure and maintain the technology that we do have.

I can give you many examples, but my point is to ask for you to support technology funding for rural areas such as Spooner, Wisconsin. Any support would greatly be appreciated.

Thank You!
Jon Griffith

MTC-00008664

From: Dean and Urs Ratti
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:31pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

As long-time consumers of Microsoft products, our desire is to see the Microsoft lawsuit settled NOW. It appears that those entities which are delaying the settlement are doing so for political reasons only, to the detriment of the consuming public and in turn, the overall economy. As harsh as the Court of Appeals ruling is, let it stand, and let us be done with the continual litigation.

Dean and Ursula Ratti

MTC-00008665

From: Jim Cornwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:08pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
BEING A BUSINESS OWNER I WAS APPALLED WHEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, SPURRED ON BY THE COMPANY'S COMPETITORS, ATTACKED ONE OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSES THAT HAS GROWN IN OUR COUNTRY IN RECENT YEARS. IT WAS A RELIEF WHEN THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE CHANGED IN THE WHITE HOUSE AND THIS WITCH HUNT WAS BROUGHT TO AN ABRUPT CONCLUSION. REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE "SETTLEMENT" TERMS ARE, THE IMPORTANT POINT IS THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS STEPPED ASIDE IN ORDER TO LET AMERICA'S CAPITALIST FREE MARKET WORK. DO NOT LET THESE SPECIAL INTERESTS DELAY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SETTLEMENT.

THANK YOU FOR RESOLVING THIS MESS AS SOON AS CLINTON WAS DEPOSED.

YOURS,
JAMES CORNWELL

MTC-00008666

From: John Phillips
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

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.

Thank-You
John Phillips

MTC-00008667

From: donescher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Further prolonging the Microsoft litigation is a drag on the U.S. economy and on

American industry in general. We believe the proposed settlement is fair to the parties and just as importantly, the American consumer. A continuation would appear to be counter productive in these dangerous economic times.

Shirley & Don Escher

MTC-00008668

From: WaltJoy212@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already. The non agreeing states case must be dismissed so that we can go on with the rebuilding of the economy of New York and the Country. The issue is greed and how the government can try to ruin the greatest success story in the history of mankind. By delaying the settlement of the contribution of massive computer help to the schools that need help the most, we delay the help to another year of students.

I hope that we can count on the Federal Government to do the right thing and end this mess.

Walter Steckman
2 Tudor City Place 10HS
New York, New York 10017
Waltjoy212@aol.com

MTC-00008669

From: is
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am happy with this settlement.
Thanks,
Igor Spivak

MTC-00008670

From: Tony Palumbo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:50 pm
Subject: Excellent Comments

[Text body exceeds maximum size of message body (8192 bytes). It has been converted to attachment.]

I'm forwarding this article (and it's link) as I feel it portrays the Microsoft settlement for what it really is (nothing more than a cleverly disguised scam)

Yes, the article is long, but should still be read
<http://www.macobserver.com/news/2002/20020103/kheit—msantitrust.shtml>

Microsoft: Of Kids & Con Men by John Kheit
Of Kids and Con Men

Microsoft seems to be trying to use kids and education to lull everyone into believing them. The hope seems to be that maybe no one will question that Microsoft's proposed settlement allows it to extend its monopoly product leverage into the educational market. It also seems that Microsoft would like everyone to believe that promising to be good monopolists under an honor system is a reasonable solution to anticompetitive practices. Perhaps next they'll suggest convicted drug dealers should be allowed to pay their debts to society by giving free crack to our kids, assuming of course they promise to not run other dealers out of the market. Give me a break.

Microsoft Settlement Jibber Jabber

The laudable goal of helping our kids with a proposed settlement that Microsoft wants to direct at schools may well be a cue that we're being suckered. Recently, Steve Jobs, the ever effervescent technology leader and CEO of both Apple and Pixar, chimed in with a chorus of other commentators to pooh-pooh on Microsoft's scandalous proposal to settle for its crime of being a naughty monopoly. Microsoft's proposal to settle a class-action, civil, antitrust lawsuit with various states and private parties could have it paying \$1.6 billion to schools, mostly by way of Microsoft software, as a settlement for its past misdeeds. Mr. Jobs claimed to be "baffled" by the proposal.

Some legislators have this nasty habit of packaging together nonsensical laws for rhetorical and/or other less-than-righteous reasons. It's interesting to note that our government doesn't see any hypocrisy in its normal operations employing tying and other trust-like activities for leveraging power to force the acceptance of questionable laws while not allowing industry to do the same with products. I expect that one day soon a bright legislator will draft a bill that declares his home address to be tax free zone, provides himself with billions in disaster relief, declares himself emperor of the world, and adds a law saying "you should be nice to kids." This bright legislator will do this for the same reason others have done it, to mask his true intentions. The hope in this sort of scheme seems to be that everyone will be too ashamed to vote down a bill that says "you should be nice to kids" for fear of rhetorical backlash. The fear of being criticized for voting against a bill that says "you should be nice to kids" can make people and legislators alike do stupid things like adopt laws that are otherwise illegitimate.

So why am I harping on the flimflam tactics of con men, terrorists and politicians alike (please, I know I'm being redundant) in an article about Microsoft? Because a scam may be afoot. The reason for Mr. Jobs' and others' apparent consternation is if Microsoft gives its software to schools, it will incur no real penalty. Commentators state that approximately \$840 million of the settlement will come by way of Microsoft software, which would actually cost Microsoft approximately a paltry \$1 million. That's because making copies of its own software is essentially free for Microsoft. Furthermore, Apple and others fear that dumping that much Microsoft software into schools will shore up Microsoft's market position in the educational sector, where up until this point Microsoft has not managed to clearly dominate. Many commentators and Mr. Jobs have suggested Microsoft give the schools the entire settlement in cash. Of course, there is some degree of jibber jabber over the amount of cash that Microsoft should give to the educational sector, however, it seems that no one dares question the choice of market itself. That's crazy.

Only Microsoft Is Paying Attention to Relevant Markets

The fact that Microsoft chose the educational market, alone, should be a red flag to any practicing antitrust attorney. Most

antitrust attorneys know that market definition at trial is largely determinative of the outcome. "Because market power is often inferred from market share, market definition generally determines the result of the case." *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Technical Services, Inc.*, 504 U.S. 451, 469 n.15 (1992) (citing Robert Pitofsky, *New Definitions of Relevant Market and the Assault on Antitrust*, 90 Colum. L. Rev. 1805, 1806-13 (1990)). For example, if Microsoft's marketplace were considered to be all software made anywhere for any processor, it would only hold a small percentage of that market. That's because most of the world's software is not made by Microsoft. For example, there is a lot of software in calculators, microwaves, cars, airplanes, missiles, telephones, mainframes, televisions, etc. Thus, if a court decided that the relevant market was all software, then it would have been very likely that Microsoft would not have been found to be a monopoly. On the other hand, if the relevant market was said to be Intel compatible personal computers, then Microsoft easily would be deemed a monopoly. You've probably heard this before, but it is important to note that it is not illegal, per se, to be a monopoly. However, once you are found to be a monopoly, it is illegal to abuse your monopoly power in anticompetitive ways. 15 U.S.C.A. Sect. 2; *U. S. v. Grinnell Corp.*, 86 S.Ct. 1698 (1966); *Intergraph Corp. v. Intel Corp.*, 195 F.3d 1346, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Regardless, depending on how the market is defined, one can pretty much predict if an accused company will be found to be a monopoly.

Microsoft's Solution Ignores the Victims

With this background, it is interesting that Microsoft would focus on a market where it is not currently dominant rather than giving the damages to parties that have been more directly injured by its anticompetitive practices. Its main victims, supposedly, were other software companies stunted or driven out of business (anyone remember Stackercor?) and consumers that have been overcharged.

Consumers Overcharged

Some analysts posit that Microsoft overcharged individual consumers by as much as \$150 on products over the years. Many consumers were fleeced and forced to pay Microsoft a license fee for Windows when buying a computer even when they didn't want to run Windows or even when they already had a valid license for Windows. Microsoft evinced its recompense to the consumer by raising prices on Windows XP significantly.

Obvious Solutions Ignored

Certainly, there seem to be easy remedies that actually address and would affect Microsoft's monopoly power while providing compensation to both groups of victims. With regard to consumers, potential solutions may include: offering money to those that can show they were forced to buy unwanted Windows licenses, giving money back to OEMs (so they can lower prices on their non-Microsoft products), or giving cash to consumer groups to monitor any heavy handed tactics in the future. With regard to

the software industry, individual companies that can show damages should be compensated, e.g., Netscape, or at the very least settlement money should go to the Small Business Administration (or non-government analogues) for them to help software start-ups, which would promote more competition.

The most obvious places to send any settlement money would be to these victims. Otherwise the injured parties will have no redress for the damages wrought by Microsoft. Microsoft's current proposal is a little bit like offering to give money to a for-profit orphanage run by Microsoft as a punishment for having robbed a bank. Sure, some orphans may benefit (and probably will be trained to be future bank tellers), but Microsoft still keeps most of the money and the bank gets nothing. Of course, paying damages to the software industry would likely result in greater competition by infusing capital into a sector that certainly can use it. Furthermore, paying money to an independent watchdog consumer group would tend to prevent Microsoft from freely using its monopoly power in anticompetitive ways. I'm sure Microsoft had very conscious reasons for choosing the particular market of education and ignoring the two groups most directly affected by its anticompetitive actions, and I leave it to the reader to decide for themselves what those reasons were.

Counterproposals Make for Bad Law and Will Further Reduce Competition That's why it's so fascinating to me that with market determination being so central and critical in the world of antitrust that no one is questioning the choice of market for the settlement. I don't know of any parents that wouldn't at least question a proposed punishment for their children's wrong doings, if they were even liberal enough to allow their children to propose their own punishments in the first place. Regardless, the main counterproposals from commentators seem merely to concentrate on Microsoft settling with a full cash payment instead of supplementing the settlement with Microsoft software. The states' proposal basically would force Microsoft to license its source code and keep producing Microsoft Office for the Apple Macintosh and maybe Linux. Such suggestions seem to take one step forward and two steps back.

The step in the right direction is that Microsoft pay damages in cash. Last time I checked, this was still the United States of America and the official currency was a green-back and not a license for Windows. The step backward is that the state governments are considering requesting that Microsoft actually widen its Monopoly by having Microsoft enter new markets, either itself or through licensing, that it currently does not dominate, e.g., Linux. The states basically want Microsoft to open up its source code in return for licensing fees. Great! Now the states are basically making Microsoft's code essential. We've seen that even with supposedly open standards such as Java, HTML, etc. that individual companies are capable of steering and using those systems to proprietary effect.

One unpropitious scenario that may result from such a forced licensing system is that

Microsoft technology would now become even more dominant. A significant collection of software developers on the Linux platform could be adversely affected by Microsoft bulldozing in with its Office suite; this would allow Microsoft to use Office as leverage to subvert the platform as it has often been accused of doing with the Macintosh platform. Where do you think most people (or at least most corporations) will buy their version of Office, Microsoft or some secondary licensee? And even if you buy from a secondary licensee, Microsoft still makes money on licensing fees as per the states' proposal because Microsoft would be entitled to receive a reasonable royalty for its intellectual property. It's as if the states are trying to help Microsoft spread its wares even further with this solution.

I cannot recall any settlement in antitrust history where a solution to a monopoly was to further expand existing and/or potential markets with the monopolist's products. The law seems to require quite the contrary. 15 U.S.C.A. Sect. 2. Yet at every turn, counterproposals seem to actually expand the adoption and/or reach of Microsoft's products. Microsoft suggests donating software, which would further saturate the educational market. The states suggest entry into alternative markets from which Microsoft will benefit by way of increased licensing revenues. Even merely giving cash to schools for purchasing software (as suggested by some commentators) will tend only to strengthen Microsoft because it will continue to benefit from its monopoly position. Buying Market Share Witness its Xbox game console. Microsoft's Xbox retails for \$299, but it is rumored to lose about \$125 on every unit it sells. So, perhaps, it is not surprising that Microsoft is willing to spend money on capturing more of the education market.

Microsoft Gets Everything It Gives

For example, even if Microsoft gives cash to the schools, Apple, likely, still will get screwed. Assuming Microsoft gives the schools \$1 billion for computers and software, Microsoft will still win market share and its actual costs will remain low. Why? The schools will hand most of Microsoft's money right back to it to buy software, and the government will also end up kicking some money back to Microsoft. Even if half the schools buy Macintosh computers (which is roughly Apple's market share in the educational market), the schools will still buy Microsoft Office. Microsoft Office costs a lot more than a license for plain old Windows. And let's face it, if Microsoft ever kills Office on the Macintosh, it will have terrible consequences for the platform; and if someone were to speculate what a nasty monopolist would do when given a chance, then one might speculate that such a nasty monopolist would kill Mac office, which would force the remaining 4% of the computing world over to Windows. The point being, one way or the other, a large portion of any cash settlement will come back to Microsoft by way of software purchases, and Microsoft will still be able to leverage its products unfairly across markets. Furthermore, Microsoft will be able to write off the \$1 billion settlement as a loss and

recoup from around one third from the government. I.R.C. Sect. 162(g); Tax Reg. Sect. 1.162-22. In the end, a cash settlement still will cost Microsoft relatively little while at the same time it still will increase its market dominance, and the reason why remains the same. They are a monopoly.

Just Because You Used To, Doesn't Mean You Still Can

A little example may be in order. If you are Acme Inc. with 1% of the PC market and wish to bundle your screen saver with your PCs, no problem. The government might even hold you up as a "go getter" in the sense that you are trying to compete to win market share. However, if Acme starts to win more and more market share and later owns 99% of the market, then giving its screen saver away for free might be considered to be dumping, tying, predatory pricing, and/or the like illegal activity because it is now a monopoly. So there are some things, i.e., the very kinds of things, that are encouraged in a competitive and open market that become illegal once you attain the status of a monopoly. *Wolfson v. Artisans Say. Bank*, 428 F.Supp. 1315, 1321 (D.Del. 1977).

Nothing the government is currently proposing is designed to change that fundamental reality. Apparently the only arguments that proponents of the proposed settlement provide is that at least a cash settlement would cause Microsoft to lose some money. However, that seems to miss a great irony of why Microsoft is supposedly being punished in the first place. As any M.B.A. will tell you, Microsoft, as with any other corporation, wants to own every market to maximize returns for its investors. Owning the education market would help Microsoft shore up its current dominance by getting young people "hooked" on its products. By getting kids hooked early, they are less likely to try other systems because the cost of learning a new system is not insubstantial. Furthermore, Microsoft certainly shows it is willing to invest money to gain market share.

Thus, such a settlement, arguably, can be viewed as just a cost of doing business to garner market share. The irony is that a monopolist is not allowed to give products away or sell them at a loss.

Xbox Errata

With the government practically abetting a convicted monopolist in anticompetitive practices on its core products, there seems little likelihood that there will be an investigation into Microsoft's Xbox pricing and other tactics used to enter and buy out the gaming market; tactics that arguably may violate other antitrust laws. Of course that didn't stop me from buying one as it is the most incredible gaming platform I've ever seen (particularly with Halo, the formally independent producers of which have been bought out by Microsoft), but I digress.

Such predatory pricing and/or dumping tactics are normally illegal for a convicted monopolist. *U.S.v. Columbia Steel Co.*, 334 U.S. 495, 530 (1948); *Western Concrete Structures Co., Inc. v. Mitsui & Co. (U.S.A.)*, Inc., 760 F.2d 1013, 1018 (9th Cir. 1985). Thus, it is currently illegal for Microsoft to give its software to the educational market for free or at a price below its costs because they

have been found to be a monopoly. However, if the government agrees to Microsoft's proposed settlement with the states, then the government will at the very least be providing Microsoft with an exception to this rule, or at worst be a collaborator in illegal predatory pricing and dumping. It is not even clear if DoJ may allow the states to settle with Microsoft when the settlement terms, arguably, further require breaking the antitrust laws. Setting up an end-game as beautiful as this certainly deserves adulation in the annals of business history. The lawyers at Microsoft must be dancing jigs of joy all day long at the thought that the government may actually require the company to increase its software penetration in various markets and in some cases be allowed to use tactics that otherwise would be illegal.

Microsoft's proposed settlement, which is ostensibly a punishment for anticompetitive monopolistic practices, is refreshing in its outright obnoxiousness. They deserve kudos for selling their proposal without anyone questioning the fundamentals. Microsoft has managed to frame the settlement so that people are not questioning how, where, and/or why it should be punished, but boiled things down to only a question of how much it should pay.

Kids Are Irrelevant

I suppose people are afraid to question giving money and resources to the schools "for the kids." And don't get me wrong, I'm all for improving education in the United States. In this case, however, the kids simply don't deserve this money. That is because the greatest harm befell the public at large and countless innovative software companies (their creditors, employees, investors, etc.), which were driven out of business, stunted from pursuing markets for fear of oblivion, and/or never materialized because Microsoft's presence and practices were too ominous an obstacle. Those are the people that were primarily smashed and/or pushed around by Microsoft as mentioned throughout its antitrust trial. If any one industry was wronged and deserves recompense, it is the software industry as a whole (excluding Microsoft of course). Yet no one is even considering directing damages to the software industry when it was the clear victim. This is shameful; the kids are not more deserving here. And if you think I'm being a big meany, please refrain from being a big ole hypocrite and don't bitch if (heaven forbid) your home is burned down, and then the arsonist decides it would be better to give money for rebuilding your home "to the kids." Regardless of where the money should ultimately go, it's amazing the choice of where it should go has not been the subject of much, if any, debate or dispute.

Government Bargain

The government, save for a few states, certainly doesn't seem to have questioned anything all that much. The DoJ's perspective seems to be "we've told Bill he's been naughty, and he promised he'd be good." Microsoft has promised to be a good monopoly, however, Microsoft's outright cheap (offering to expend a few million in actual costs while claiming it's worth \$1.6 billion while knowing the states are likely to

collect over \$14+ billion if the case goes through trial is at the very least thrifty) and duplicitous proposed settlement, its structure, and the chosen market should be evidence itself as to how solemnly it regards its obligation to be a good monopoly. Generally, it is questionable if it is even possible to be a good monopoly. Supposedly a good monopoly is one that doesn't engage in "anticompetitive" practices (IP right holders and their government sanctioned monopolies withstanding, which is a topic for another day). Wolfson, 428 F.Supp. 1321; Intel, 195 F.3d 1346. That seems to imply that Microsoft should then engage in competitive practices. Yet, that's what Microsoft has been doing all along, i.e., competing like crazy, and why it's in trouble now. Or perhaps the government would like Microsoft not to be competitive so that the rest of the industry will be able to compete with an artificially handicapped monopoly? Neither solution seems to result in a truly competitive market. The only solution proposed, so far, that would result in a situation where Microsoft and the rest of the industry could all truly compete is where Microsoft's hold over the industry is broken.

Break-up Complimentary

Microsoft's brilliant business practices have made it a dominant force. Bill Gates and company truly deserve a great deal of praise for demonstrating incredible business and political acumen. I'm not trying to be sarcastic and my praise is genuine when I say that Bill Gates is the best businessman ever to walk the earth. Truly the highest compliment the government and President Bush could pay Mr. Gates would be to regard him as one of the greatest American success stories of all time. Mr. Gates should be in an elite cadre of moguls who won at playing the American dream. Just like J.D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil, Bill Gate's Microsoft needs to be broken up. Yet the DoJ, after winning the antitrust case against Microsoft, has gone from promoting a break-up as a remedy to shunning it for a settlement with the apparently coincidental arrival of the Bush administration. Why settle a case on poor terms now? To be sure, there are reasons to settle after winning a case, but these usually revolve around the strength and cost of an appeal. The government claims it has a solid case on appeal, and the cost of an appeal is irrelevant (relative to the ramifications of a poor settlement) to both Microsoft and the DoJ. So, once again, why settle a case on such unfavorable terms after winning on the merits!?

You don't have to be much of a conspiracy theorist to surmise that the Bush administration's inexplicably chummy perception of Microsoft has influenced the DoJ's about-face and acceptance of a Microsoft settlement. Certainly, the DoJ seems to have some interesting interpretations of what a just punishment is for a convicted monopoly that has driven away and/or killed off some of the world's most creative competitors by means other than merit.

Leveraging Honor Unwise with Monopolists

The break-up solution at least addresses the unfair leverage Microsoft uses across

markets by exploiting its Internet browser (Internet Explorer), operating system (Windows) and application suite (Office) line of products. The proposed settlement of giving money to schools will do nothing to reduce the inter-market leverage that Microsoft enjoys. In fact, giving the schools money for software and training will likely only increase the dependency those schools have on Microsoft's products. Furthermore, the DoJ settlement relies on Microsoft being "good" and somehow tempering its extremely competitive nature. Perhaps the DoJ should spread this new punishment policy to convicted serial murderers and set them free assuring us that they promised to be good in the future. No real argument seems to have been given as to why anyone can expect Microsoft to suddenly become and remain a good monopoly when it has thus far been incapable. However, history provides an argument to the contrary. Moguls are competitive. Successful companies are competitive. The very nature and manner of competing that was at one time legal, encouraged and the cause of their successes (e.g., lowering prices, building market share, driving lesser competitors out of business) have (in many instances) become illegal practices once they were found to be monopolies. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. U.S., 221 U.S. 1 (1911); Wolfson, 428 F.Supp. 1321; Intel, 195 F.3d 1346. As such, moguls and their successful companies are more likely to continue their practices simply from inertia. Certainly, Microsoft's latest acts seem indicative of anticompetitive recidivism: dropping Java from Windows XP will not help SUN; selling Xboxes at a loss seems to leverage its financial power derived from one market to move into another; disabling non-Microsoft web browsers from accessing MSN demonstrates that even if Microsoft makes its proprietary source code variations to HTML open, it still likely will induce users to stick with Microsoft branded browsers rather than being hassled and jostled from services during the lag time it will take for licensees to implement any new proprietary "features" to obtain parity with the official Microsoft version; and using heavy handed licensing tactics in its Software Assurance Program (SAP—make up your own jokes) has garnered wide criticism for forcing a licensing strategy to make users upgrade more frequently than desired.

If history serves as any lesson, a competitive mogul like Bill Gates will not become less competitive until he's declared an official winner and has no choice but to stop competing. There seems to be only one way to be declared a winner in the U.S. and that's through break-up as enjoyed by J.D. Rockefeller and Standard Oil. Standard Oil, 221 U.S. 1. There is no reason to believe that Bill Gates and Microsoft will stop employing anticompetitive tactics until they are forced to stop competing with the full force of monopoly power. Anything less than a forced break-up will leave Bill Gates and Microsoft with the status of being mere contenders not important, successful, or dangerous enough to warrant a government break-up. It's doubtful Bill Gates could be satisfied with such a runners-up title. Thus, the government should provide Mr. Gates and

Microsoft with the closure they deserve and declare them winners officially. In a certain sense, I believe Mr. Gates would be able to enjoy his victory having fought the good fight. If not, he can try to become the first person in the U.S. to have two of his companies broken up by the government.

I will not rehash why Microsoft's proposal for (please place tongue in cheek) "justice" (please release tongue now—thank you) is akin to sentencing a serial murderer to work as an executioner at a prison and trying to pass it off as a "community service." As long as Microsoft is allowed to exist as a monopoly, it will be nearly impossible to punish it in any meaningful way so as to provide disincentive from abusing its power.

MTC-00008671

From: JP0555@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Department of Justice is not acting in the best interest of this country to pursue an antitrust accusation against the Microsoft Corporation. Microsoft is not a monopoly. They are an independent competitive corporation that has provided innovative and beneficial products and services to the businesses and consumers of American and the world.

Why does the DOJ think profit means corruption? Microsoft is simply our American system of business working in its finest form.

For the DOJ to listed to a handful of Microsoft competitors and their claim that they have been restricted from operation in a free marketplace is just irresponsible. We have a free marketplace and it is the responsibility of the DOJ to keep it that way, by allowing Microsoft, and other corporations like it to continue operating and exploring and creating new and exciting products and services, without interference or restriction from the Department of Justice.

Keep America Free! Keep our way of life and our way of American commerce unencumbered by useless and destructive litigation. Don't let the whining complaints of the few hurt the productivity and opportunity of the many.

Jay Mathews
10418 Sedgebrook Dr.
Riverview, FL 33569

MTC-00008672

From: DONALD WRAY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I AM NOT AN ARDENT MICROSOFT FAN
* * * BUT LET'S GET THIS THING
SETTLED. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT IS
REASONABLE. WHY SHOULD THE
STATES ATTEMPT TO HOLD THIS UP. IT
SEEMS TO ME THAT THE COMPETITORS
OF MICROSOFT THAT WERE SO OPPOSED
TO MICROSOFT HAVE DONE VERY WELL
FOR THEMSELVES...SUCH AS AOL. THE
ECONOMY, ESPECIALLY THE TECH
STOCKS HAVE ALREADY TAKEN A
BEATING. LETS MOVE AHEAD INSTEAD
OF STILL TRYING TO KILL THE GOOSE

THAT LAID THE GOLDEN EGG. IN SPITE OF EVERYTHING, MICROSOFT OF THE PAST YEARS, HAS DONE MORE FOR THE TECH ECONOMY THAN ANY OTHER COMPANY. SETTLE NOW.

Donald W. Wray
450 Treasure Island Cswy. Apt #207
Treasure Island, Florida 33706
dwwrayti@msn.com

MTC-00008673

From: Barbara J Cline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

3621 Oakwood Drive
Bettendorf, IA 52722
January 4, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to offer my views on the antitrust lawsuit that has been going on between Microsoft and the federal government. I have been reading about this case in the Wall Street Journal, and it is one that I have never understood or agreed with. I support your decision to settle.

The case has had no positive effects, and the negative effects have been many. Schools are being hurt, the stock market has been affected, and the economy has dwindled as a result of the technology industry being hindered during the past three years while this case has gone on. In addition, the whole idea of the case is wrong in that it is stepping on the development of ideas, and this is a poor message for the government to be sending. Our economy is really struggling at the moment, and the government should be trying to find ways to stimulate it rather than ways to keep it down. Settling with Microsoft was a step in the right direction.

Thank you for your support.
Sincerely,
Charles Cline
cc: Sen. Charles Grassley

MTC-00008674

From: DUANE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand that a decision will be made in the near future regarding penalties that will be assessed against Microsoft. During my working career I spent 30 years in engineering and management at Boeing.

We used IBM and Microsoft software to run our computers for all kinds of design, analysis and marketing activities. I am convinced that Microsoft provided the best software for many of our applications but we did use software from other companies for specific applications.

I urge you not to break up the company or force them to release code to other companies. If they are required to release source code it would be no different than Boeing being required to release the software they use to design their airplanes and spacecraft. Microsoft has invested a large share of their profits to develop new software and expand the capabilities of existing

software programs. They do not pay dividends to their stockholders, they put it back into research and development. It would not be fair to give companies software code that they could have developed themselves were they inclined to invest their profits in research and development. Microsoft did not become the largest software company by taking advantage of other companies, they became the largest because they had a great management team with a strong vision of what people wanted to do with personal computers.

I sincerely hope that your decision will take into consideration the millions of personal computer users who have benefitted from the investments Microsoft has made in their software programs. Software for our computers will become much more expensive and less robust if Microsoft is required to release source code for Windows and other software programs.

Anyone can make a difference,
Everyone should try !!
Duane Edmonds
duanee@wavecom.net
307-754-9396

MTC-00008675

From: Winslade, Winston
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 12:54pm
Subject: MS Settlement

I would like to express that this case should be settled today so that MS can move forward in providing low cost innovative solutions to the public. An engineer by schooling and involved in an industry that produced computer systems for mission critical control in the process industry, I know the pain suffered by users that were stuck (necessarily so because of no standards) with proprietary operating systems. It was not until MS introduce a more robust OS that could be used for industry that this industry started to move towards standards. This at a cost in the multi-millions of dollars to industrial users.

The point is, without MS consumers would have experienced this same costly dilemma. That fact we have plug and play and an unlimited selection of application software that can be installed by even the novice user, is attributed to MS's leadership in the industry.

Quite frankly, the consumer has never been hurt by any of MS practices. In fact, the consumers has low cost software and OS' because of MS. This case should never have been heard in the first place.

The opinions expressed here are that of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of my employer.

MTC-00008676

From: HIROLLERIG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Why does the Government always try to brake down a company for getting big and making a profit. Isn't that the American Wau. LEAVE Microsoft alone.

MTC-00008677

From: elizabeth jones
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 12:56pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Leave Microsoft alone! Hurray for Bill Gates.
E. Jones, MD

MTC-00008678

From: Cris Von Wald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My view is that I fully support the proposed DOJ settlement. It is time to move on and does no one any good to continue to draw this process out.
cvonwald

MTC-00008679

From: andy greenwood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please finalize the agreement with Microsoft as it stands and let's get on with business. It's a competitive world, let's let it stay that way. Microsoft is one of the world's great innovators. Let their competitors "compete" with new and better products if they don't like the way things are.
Andy Greenwood

MTC-00008680

From: Dr. Manton Gibbs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Legal Settlement

The settlement between the US Justice Department and nine states seems fair and just. Given the downturn in the economy, there is a pressing need to settle the litigation. Customers and taxpayers should and will benefit. Global competition should keep all players on their best in providing low cost and quality service and products. This settlement does not mean the end of monitoring. Global competitors, customers and government can bring complaints at any time and place.

Manton C. Gibbs, Ph.D.
Associate Director of the American Society for Competitiveness.

MTC-00008681

From: Andy or Gail Hatle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:08pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is damn well time to get off the back of Microsoft. If we, the consumers aren't happy with it, we can stop using it. We are not slaves to Bill Gates. How much have we wasted on useless persecution of a software producer, and how much had we spent going after bin Laden before Sept. 11, 2001? Let's get our priorities straight and consider the good of the country instead of following the path of Bill Clinton trying to repay his campaign contributors. We need real leadership instead of playing stupid political games.

Sincerely,
Andy Hatle
hatle@earthlink.net

MTC-00008682

From: Dave Tomesch
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:07pm

Subject: RE: Microsoft Settlement

Dear To Whom it May Concern;

I have been using Microsoft Software for several years with great enthusiasm. I like their software and the support I get from buying their products. I do not feel they have a Monopoly in any way compared to Bell or Hydro or Oil Or Gas or the Lumber Industry. I am certain that there are many Hackers, Malicious programmers that are Jealous of Microsofts Success and therefore only a monetary discount on products or services is required to settle any further waste of TAXPAYERS money on this CASE! PS I have used Atari products in the Past with 1000's spent on them with little or no help from the company! They definetly had a monopoly on their products in the 70's and 80's along with Apple and you did not see any lawsuits then!!!. If you really wanna know what most consumers think, they think Unix and Internet programming companies are jealous of Microsofts successes and several Democrates took advantage of Taxpayers dollars to push a Insufficient evidence case against microsoft compared to reality. Reality is Oracle has or had a monopoly on Internet Servers (WHERE's THEIR MONOPOLY CASE???, You can use their own commercials on TV against them(we have 100% of the Marketplace on servers was their slogan!) The list could go on and on so I hope the Justice Department ends this case soon, give Microsoft a slap on the wrist along with Oracle, Sun Microsystems etc and get on with Consumer Products from all the US and Canadian Companies. Setup a department for Monopolies in any field of US. Commerce) Because in Reality Microsoft could move to Canada and what CASE would you have then? US. Laws do not work in Canada or we wouldn't have BELL CANADA or PetroCan ETC, and their are many more real big monopolies around the WORLD! (GOLD Companies ETC So putting the computer Industry in perspective!!!!!! if the key, I owned an atari 400, 800, x1800, 1200, Atari ST, Atari STE, Apple, IBM Computers etc. etc. You can see Microsoft came out on top but maybe the future some other company might do better so let the industry continue and Maybe those new Tablet PCs made by other companes might be the next big thing who knows!!!.

Sorry for the long PS but the Justice department should really be looking into why Oracle shares went from 25 dollars to 130 while Clinton was in office and back down again! There is a real monopoly of servers there and get with reality. I dont own a microsoft Monitor(its a clone) I don't own a Microsoft printer its from HP, I dont own a Microsft scanner its from IBM, I don't own a Microsoft Hard drive its from Western Digital, all my software is 80% owned by other companies, Disney, 3D0, etc, 15% is microsoft Kids games or Operating systems, SO IN REALITY there is NO MONOPOLY HERE!!!!

SO WHERE IS THE MONOPOLY CASE IN MY HOUSE????? NO WHERE!! ITS NON EXISTENT!!!

Dave Tomesch

(You can quote me if you like!)

MTC-00008683

From: Dave Rice

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:07pm

Subject: DOJ:

DOJ:

Please stop the witch hunt of Microsoft being orchestrated by its competitors and their agent polititions. The whole issue revolves around the preposterous definition of the "relevant market".

David L. Rice

MTC-00008684

From: RC Fullerton

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:10pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice

This lawsuit with Microsoft as defendent has gone on too long and now that there is a chance for a settlement, the action for settlement should be taken by the Court. RC Fullerton Canyon Lake, Texas

MTC-00008685

From: BKhynes@cs.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:09pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Civil Servants,

The agreed upon Microsoft Settlement is just and the government needs to move on. This lawsuit has done nothing to help consumers from day one (Microsoft's products have always been fairly priced) and was initiated to protect competitors that could not compete with Microsoft. Agreed, Microsoft is a tough competitor but the reasons that it has succeeded are not do to monopolistic activities but to a new business vision on how to survive in a fast moving technology world. They pour more profits back into research and have the lowest paid management team in the industry. They operate the company like a graduate school where the rewards are stock options versus degrees. Their workers are highly motivated.

Sincerely yours,

Robert J. Hynes

MTC-00008686

From: Frank Danaher

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:18pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear sir

Please be advised that I think the settlement agreement with Microsoft is fair and the litigation should be ended as soon as possible.

We have seen how the asbestos, tobacco, cigarette, breast implant and pharaceutical litigations have caused the demise of many fine companies. For the sake of the country we do not need excessive and oppressive litigation that will serve to protract the recession and bring about the demise of many fine companies.

Would like to suggest that you take proactive measures to discourage lawsuits at all levels. Finalizing the MicroSoft Settlement would be a fine start.

Thank you

Frank Danaher

MTC-00008687

From: john j boyle

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:22pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not delay the settlement further.

It is not in the best interest of the nation or consumers to drag this on any longer.

Sincerely,

Marsha E. Boyle

Florida

MTC-00008688

From: Scott Brooks

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:25pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

As a satisfied customer of Microsoft for over a decade, and as a dis-interested third party, I'd like to comment that the entire DOJ action against Microsoft disgusts me. Microsoft has, in the past, done much more public good than evil, at least from my viewpoint. Before Microsoft, interactivity between software applications was practically non-existent, and competitive products couldn't use each other's data. With Microsoft's so-called monopoly, my productivity has increased dramatically because I can now integrate one application's data into another application very easily. As far as I'm concerned, Microsoft should be allowed to continue operating as they have been until they actually cause harm to me or the American public. The only entities they've hurt are their competitors, and that's the way capitalism is supposed to work

* * *

Regards,

Scott Brooks

1519 Chardonnay Dr.

Harker Heights, TX 76548

MTC-00008689

From: Jim Baskin

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 1:28pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have not seen consumers hurt by Microsoft's action, and I have not seen it proven in court. It has been disappointing to have our government fight against what I think is a great company, seemingly expressing the views of Microsoft competitors in court (not consumer views). As a citizen and taxpayer I ask that you end this litigation as soon as possible. The current Microsoft offer is a HUGE benefit to the nation.

Thanks,

Jim Baskin

Senior Consultant—MCS Microsoft

Telecom Practice

Phone (425) 705-3749 Pager 800-895-6003

"You can stomp the grapes twice as fast, but that doesn't create a 20 year Tawny Port in 10 years."

MTC-00008690

From: Saddiq, Tareq

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/4/02 1:33pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing this letter to lend my support to the settlement reached between Microsoft

and the Department of Justice. This lawsuit is just a way for competitors of Microsoft to feel good about their lack of success and block any further achievements of Microsoft. Even though I believe this suit should not have been brought about, it is better to resolve this issue and move ahead, rather than spending another three years in court.

Microsoft has earned its success along the way. It has provided its consumers with quality care and service, which has tremendously helped in its worldwide accomplishments. Microsoft opponents have suggested terms that appear to stifle trade, such as uniform licensing price agreements. Even so, Microsoft has acknowledged the terms so that it can move on. This waste of American tax dollars is pointless. To stop this from continuing any further, all action that is taking place at the federal level be brought to an end.

Sincerely,
Tareq Saddiq,
Senior Network Architect, Phone: (608) 278-7888 or (608) 225-8741
CC: 'Tammy.Baldwin(a)mail.house.gov'

MTC-00008691

From: Steve Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:34 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Steve Miller (sw miller@hotmail.com)
From the outset I disagreed with the Government's prosecution of Microsoft. The success of any operating system platform is determined by those of use who write software for it. For years nearly eight million developers have written software for the Windows platform. Since so many developers have chosen to write for Windows the consumer had more applications from which to choose. Allowing the consumer to pick what they felt was fight for them.

Microsoft Windows has been far more open and allowed consumers more choice than other operating systems. Other operating system vendors give you what they think you should have rather than listening to the consumer and providing the features important to the consumer. Since, the settlement is in place I think it should stand. While I continue to think that it is unnecessary it is better than the attempts to break up Microsoft. I think the break up attempt was a contributing factor to the soft economic conditions we are now in since our economy is technology driven. Any further attempts to limit Microsoft will only hurt the economy more and punish those eight million developers who have chosen to make their living using Microsoft technologies.

Thank you,
Steve Miller
425 Kemper Drive North
Madison, TN 37115
(615) 612-1919
sw miller@hotmail.com
Steve Miller (sw miller@hotmail.com)

MTC-00008692

From: PacHome@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement January 4, 2002
I believe that the Department of Justice should settle the Microsoft case. The

agreement reached by the federal government and nine states with Microsoft addresses the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling.

Further litigation is unnecessary, and harmful for the American spirit.

Sincerely,
Valerie Hines
PacHome@aol.com

MTC-00008693

From: Mehran Behdjat
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
DOJ

I believe that the most recent settlement between DOJ and Microsoft is fair and equitable and no more litigation is necessary. Continuation of litigation against Microsoft is detrimental to the fragile U.S. economy and will hurt the technology and innovation as a whole.

Sincerely,
Mehran Behdjat

MTC-00008694

From: david faibish
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement—CASH ONLY!

The penalty paid by microsoft should NOT be an in-kind contribution (of software, hardware, or services).

Recipients should be free to choose who and what they buy with the proceeds of any settlement.

Especially in the education marketplace which is one of the few where microsoft faces real competition (ie Apple); a "forced" gift that is platform-specific undermines not enhances the very competition which is the goal of the penalty in the first place!

regards:dlf

MTC-00008695

From: Chris Cleary
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

People are envious of the success of large companies and individuals such as Microsoft and Bill Gates, respectively. This should not cloud the vision of the Department of Justice. Do not break up Microsoft.

Leave the company alone, solve real crime, and go about you business.

Breaking up any company that has been made large and prosperous from people voting with their wallets is socialism. There are no barriers that Microsoft competitors have to surmount that have not been surmounted before. They need more creativity as they lack ideas. Microsoft's competition has not been outlawed as with the U.S. Postal Service and First Class mail; it is merely uncreative.

Leave Microsoft alone and go after the real criminals.

Chris Cleary
Fairfield, Ohio

MTC-00008696

From: DENNIS BROWN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
Microsoft continues to abuse its' customers, the general public, and the laws of commerce in our great nation. Their arrogance is most apparent in the way in which they have launched the latest version of their operating system and its' integrated software. Microsoft has flaunted the very settlement and suggestions of the DOJ and the prior trial judge. The new version of the operating system is even more anti-competitive! Please reconsider, on behalf of the American people, your settlement offer.

Dennis Brown
dbrown@Kaneland.org
Kaneland High School
Maple Park, IL

MTC-00008697

From: James T. Murphy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:44pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Please approve the settlement and let all parties move on with business.
J.murphy

MTC-00008698

From: Kirk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice, With the settlement of the Microsoft case nearing the point where the District Court will rule whether or not this settlement is in the best interest of the consumer public, I wish to urge that it is.

The proposed settlement with the DOJ and 9 states is tough, fair and appropriate. As a consumer, I have never felt that I was harmed in any way by Microsoft's business tactics. I believe that standardization is actually the consumer's best friend, assuming that the quality of the standard is upheld. I believe that Microsoft works very hard and invests millions, or even billions of dollars to ensure that their products are the best.

As an investor, I have lost significant amounts of personal wealth in the past 18+ months, partly due to the economic downturn, but also in large part because of the case against Microsoft, which drove the price of Microsoft stock, and the stock of nearly every other company down. I have always maintained that the pressure on Microsoft stock, which is so widely held in private accounts as well as institutional funds, has had a large role in eroding our economy during the past couple of years.

As a taxpayer, I feel that more than enough has been spent on this case. In the interest of the taxpaying public, I think it is time this case were settled and put to rest for good. I wish the other 9 states attorney generals who have not agreed to this settlement would also put aside political aspirations and act on behalf of the public as well, and join in this settlement agreement. Private interest groups who oppose this settlement do not have the majority of public interest at heart- for them it is a personal vendetta.

Suffice it to say that as a consumer, and investor, a taxpayer and as an American, I feel this settlement is appropriate and necessary so that we all might get on with our lives and with the business of

strengthening the American economy. In order to do this, one key step is to put this case to rest. Please include my sentiments as part of the public record for the District Court to review.

God Bless America.
Sincerely,
Kirk Werner
Duvall, Washington

MTC-00008699

From: Maiale@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

One thing more: a lot of this complaint by Microsoft competitors to the Government is because they cannot compete in price and performance. Therefore we believe Microsoft has been punished for being efficient. The country does not need this sort of action by the Government. It stifles business innovation and loses jobs. Mr. and Mrs. Anthony J. Maiale 941-597-5864. 672 92nd Avenue, North, Naples FL 34108

MTC-00008700

From: Pete Detskey (ELN)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to oppose the anti-trust settlement that has been proposed with Microsoft. I write as both a small business owner and as a consumer of Microsoft software products.

Capitalism works only when competition exists. Justice must be served in regards to the anti-competitive behavior of Microsoft. The proposed settlement does not guarantee competition for new companies; it does not promote benefits to consumers.

One flaw with the proposed settlement is that it leaves open too many loopholes on what code is not required to be made open to other business seeking to develop new products. It also seems to have a sunset provision on when the oversight committee will disband in several years. We need a permanent solution to the Microsoft monopoly problem.

The nine states that did not sign on to the agreement have a better plan on promoting competition. For example, they require that Microsoft Office products be ported to rival operating systems.

For consumers, consider the recent warning that the FBI issued regarding the security holes in the Win XP operating system. I think it is awful that the FBI has to issue consumer warnings—at taxpayer expense—because of Microsoft negligence. In a competitive environment, no company would release a software product with serious flaws; that action would risk going out of business. But in a monopoly, Microsoft has no fears and will bully everyone around as it sees fit.

Justice must be served on the anti-competitive behavior of Microsoft. The current settlement offer does not safeguard competition in the marketplace. It provides no benefits to consumers with flawed software products.

Justice is NOT served in the proposed settlement. I urge that an alternative settlement be proposed.

Sincerely,
Peter Z. Detskey
Tucson, Arizona
(520) 297-7289

MTC-00008701

From: Magnus Hammar Borsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Well, maybe this is totally unimportant for you. But I wanted to make myself heard. Since I am not an american citizen, I do not have any constitutional rights to express myself in this matter.

But this is as important to me as it is for any american. Microsoft is not an "american" corporation, it is an international corporation and most people working for Microsoft are NOT americans (some are as me, swede's. Not to mention all programers from India * * *).

Maybe you as americans, for once, should ask other nations what they think about Microsoft? And just maybe you should try to addept to others, instead of trying to change those who think different from you? Sooner or later your pride might be your fall, and that would truly be a sad end for a beautiful nation as yours.

Magnus Hammar

MTC-00008702

From: David G. Odom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge in the above settlement case: I am a user of the OS/2 operating system from IBM. I have found this to be a technologically superior product over the operating systems offered by Microsoft, including their latest version, Windows XP. Unfortunately, OS/2 has been in decline for a number of years from what I believe to be unfair monopolistic marketing tactics of Microsoft. As a result, vendors of OS/2 related products have also diminished over the years. Contrary to arguments by Microsoft that their products encourage competition, I believe the opposite is true; that Microsoft's marketing practices actually discourages competition and stunts technological growth. To believe that Microsoft is anything BUT a monopoly in the micro-computer market, is nonsense. Looking at anyone's PCs or any companies micro-servers will tell you otherwise and the truth.

Consequently, I do not believe the Federal Government's proposed settlement with Microsoft, in its current form, is inadequate and that stricter measures be imposed on the company to prohibit such tactics from being used in the future. I believe the proposed settlement fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting Microsoft's illegal conduct, promoting competition in the industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains.

I would be happy to discuss those controls if you need input from the "regular public" that has to suffer through the Microsoft monopoly environment.

Sincerely,
David G. Odom
Tucson, AZ

MTC-00008703

From: JHWallis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 1:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Continue the trend away from the anti-business/anti-capitalist tenor left behind by the previous administration. The settlement is sufficient.

MTC-00008704

From: Nathan Vick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
I would like to add my voice in favour of breaking Microsoft into an Operating System business and an Applications business. I think that is the only effective way to get Microsoft make windows more extensible for third parties, more standards-compliant (without embrace-and-extend) and more thoroughly documented. I think breaking them up is the only effective way to accomplish these goals because it is the only way that produces and fast-acting economic incentive.

Nathan
nvick@capcollege.bc.ca
Nathan Vick
Programmer/Analyst
Capilano College

MTC-00008705

From: PCCorral
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For many of us who are in the PC industry we have know all along that this lawsuit was motivated, funded and perpetuated by Sun Microsystems, Oracle, the Sansoni legal eagles and other Microsoft competitors. Though there was some merit to the complaints about Microsoft's OEM pricing policies, those practices have been discontinued and remedied.

The one who is really being hurt by the continuation of this case is the consumer. Microsoft's competitors don't want Microsoft to be able to add free new features to its software. But it's the consumer who would be hurt by this. It is time for this case to be settled. Do ever consumer out there a favor and settle it!

MTC-00008706

From: RGoodwill@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:05pm
Subject: (no subject)

Drop the suit. It is a waste of money
REGoodwill Jr

MTC-00008707

From: ETZZY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:10pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Department of justices I am writing to you concerning the Microsoft settlement. I think the settlement is fair to all, and any future litigation will only hurt the consumer. I am disabled and on a limited income, (in some ways we all are, on limited income that is)

and Microsoft has help me buy some products I might not otherwise be able to afford. I do own some Microsoft stock, which if the company was left alone the little bit I have invested will help my income someday. thank you for this opportunity to share with you.

Ed etzwiler

MTC-00008708

From: MILLWOOD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the current proposed DOJ settlement. Let's not get tangled in further litigation. Thanks

MTC-00008709

From: Brooks, Steve
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft Settlement is reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Steven J. Brooks

Senior Systems Analyst, D.B.A.

ADP COBRA Services, Inc

wk. (770)-619-7200 ext. 1342

cell. (770)-367-1759

MTC-00008710

From: jack timmons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer professional for over 20 years, I'm shocked that the US government is still trying to sue Microsoft. Microsoft has contributed more to this country than all the other computer companies combined. Instead of a well deserved award, you are punishing them, obviously on behalf of their competitors in Utah (Novell), California (Sun/Oracle) and New York (IBM/AOL).

Stop trying to kill the goose that continues to lay golden eggs!

Shame on you for supporting their competitors in such a painfully biased and unfair way!!! It's incredibly obvious what a hack job this is.

Jack Timmons

Seattle, Washington

MTC-00008711

From: Mister Thorne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Could you please advise as to the deadline for the public to submit comments on the Proposed Final Judgement? Is it Sunday, 6 Jan 2002 which is 60 days after the 6 Nov 2001 posting of the Judgement? Is it Tuesday, 15 Jan 2002 which is 60 days after the 15 Nov 2001 posting of the Competitive Impact Statment?

Thank you.

Mister Thorne

MTC-00008713

From: Robert Westerberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's stop wasting taxpayers' money and making life difficult for one of the great companies of the technological age whose continued existence is of paramount importance for the economy of the United States and the progress of global freedom. Bill and Paul took a chance way back when, in the true spirit of American entrepreneurship, when computers were the toys of academia. Now Microsoft is being punished because they have been successful beyond anyone's dreams or imagination.

Yes, I have a vested interest in Microsoft. It is the heart of our retirement plan. Stop jerking Mr. Gates around just because some whiners didn't take risks when the Internet Age was in its infancy. That is the real reason there is only one truly capable operating system for computers in the world today.

Affirmative action is of the past—be it for people or corporations. Countless millions have been spent for lawyers in this matter so far. This should not become another AT & T attorney welfare scam.

Hands off Microsoft!

Robert Westerberg, faithful shareholder since 1998.

MTC-00008714

From: Dillon Dale Civ OC-ALC/LGPA
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 2:30pm
Subject: Comment on settlement

Dear sir or madam

Please be advised that I do not agree with the current settlement as proposed by the Dept of Justice.

In summary, what I see is this, Microsoft owns the only trainstation, that is the OS. It knows where it layed the tracks and how the tracks operate, (internal workings of OS) this gives them a HUGE advantage on software development. No one else knows this as well as Microsoft and it protects and uses this knowledge to it's sole advantage.

I am by trade an accountant. I have dabbled in computer systems for years, learning to program in various programming languages. I can remember Microsofts first set of side products that had direct impact on me.

QuickBasic was the applications name, it was a wonderful product and it was all due to competition with Borland and the great programs that they had. (Borland lost a lot of ground when Microsoft switched from DOS to Windows version 95. Borland no longer makes a Basic programming language.)

I can remember the big switch when Microsoft introduced it's Windows operating system and it's suite of Office products. Suddenly the things that I knew the most lotus, peachal, supercal etc... spreadsheets disappeared from the store shelves. Everyone had to learn a new interface, you couldn't share spreadsheets because of all the things Microsoft did to make it hard to switch from their product to other products. (This was no doubt by design and still is by design.) Microsoft now totally dominates the market when it comes to spreadsheets, but they still lag behind some of the original spreadsheets ability.

Where our office went from lotus and supercal we acquired more work, not less, MS Excel created more keystrokes for us and a decrease in productivity. The macro ability

was greatly reduced and it created for us a very large problem, we had to basically carry two spreadsheets. One DOS based from ages ago and the other Windows related (MS Excel). In short we still have not upgraded the majority of our spreadsheets because Excel does not do as good of job.

In our office we use programs that where written in Basic or GWbasic many years ago. This ability and language was provided by Microsoft or IBM with the purchase of an OS many years ago. Microsoft no longer provides this type of program with the purchase of the OS, I admit I do find it strange that they will add an internet browser for free, but won't keep a language that was a standard feature of the OS for years and years. I am currently writing Java based programs to replace the programs written in Basic or GWbasic many years ago. If Microsoft is allowed to drive Java out of business or goes to big lengths to make sure it does not work with it's system then nothing I can do will replace those programs that we do business with now. I do not have the money to buy the solution from Microsoft. If you pay close attention to the Government you will find that a lot of Government facilities are now stuck with the older version of Internet Explorer (version 5.5 service pack 2), because a lot of Government pages are written to work with Java. The newer version of IE (version 6) will not work with Java. Why would Microsoft do this? Is it now the most efficient product when viewing the web? How much will the Government have to spend to correct these problems? Or will the Government be stuck using Windows 5.5 with service pack 2 until MS decides it won't want to support it any longer? If they give it away as part of the OS package, then it shouldn't be a tool used to destroy the business of others. It should be made to work with other things out there.

To me it is just like buying an OS for a computer that says it is designed for use in any IBM compatible PC, but it won't work with Seagate Hard Drives because our company owns Western Digital. BTW it's about the only OS available as it has driven every other OS out of the market, used it's OS to capture market share it does not deserve, because of unfair competition and it's insider knowledge on the OS. How does it benefit the public? We have seen that the courts ruled it was a monopoly.

Now it's up to you the DOJ to fix the tracks so that other trains can run in and out of that trainstation without being derailed, your settlement leaves a lot to be desired and actually rewards Microsoft, does not force them to retreat from the practices that have hurt so many in the past and cripples innovation.

Dale Dillon

MTC-00008715

From: Michael
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs and Madams:

It has come to my attention that nine misdirected states are attempting to thwart the Department of Justice's proposed settlement with Microsoft. After reading the proposed remedies, I have concluded that

these are fair and beneficial to the consumer in the long run. In the short run, it will serve to employ hundreds of lawyers to determine what courses of action are acceptable for the company to pursue.

When the nine states continue to whine about these remedies not being enough, they are truly letting their ignorance, lack of understanding of the market, and greed show through. As an example: Apple makes the only "crash proof" desktop computer on the market. Apple has a 100% market share for that market. Apple refuses to allow other vendors to manufacture compatible "crash proof" hardware. This Apple monopoly locks out any and all competitors, raises the market price of Apple hardware, reduces the market share of "crash proof" systems, and hence due to that minimal market size, discourages developers from creating competing products for the Apple platform. Each of these steps TRULY harms consumers. Were it not for these foolish policies, Apple would be a true competitor to Microsoft compatible computers today.

In the days of the USSR (command & control) where only the government made automobiles, were they the best buys in the country for a good reason? Yes, it was due to their being the only automobile available to the few that could afford them. If the dissenting states were truly worried about consumers and competition, they would be working through the DOJ to force Apple to open their market. The fact they are not simply demonstrates their ulterior motives.

The last 2 large anti-trust cases in U.S. history (AT & T, and IBM) had the unintended and ugly effect of turning these two symbols of American technology into bumbling giants void of any current serious innovation. Please look at the meaningless shell that is now AT & T before you decide to drag this case on further.

Best regards,

Michael Patrick Chaffey, OCP, CPA
17516 NE 138th St.
Redmond, WA 98052

DISCLOSURE NOTE: I own less than 1000 shares of Microsoft stock, and have used the company's software products for over 10 years.

MTC-00008717

From: john himes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:46pm
Subject: microsoft

Please let the microsoft settlement stand and let our economy recover. This recession started the day Judge Jackson tried to break up microsoft. It was a stupid move then and remains the same today.

Thank you
John E. Himes
102 Melvin Ave.
Catonsville Md.
21228

MTC-00008718

From: Lynn B. Boman Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear United States Department of Justice,
I am writing you today to express my feelings in regards to the settlement reached

between Microsoft and the Department of Justice on November 2nd. I am anxious to see this dispute resolved, so I oppose further action against Microsoft. This settlement is fair, contains provisions that foster competition, and is good for the technology industry. Microsoft has pledged to share more information with other companies and give consumers more choices. Under this agreement, Microsoft must design future versions of Windows to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software and must disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows.

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and stifles innovation.

Thank you for your time,
Lynn B Boman Jr.

MTC-00008719

From: Chris Long
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 2:57pm
Subject: microsoft problem
hi there:

I was told that I could send an email to you, offering up my 2 cents worth on the microsoft fiasco—I believe that this company's business practices are beyond irresponsible—I would go so far as to say that their pure greed has put them in a position wherein one of their biggest goals is to squash any and all competition—which I think is a sorry state of affairs at best. with the situation as it stands now we have a STUPIDLY HUGE percentage of the computer software being controlled by one company: microsoft. apple remains the only real competition. the LOSERS are consumers like myself—who KNOWS where we might be today if microsoft had acted legally over these past years?

Since microsoft has already been found guilty of multiple antitrust law violations, my opinion is that they should receive an extremely harsh penalty indeed; as severe as possible within the limits of the law. what I've read of the current situation (a fair bit) only shows the government willing to settle for a light 'slap on the wrist'.

Let's have some JUSTICE!!!

Thanks for listening,
Chris long

MTC-00008720

From: DallasFlwr@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:00pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
TO DOJ,

IT IS TIME TO SETTLE THE MICROSOFT CASE. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT BROUGHT FORTH BY THE DOJ AND NINE STATES SEEMS MORE THAN ENOUGH. I HAVE HAD A HARD TIME UNDERSTANDING HOW THE CONSUMER HAS BEEN HARMED. DID WE PAY TOO MUCH FOR MICROSOFT PRODUCTS? REPORTS IN THE MEDIA STATE WE MAY HAVE OVERPAID 20 TO 30 DOLLARS FOR WINDOWS. IF IT'S AN ISSUE OF THIS AMOUNT, PERHAPS THE INDIVIDUAL HAS MORE PROBLEMS THAN OWNING A COMPUTER. THE CONSUMER IS ME. THIS

LITIGATION WILL NOT HELP ME IN ANY WAY. I DID NOT ASK FOR IT AND I DON'T WANT IT.

LET'S BE HONEST, THIS IS ABOUT MICROSOFT'S COMPETITION ALWAYS LAGGING BEHIND THE CURVE. ALL THEY NEED TO DO IS BUILD A BETTER MOUSE TRAP. THIS CASE HAS HURT OUR ECONOMY AND INVESTORS. IF IT DOESN'T END NOW, I'M GOING TO BLAME SOME PEOPLE AND NOT BUY THEIR PRODUCTS...NOT VOTE FOR THEM ETC. WHO'S GOVERNMENT IS THIS ANYWAY? IF WE DON'T STOP THIS CASE NOW, PERHAPS THE DOOR WILL OPEN FURTHER FOR AN OVERSEAS COMPETITOR..THINK AIRBUS !

GIL HODGES , REGISTERED VOTER.

MTC-00008721

From: Robert Steffy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dears Sirs:

I support the comprehensive agreement reached with the U.S. Government and Microsoft Corp.. I think the agreement is fair and will finally end this costly and non-productive litigation. Please consider my opinion as you make your decision on this matter.

Sincerely;
Robert M. Steffy,
Holtwood, Pa

MTC-00008722

From: Dan Van Fleet
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I've been involved in the computer industry from before Microsoft became a widely known company. I remember the 640K capability of DOS, being what seemed like more than we would ever need, I admired and respected Microsoft at that point. My how times have changed.

Today, I find Microsoft's actions to be horrid. I feel much like a young child in Chicago when he finds out that nice man down the street is actually a mob boss. The child asks his mother, "That man, he kills people?", his mother responds yes he does. The child, afraid, still smiles when the man says hi, he takes a bit of candy when offered, so to not upset the boss. Microsoft is that boss, ISV's and users are the children.

Through my daily dealings with Microsoft software, I've felt Microsoft was unfairly using it's power to force it's products on the public. That has now been proven in court, the proposed settlement is not a solution. Microsoft has already ignored a similar solution, and lied about it through demonstrations in court. Don't let them do it again.

Further, please do not let the actions of 9/11 cause you to go easy on Microsoft, that would be a travesty of justice. Microsoft is currently using those events to attain their goals, don't let them do it. It is a pity that Judge Jackson, so horrified by the testimony, spoke out of turn, don't let Microsoft take advantage of his mistake.

Sincerely,

Dan Van Fleet
IT Director
Dayton, Ohio

MTC-00008723

From: Hanaleisrf@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:14pm
Subject: Stop the idiocy of litigating against innovation

Please stop spending my tax dollars to litigate against Microsoft.

MTC-00008724

From: Philip Robbins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice:

Please settle the Microsoft case with all states and let us, as the President said, get on with our lives. We, at this critical time in our country, do not need one more thing to drag down our economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.
Philip J, Robbins
36 Rock Hill Lane
Fort Thomas, KY 41075

MTC-00008725

From: Dkmar1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:20pm
Subject: Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled as soon as possible.
D.K. Martin
dkmar@aol.com

MTC-00008726

From: DavidatEH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs,

This letter is written in support of the Microsoft Settlement with the hope that the already negotiated agreement will be finalized so that all parties will be bound by it and therefore complete the agreement forthwith. It is important that Microsoft competitors and some misguided states attorneys general are forced to comply with the already negotiated settlement and finish this protracted bloodletting at once.

Respectfully,
David C. Mactye, M.D.,
PO Box 50, West Bloomfield, NY 14618
716-370-0361

MTC-00008727

From: Dennis Gignac
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I would like to let you know that I have been following this case since the very beginning and have written to the Wisconsin State DOJ a number of times expressing my opinion on the subject. I find it very satisfying that now that there appears to be an end to this mess it is very close to my original opinion. Anyway, I am completely in favor of the current settlement arrangement and I feel strongly that Microsoft has not harmed me in anyway with their actions in

the past. I will agree that Microsoft has taken a hard line with computer companies and although I see no real anti-trust I will concede that the USDOJ most likely knows that laws much better than I do. I will say that my opinion is that Microsoft has done more to protect the software industry and end users with the stance they have taken then damage they may have done to competitors.

Anyway, I am strongly in favor of the settlement and it is time allow Microsoft to get on with their work of adding more features into their operating systems at will.

Thank you
Dennis Gignac
Brookfield, WI

MTC-00008728

From: TwoVirgos@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:27pm
Subject: Opinion

We are in favor of the settlement worked out with Microsoft.

Marlene & Alan Feinstein

MTC-00008729

From: Rollie Schmidt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern at U.S. Dept. Of Justice,

I have worked in the computer industry for nearly 28 years. I have seen many things come and go since the early-to-mid 70's. One of the most ridiculous things I have witnessed it this incessant hounding of Microsoft. Why? They are successful. Get over it. Why are they successful? They build good products for which the public willingly exchanges value in the form of legal tender. Again, gladly in the manner in which they (the public and businesses) do so.

Have you ever gone to an Office Depot or Staples or whatever store and seen anyone pushing people into the aisle with MSFT products? Any in hammer locks being forced to buy MSFT products while the Apple side of the aisle (or usually completely different aisle for Apple since there needs to be a whole aisle just for MSFT binaries) is nearly vacant? So you have choice, you have a free market, you have people voting by the millions with their checkbooks for MSFT products. I have used Sun Microsystems machines, which I consider better than most Intel-based machines for many tasks. I can and will use them when needed. The Sun Solaris operating system is excellent. In many cases better than Windows2000 or any other OS. There are a number of great applications. If there were not why would SUNW be a multi-billion dollar commercial success? I have Linux at my disposal on my Intel-based systems as well. I can run that and have. It's good for a lot of things. It has applications too. People run them. In many cases they are even free. You get what you pay for. That's why I have CHOSEN to buy Microsoft products for all my family's home needs. It's why I use them on my business laptop as well. They work and they work very well.

Why not consider this and stop wasting my and other taxpayers' money by hounding

MSFT any further? Jealousy of their success is just some warped commercial form of class envy. Let someone else step up and do a better job than Microsoft and they market will take care of itself. Please get closure on this Microsoft litigation and free them to focus on doing their fair share, which they likely are more than willing to do, and channel their valuable resources into helping to get the economy into high gear again. Hounding Microsoft any further is wasteful of taxpayer resources, wasteful of Microsoft and Microsoft shareholder resources and just generally bad for everyone.

Thanks much,
Roland Schmidt
Auburn, CA 95602

MTC-00008730

From: Aaron Freed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am a systems administrator and have been for 15 years. I have held an MCSE since 1999.

I have been working with Microsoft products since Dos 2.11, and since Windows 3.0. I have worked with all versions of Windows NT starting with version 3.50 and up through the current version of Windows XP.

I have spent many, many hours with Microsoft products, learning them, supporting them, trouble-shooting them.

I have been involved with Linux (RedHat) on a serious level since Version 7.1 (on a less serious level, since Version 6.2).

With Microsoft, when there is a problem, I find that the solution is about 70% trying to figure out what the right menu option or button is to select to elicit a dialog that allows me to change the desired settings. 20% of the time is spent trying to find away around Microsoft's attempts to prevent me from "doing something dangerous, that might harm my software". And 10% of the time, I am actually resolving the problem.

The key to troubleshooting Microsoft problems seems to be in rote memorization of menu-options, dialogs and buttons needed to change a desired setting.

The key, with Linux, is usually a matter of editing a script or possibly recoding some software or component, which generally requires not only an understanding of why the problem happened, but also how the "fix" for it works—or at least knowing that you have access to the source code and other documentation that will help you to understand how the fix works, why it works, and how the program being fixed works.

In short, it is something like the difference between knowing how to go to the store and purchase a loaf of cake, versus knowing how to actually make a cake from scratch (with documented and usually fairly clearly explained instructions).

Microsoft is a closed system, a "black box", if you will. You generally put in your data and you get a result, but you really don't know how that result is generated. And when that result is not what is expected or desired, your recourses for figuring out why are quite limited, because you aren't allowed inside the "black box".

Linux, on the other hand, is an open system. Like Microsoft, you put in your data and get a result out. However, if the result is not what is desired, or expected, you have the option of taking apart the "black box" and tinkering with its internal workings to make it work the way you want it to.

Microsoft charges you for the privilege of using their software—their marketing effort focused primarily on emphasizing the claim that MS is easy to use and that "if you know one program, you pretty much know them all."

Linux makes no such claim. Nor are you ever charged for it. However, with a little know-how and a willingness to learn and try to understand, what you give up in a generic, standardized interface, you more than make up for in terms of control of your system and your data. And, surprisingly, it is not very difficult to customize your system to make it just as 'generically easy to use' as Windows. (Frequently even more so.)

Now, Microsoft wants to offer us the ".Net" option, where we completely surrender control of our system to them in the form of paying a monthly or yearly subscription fee to "rent" their software. Ostensibly, this alleviates the need for upgrades, maintenance, and troubleshooting on the part of the end-user. In truth, it removes the "ownership" of the user's data from him, because, should the user decide not to renew this "subscription" to Microsoft's ".Net" service, they will find that they can no longer access their data because it is stored in formats understood only by Microsoft.Net programs.

Not only are we being asked to surrender control of our computers to Microsoft, we are being asked to surrender control of our personal data. And, on top of that, we are being required to pay Microsoft a monthly fee for the privilege!

Slavery is one thing. Asking the slaves to pay for the privilege of being enthralled to a master who hardly has their best interests at heart is just plain stupid.

I choose not to be part of this.

I choose an operating system that does not require daily reboots just to keep running properly.

I choose not to spend hours of my time trying to navigate through installation routines that have been made Byzantine in their complexity—in order to protect Microsoft's software license.

I choose not to use an operating system and software applications that were designed with the assumption that I not only don't know what I am doing, but also that I am too stupid to learn.

I choose not to be required to call Microsoft and inform them of every significant change I make to my hardware.

I choose not to be an unwitting "beta test site" for products that have not been properly quality controlled because it was deemed more important to rush the product out the door in order to make a few extra sales.

I choose Linux.

I choose FREEDOM.

With Linux, when there is a problem, I find Aaron Freedcyclopes@mediaone.net
netadmin-voicesignal.comafreed@voicesignal.com

"The truth is out there... But I have no idea who left it there, nor why."

MTC-00008731

From: ereomnscom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:37pm
Subject: Dear Sir,

Dear Sir,

It is very important that the case is settled once and for all. I don't think Microsoft did anything wrong. This Country was build on free enterprize and the freedom to inovate products and to have a patent on the products they they invent. No one can just come along and try to get in on the product to make money..

That is wrong.

Liz Reo

506 S. Owen

Mt. Prospect, Illinois 60056

ereomnscom@email.msn.com

847 398 6151

MTC-00008732

From: dgsfox@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The is a bought prosecution...And a shame to our country.

MTC-00008733

From: Flipboggs@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair. That company is a national treasure. There is no question that without the technology that they delivered to us, I and many others would not be as computer capable as we are now.

Phil Boggs

MTC-00008734

From: Roger Reece
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to express my support of the November 2, 2001 settlement between the US Department of Justice and Microsoft. The last thing the country needs is our benevolent government spending additional time and resources pursuing Microsoft that ultimately benefits competitors who are using the legal system in stead of superior products to defeat Microsoft in the market place. There are more important issues for the government to address. Our economy is on a down slope, unemployment is on the rise, public health and related legacy environmental issues need to be acted on, and money laundering is requiting greater amounts of manpower with its increasing threat as food for ciminal endeavors.

The US should stay focused on the events of the recent past and wake up to the fact that petty legal means to chip away at Microsoft's hard-won success benefits none but a few. Common knowledge is that international criminals have us in their crosshairs; what rights have Microsoft so violated to deserve such scrutiny? Microsoft, if anything, is at the forefront helping individuals and the country realize our potential through leading

edge technology, philanthropy and enterprise also benefiting Microsoft's employees, vendors and end-users that span the country and the globe.

Under the terms of the settlement, Microsoft has accepted to undergo major changes in the way they conduct business. It includes the following: Granting new rights to computer manufactures to configure their systems to access various Windows features as they see fit.

Microsoft must design future versions of Windows to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software.

The DOJ will create an ongoing technical oversight committee. It will have access to various Microsoft trade secrets and intellectual property—a painful right to ownership for any company to give up.

Finally, the settlement negates the rights of no one as competitors can still sue Microsoft if they feel Microsoft isn't complying with these terms. Please settle these legal actions under the current agreed terms and redirect your energies to the slim that is out to distroy America.

MTC-00008735

From: John Peter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Friends:

I am writing to support the Microsoft settlement. I am a 4th grade teacher and a building computer contact in our district. Our school, along with others would welcome any and all help for our technology program. Because of budget cuts, our entire computer budget relies solely on our state TEACH grant which amounts to about \$40,000. The inservice portion of our budget is gone, and almost no training takes place. Hardware and software budgets are about one fourth of 3 years ago. Please settle this agreement and help us and other schools.

Thank you for your consideration.

Have a GREAT DAY!

John Peter

Spooner Elementary School

1821 Scribner

Spooner, WI 54801

(715) 635-2174 ext. 1227

(715) 635-7984 FAX

Every Child Deserves a GREAT School!

CC:BarthL@WEAC.org@inetgw

MTC-00008736

From: tnjb123
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough! Let's get on with the Microsoft settlement. In the interest of the economy and all parties concerned, pandering to crybaby competitors and special interest groups needs to stop. It is in all citizen's interest to stop the litigation.

Respectfully,

Thomas J. Barbercheck

321 Mary Drive

New Albany, IN 47150

MTC-00008737

From: Lawto@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 4:03pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think you all would be well advised to drop this case forthwith.

Larry Townsend

MTC-00008738

From: PontoR@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:10pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

We understand that the District Court is accepting public comment regarding the Microsoft Settlement. It is in this regard that we submit the following. We strongly believe that the settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. We further believe that this entire action over nearly four years, has been motivated and sustained not by consumer interest or demand, but has been due to the aggressive efforts of a few special interests, primarily Microsoft's competitors. The spinoff effect of this activity has negatively impacted the American economy and has not been of benefit to consumers.

We urge that the District Court accepts this settlement. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation on this matter, that may benefit only a few competitors, while further damaging consumers.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Roger W. Ponto

8611 NE 26th Place

Bellevue WA 98004

Phone: 452.453.1979

Fax: 425.453.2595

E-mail: pontor@aol.com

MTC-00008739

From: Tony Domit

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:16pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer and engineer who has worked in the computer industry for over 35 years, I support and encourage Microsoft to continue innovating in the world of high tech. As a consumer, I am delighted with the price, performance, and ease of use they provide with their software. This is particularly the case when comparing their current offerings to those available ten years ago and earlier.

My understanding is that DOJ's antitrust responsibilities are to protect the consumer. I, and nearly every user of Microsoft products I have ever spoken with are delighted with their products. I don't believe it is DOJ's responsibilities to level the competitive playing field nor do I buy the allegations that Microsoft's practices have stifled competition at the expense of the consumer.

I believe the DOJ's current proposed remedies are more than adequate to punish Microsoft for their intense competitive practices and would like to see an end put to all the ?lawyering? particularly by many of the state attorney generals.

Sincerely,

Tony Domit

MTC-00008740

From: Mohammad Nawaz

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:17pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DOJ settlement with Microsoft is in the right direction. I do agree with the settlement and hope to get this thing over soon.

Regards,

Mohammad Nawaz

779 Wood Ave

Edison, NJ—08820

MTC-00008741

From: Mike Thibodeau

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:23pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Our economy is always thriving in proportion to how Free it is. Please keep your Hands Off!! Microsoft has improved the standard of living for everyone in the US, more than anyone ever cares to acknowledge. But more important is the principle—this is supposed to be a Free Market!

Thanks,

Mike Thibodeau

Derry NH 03038

603-234-7411

Mike Thibodeau

mthibodeau@mediaone.net

<http://people.ne.mediaone.net/mthibodeau>

MTC-00008742

From: Perry

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:31pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attn: Dept. of Justice

The Tunney settlement of the Microsoft debacle is fair and equitable. It doesn't destroy any one or any business. It evens the playing field as far as laws are concerned. Let the detractors create their own platform. Lets get on with the economy and business. By the way, if you want to stifle someones business do it to the Chinese. Fair Trade Status for them is a joke.

Perry Arnold

Chandler, AZ

MTC-00008743

From: Dwdiet@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:39pm

Subject: Settle with Microsoft

Close out this case in favor of Microsoft 100%. Let the market place prevail. Let free enterprise ring.

MTC-00008745

From: Jane D. Alley

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 4:55pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case as soon as possible without further litigation.

MTC-00008746

From: Ken Landon

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 5:02pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a consumer of Microsoft's and other companies' software products, I would like to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement.

I was saddened and dismayed that the Department of Justice chose to prosecute Microsoft in the first place. I find Microsoft's

products to be extremely valuable in both my career and my home use. The company has earned its dominant position in the market. It is every American's right—including the people who own and operate Microsoft—to be left free to "sink or swim" in the marketplace. And it is my right as a citizen of the United States to be allowed to patronize Microsoft without the interference of court-imposed antitrust restrictions on the company.

I respectfully urge the Department of Justice to drop all charges against Microsoft. Microsoft is a great American company that should be left free to operate without any antitrust restrictions.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Landon

200 Clinton Street

Brooklyn, NY 11201

718-694-0226

MTC-00008747

From: VINCENT PENZO

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 5:04pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

My only comment on the settlement is—there shouldn't be any. In fact, there shouldn't have been any prosecution to begin with. The government was created to protect people's rights, not tell productive businessmen how to run their companies. Bill Gates has every right to produce and sell his products on his own terms—with those who wish to do business with him. Anyone who doesn't like it can try to build a better mouse-trap. Enough whining from lesser-able competitors! As for consumers—remember when PC's cost \$10,000? Leave Bill alone!

The DOJ should have spent those millions of dollars all through '90s on something important—like tracking down the Islamic fundamentalist's money laundering schemes.

Let's put the 'Justice' back in the 'DOJ'!

Sincerely,

Vincent Penzo

Everett, MA

vpenzo@rcn.com

MTC-00008748

From: GARFOOT, ROGER D

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 5:06pm

Subject: Opposition to Microsoft Anti-trust Settlement

I do not believe the DOJ negotiated settlement will protect any group (consumer, manufacturer, software developer) from Microsoft's ability to extend their existing monopolies in desktop operating systems and office productivity suites into new areas such as server operating systems, internet infrastructure and middleware. Microsoft's control of the API's for the monopoly supported operating system (OS) allows them to tie new products (middleware, frameworks, etc.) into the OS in ways that other developers can not match. Once its in the OS, competing products don't stand much chance. It is far from a level competitive playing field when developing software products that compete with Microsoft. A prime example is Microsoft's lack of support for Java in Windows XP.

Microsoft found room to include all their language runtimes, middleware, partner applications, etc. in Windows XP but claims including a Java JVM would make the OS too large. Come on, as delivered by Microsoft Windows XP is already approximately 1.5 GB. The Java JVM is only about 5 MB.

Microsoft also made it much more difficult to add plug-ins into Windows XP and Internet Explorer (IE) which discourages use of competing technologies. Java has always been a threat to requiring everyone to run Windows OS and has been attacked by Microsoft in much the same way as Microsoft attacked Netscape. When Microsoft could not embrace, extend and extinguish Java, they blocked improvements and developed their own Java clone.

Microsoft is an abusive monopolist in the same way in which Standard Oil was an abusive monopolist. The proposal by the nine states not agreeing to this settlement is much more likely to prevent additional abuses.

As an IT professional, I know that the biggest reasons Microsoft is able to maintain their monopoly in corporate desktop OS's is the integration of desktop Windows and Windows servers, Microsoft Outlook integration with Exchange and the lack of availability of Microsoft Office on platforms such as Linux and UNIX. The proposed DOJ settlement will do nothing to rectify this situation and allow increased consumer/corporate choice in desktop OS's

Roger D. Garfoot
Computer Applications Engineer
T&D Computing—Application
Development
Omaha Public Power District
444 S. 16th St. Mall
(Mailstop: 6W/EP3)
Omaha, NE 68102-2247
Phone: (402) 636-3175
Fax: (402) 636-3947
Email: rgarfoot@oppd.com

MTC-00008751

From: william scott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,
It seems to me that the Microsoft settlement is sufficient and adequate. Plus enough tax money has been expended trying to stifle a successful company.

Sincerely,
W.I. Scott

MTC-00008752

From: Bob Coleman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

I applaud your efforts to settle the Microsoft issue. My opinion on the entire matter is that failed competitors used the US justice system to enhance their business position to the detriment of consumers and to the detriment of the information industry.

We needed a cheap, stable, common system which Microsoft provided. The initial suit was unwarranted. The proposed settlement by the DOJ and MS is much more

punitive to MS than what I consider fair, but if it brings this issue to closure, I can see its merits.

MTC-00008753

From: FRANK MACK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This matter has dragged on far too long and I urge the settlement go forward with no further delay.

MTC-00008754

From: arnebBronton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear General Aschcroft:
Freedom comes in many forms, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, however, this great Country used to have freedom to innovate, create and develop processes that benefited all of mankind, the developer as well as the general public worldwide. Unfortunately, the Justice Department, under former President Clinton, attacked Microsoft, a company that revolutionized the industrial world. What used to take days can now be accomplished in minutes. Such innovation of course, also enhanced the company's share value which benefited all of its shareholders, those visible and those not so visible in 401K's, IRA's, pension plans, etc. Unfortunately, when the Government continues its attacks on companies such as Microsoft and the like, the desire to create and invest becomes stifled. Just look to Europe when governments controlled development.

I know we have a now have a President who looks to the future and wants to encourage further development. I am sorry to say that I feel we still have a number of narrow minded people in the Justice Department and with nine State's Attorneys who have the mind set of if I have 6 they are entitled to 3 whether they have invested in risk, market, innovation or not. This type of thinking should have been abolished with the fall of the Berlin Wall as it has no longer a place in a free society.

I respectfully solicit your assistance in ridding our Country of these frivolous lawsuits that is harming companies, and millions of hardworking taxpayers, investors and retirees.

Sincerely,
Anne Bronton
4724 Oak Leaf Drive
Naples, FL 34119
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00008755

From: John R. Simmons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To those having challenges:
How long must this go on? As a private user of Microsoft operating systems since DOS originated, for me 1975?? Microsoft has been most cooperative in solving any challenges that I have had. Just because they have been successful in developing good systems and continuing to do so, why must government keep anyone from doing so?

This computer is my 4th computer with each having Microsoft's operating systems. Currently have Windows XP. It is about time we stop interfering in the lives of corporations and individuals who are intuitive to getting ahead of the crowds.
Deacon John

MTC-00008756

From: William Stone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was pleased with the Nov 2nd settlement agreement in the Microsoft antitrust suit . . . the settlement seems reasonable and well thought-out . . . it requires significant changes in how Microsoft develops and markets its products.

I believe that revisiting the settlement and/or further litigation will have a negative impact on our economy, slowing its recovery and is basically a last ditch effort by Microsoft's competitors to further curtail the company's operations.....with the troubled condition of our economy and budgets, it does not make sense to spend more time and money on a settled lawsuit.

William Stone
82 River Dr.
Appleton, WI 54915

MTC-00008757

From: Pat Tormey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm a software developer who's small business depends heavily on Microsoft products.

I would like the DOJ to settle this matter as quickly as possible.

In a capitalist economy the people "vote" with their wallets and the people have already voted in favor of Microsoft. We Like them! They are good for business. Small businesses depend on the affordable tools provided by Microsoft. If we didn't, then we would buy our tools from the other guy.

The DOJ is not protecting the consumer they are only shielding other large businesses from the free market.

Thanks to the DOJ's efforts to "help", we now have serious instability in the economy. The DOJ's efforts have severely damaged millions of retirement plans and pushed thousands of small businesses out of existence. AND STILL Sun Micro Systems reports "Net loss for the first quarter was \$158 million" and Netscape can't even GIVE AWAY its Internet browser. Let's face it, these guys cannot compete even with the DOJ's thumb on the scales of justice.

DOJ, please settle this action as soon as you can. Your efforts to "help" the consumer are killing us off.

Pat Tormey PE
www.FourSquare.com

MTC-00008758

From: Ron Rouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

No more litigation, enough is enough.

MTC-00008759

From: joseph a santillo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to applaud the settlement which was reached. As a consumer, I believe that the settlement will provide benefits to me. Further, I think that the economy in general will benefit.

Sincerely,
Joe Santillo,
Gouldsboro, PA.

MTC-00008760

From: Judy Ponto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:57pm
Subject: freedom

Our freedom in the USA does guarantee our right to free speech and to enterprise. This should also include innovation and mfst has strived for innovation through their products.

Judy Ponto
jodbob@nwinfo.net

MTC-00008761

From: Judy Ponto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Americans have always had a freedom of speech. Msft has used innovation to the nth degree for their customers. Please listen to our plea for continued innovation without government control.

Judy Ponto
jodbob@nwinfo.net

MTC-00008762

From: tjok@pocketmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 5:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a private citizen and a small investor, I believe that Microsoft has already paid a high price for alledged wrong doing. I believe that Microsoft is only being victimized by its success in the marketplace.

Any further action against Microsoft is totally unfair.

MTC-00008763

From: Emfman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

please leave microsoft alone!!!! they produce a product that millions use at a bargian price. this attact has hurt the economy and dirupted thier pursiut of future products.

guy e estes
stockholder
thank you.

MTC-00008764

From: jwhsm@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:06pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe that the settlement is fair and good for the U.S.A. Lets get on with the other important issues in our country.

j.w. moore

6967 gates rd
gates mills, ohio 44040

MTC-00008765

From: USER9679@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I am against any prosecution against Microsoft. The PC as it is today is the result of this company. All the inovations have been made by them and I for one am very glad to be a part of this company. Think again

MTC-00008766

From: Pat (038) Jim Ferguson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this settlement once and for all. The government will only be acting in the people's interest if this problem is stopped. Can't lawyers find something better to do with their time?

Pat Ferguson

MTC-00008767

From: Hugh Roberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To all Anti-Trust, Anti-Microsoft supporters:

What you are doing to Microsoft is worse than what bin Laden did to the Twin Towers. Your target is obviously the same as his: US Capitalism. Drop all further action against Microsoft and go back into your AntiTrust caves. Rejoice in the totally evil and irrational damage you've already inflicted on the US economy and Microsoft. You and the Taliban can celebrate together.

Hugh Roberts
3636 New Karleen Road
Hephzibah, GA 30815

MTC-00008768

From: Gary P. Beck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please back off this company. They are operating in a free market society.

Thank you.
Gary Beck

MTC-00008769

From: Fred Oberkamp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement??

To Whom it May Concern:
After review of the alleged "Microsoft Settlement", I am simply amazed. I have been in management and management consulting in the Information Technologies industry for over 25 years and this settlement is about as close to a whitewash as anything I have ever seen.

Microsoft has been "licking its chops" for the education market for years and you are willing to give it to them with this settlement. Schools are the training ground for young minds. What our children learn in school will be carried out into the business world with them. You are giving Microsoft

the absolute and undisputed authority to monopolize this market with their "free" give away. I cannot wait to see Microsoft's advertising campaign in about a year when they can legitimately claim that they have been "selected" by 100% of the schools in the country as their Operating System of choice, thanks to your settlement. This does not even consider that most of the refurbished equipment that Microsoft has proposed to give to the schools will probably not be compatible with its newer Operating Systems. Schools being as tight with budgets as they are known to be will probably spend a fortune upgrading the equipment rather than just get rid of it like they should.

You are also opening up all of our schools to hackers with this settlement. This is due to the well-documented (and possibly as of yet unfound) security "holes" in the current Microsoft Operating Systems. Just what this country needs is to have our school systems spending millions of dollars to fight electronic invasions. Has anyone considered how devastating that could be to this country?

Furthermore, Microsoft continues to gobble up small software companies that would have been their competition. At this time, that can only be blamed on the greed of the owners of those companies and Microsoft's total disregard for any previous agreement they may have had to cease their predatory practices with the Department of Justice.

It is my personal opinion and that of many others I have spoken with, that we, the American taxpayers and citizens, have been sold down the river with this proposed settlement. If this process is allowed to continue, this settlement will only serve to make it appear to the normal citizen that enough money can buy its own justice. That may seem like a rather harsh statement, but companies like AT&T have gone through far more serious penalties than this proposed settlement even comes close to and they have survived quite well.

Thank you for your time,
F.J. Oberkamp

MTC-00008770

From:
john.rosengarten@pacebus.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Public

Comment

May it please the court:

I am a systems professional and actually install, configure, maintain and support the products made by Microsoft and other software publishers. I work for a transit agency and am not a supporter of either side in this case (Microsoft or its rivals: Sun-AOL/Netscape-Oracle-Linux-Apple.) My mission is to keep real users working productively, to manage change and maximize my agency's investments in technology so as to give the taxpayers the best results for every dollar spent on computers and software. I have worked in help desk, LAN security and now Internet Administration for my agency. I have no personal interest in this case and am not affiliated with either camp (MS vs ABM, where ABM=Anyone But Microsoft.)

In short, I understand the delicate balance between software design and real-world

usability. While those in the legal profession are increasingly knowledgeable about computer systems, there are some details that must seem capricious and arbitrary. Also, some of the arguments between Microsoft and those in the computer industry who oppose Microsoft have distorted some of the real facts about:

1. the relationship between the operating system and bundled applications
2. availability of API entry points and usage information in the operating system that can be used by programs
3. the benefit of providing internal source code from Microsoft's products
4. the use of monopoly power by Microsoft to stifle its competitors Let me offer some observations about these four issues (I will keep it short, but will gladly provide additional information if asked by the court.)

1. It benefits the consumer when a free application is included. This should be encouraged and Microsoft should not be seen as predatory by bundling Internet Explorer, Messenger, Media Player, Movie Maker or any other software. However, Microsoft should make it easier for users to NOT use their software, or to change their minds. Creating software that is deliberately unstable to make a competitor look bad by making their applications fail is predatory and should be discouraged. These two aspects are connected: if they want to give you a free web browser, fine, but they should allow you to uninstall it, use another product and never sabotage a user's work to gain competitive advantage.

2. An Operating System must have clearly defined entry and exit points for all supported services: connectivity, fax, applications, chat, sound, video, interprocess communication and transparent error messages all rely on system calls and other API resources. To withhold any known API information is anti-competitive. If the systems division writes a "special" interface to optimize an application division program, that is anti-competitive. Any API information available to Microsoft's programmers should be documented publicly (and well!) to benefit the public.

3. Computers that crash can cause loss and even harm. Allowing programming errors (bugs) to remain, or withholding information about the underlying operating system idiosyncrasies from the general public should be penalized. Computers are increasingly used to maintain and monitor critical processes. Someday, even life support systems might rely on Windows internals for stability and correct processing. Opening the source code to all major components would allow peer review and improvement of the whole system.

4. Microsoft's business practices are consistent with American industry, however because of the sheer power that one sole vendor possesses in this market, Microsoft's dictating terms to manufacturers (no discount means a manufacturer suffers a disadvantage that usually puts them out of business) is very bad for consumers. All licenses should be full licenses, no product should be abandoned so Microsoft can sell a newer version. There should be Home and Professional versions, and all Home licenses

should be very cheaply (<\$20) upgradeable to the current version. Professional versions should be about \$50 to upgrade to the current version. Microsoft should not place limitations, stipulations or other coercive mechanisms to force users to buy a new version. If Microsoft is making a free version of an application available to users of the latest OS version, there should also be a comparable program for older systems at the same cost.

Proposed Remedy: The present monopoly can only be remedied by having two companies like Microsoft. One for home, one for business. Microsoft Home: Windows XP Home, MSN, MSNBC, Microsoft games, The Zone, Works, Money, Educational and Entertainment software. Also all hardware mice, game devices, keyboard, etc. Microsoft Business Windows XP Pro, XP Server, Advanced Server, IIS, SQL, Languages, Office Applications (Word, Excel, Powerpoint, Access, Publisher), embedded applications, handheld PCs.

Both companies should offer a one-time upgrade to any user surrendering a Windows license, users must provide name and address and perform some product activation to connect the upgrade to the user. The license should be transferable to new systems owned by the same user. The upgrades should cover the costs to Microsoft but not become a profit center. This remedies the millions of Americans who paid for a working operating system and are still waiting. Both companies would have to specify and coordinate the future of Windows API and services, this information would be public to encourage competitors to Windows. If ever Windows fell to less than 50 percent of market share of new computer sales, this provision would be removed for every subsequent year that Windows constituted less than 50 percent of the market for operating systems.

Both companies would be enjoined from and penalized for anti-competitive behavior, including limiting user rights to compare and publicize any Microsoft product, manipulating manufacturers' rights to install or not install any software, and to sell systems with no operating system at all if they choose. Also, Microsoft must refrain from blatantly lying about competitors as they recently did to Novell. "Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt" are bad for the consumer, bad for the marketplace and ultimately bad for America.

All Operating System API's, including handling of multimedia, files, data and/or network connections must be publicly documented. Sufficient penalty should exist to insure conformance. No Microsoft product should be designed to fail if not used with Microsoft products or products from Microsoft's business partners, present or future. In other words, all programs should have an equal chance of operating properly, and deliberate interference with programs or connections not provided by Microsoft or its partners should constitute a punishable offense.

In summary, let me say that while the law may seem to make this a case between Microsoft and the Department of Justice, it must be remembered that the whole purpose

of antimonopoly law is to protect the consumer and the American marketplace. Any solution that leaves Microsoft richer for its use of manipulative licensing, unscrupulous practices, outright rigging of product comparisons or other blatant falsehoods to prevent marketplace competition is unacceptable. Microsoft charged home users to buy Windows 3.0, then again for 3.1, then again for 95 and 98 and 98 SE, then again for ME. I paid for "Windows" six times (eight if you consider that I also bought Windows 386 and Windows for Workgroups.) I paid each time like I was buying a perfected product but never got an OS that did not crash. This is like buying a TV that does not work, waiting for a fix and being told you have to pay for the SAME TV all over again . . . six, seven, eight times!

Business users have also been taken to the cleaners by Microsoft's marketing muscles. I am sure others have noted that Microsoft's EULA promises nothing from Microsoft other than media that is readable, yet requires you to give up all kinds of unrelated rights (like the stipulation that you can not use Windows to compile a list of Windows bugs, mistakes, criticisms of the product or performance comparisons!)

Thank you for this opportunity to offer my opinion,

John Rosengarten
Internet Administrator
MIS Internet Services
Pace Suburban Bus Service
desk 847 228-2348
fax 847 228-3596
john.rosengarten@pacebus.com

MTC-00008771

From: Brian Ward
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I believe it's time to end the litigation in this matter. A settlement is on the table. For the sake of the economy put this matter to rest.

Brian Ward

MTC-00008772

From: Roberto A.Perez—CARGAMERICAS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:35pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I THINK THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SHOULD LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE AND LET THEM GROW EVEN FURTHER SO THAT NOT ONLY USA BUT THE WHOLE WORLD CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THEIR PROGRESS. I CAN NOT UNDERSTAND THAT BEING GOOD AND SUCCESSFUL SHOULD BE PENALIZED BUT INSTEAD REWARDED SINCE WITHOUT THE MICROSOFT WINDOWS SYSTEM WE ALL WOULD BE YEARS BEHIND IN TECHNOLOGY.

I DO NOT RECEIVE ANY MONEY FROM MICROSOFT BUT I AM A BUSINESSMAN AND I HATE TO SEE MY POSSIBILITIES CUT BECAUSE I HAVE BEEN WORKING HARD AND THEREFORE MY SUCCESS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THE GOVERNMENT DECISIONS. OF COURSE

THERE ARE OTHER COMPANIES THAT WANT MICROSOFT PENALIZED SIMPLY BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT HAD THE TECHNOLOGY OR THE KNOW HOW TO DO WHAT MICROSOFT DID. MY ANSWER TO THAT IS: TOUGH LUCK FOR THEM AND THEY SHOULD STRIVE TO BE EVEN BETTER THAN MICROSOFT RATHER THAN LOOKING FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO DO THEIR JOB IN CUTTING THEIR SUCCESS.

VERY TRULY YOURS,
ROBERTO A. PEREZ
10106 S.W. 93RD. PLACE
MIAMI, FLA. 33176

MTC-00008773

From: John Travitzky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:35pm
Subject: <no subject>

From: John James Travitzky
59727 Drexel Road
Yucca Valley, CA 92284
To: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney,
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division,
Department of Justice,
601 D Street NW,
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Ms. Hesse;

I am writing this letter in protest of the proposed Microsoft vs. U.S. settlement. I believe that allowing Microsoft to "donate" software/hardware at retail cost is giving them an unfair advantage in the Educational fields. The outcome would most likely be that Microsoft writes off full retail values on any "donations", therefore inflating value of the collection of debt from them. This would be a disservice to both the public, and the government.

The point of "free technical support" is the same as above in reasoning. The "cost" of Microsoft technical support is almost exclusively a maintenance issue, rather than a support issue. What I mean is, When using Windows machines, you almost always have to rely on others to keep your machine running. I have personally done many "repairs" that were nothing more than transferring a couple of letters mistyped in commands, or, in other cases, downloading a driver from an internet source. Other computers historically have needed far less maintenance, tech support, or repairs. The hourly wage charged by Microsoft for "tech support" or repairs could be inflated, therefore giving them another "out" in having to pay the full penalty.

I am extremely concerned with the proposal's "patriotic" overtones... that they (Microsoft) have utilized in the settlement. Microsoft is one of the worlds largest companies, and they are now "offering" to supply our poorest and most undereducated schools with their computers, software, and tech support. While this, in light of our immense needs in the educational fields is a great thing, it is not really an offer, but simply a way to "write off" expenditures that are grossly inflated, pay off the penalty of this crime, and make the company look more humanitarian than they really are. They have been building libraries, offering "free software", and hardware within the educational community since their inception,

and still, they are not a leader in this highly competitive market. This brings on my next point.

By allowing Microsoft to "donate" to the educational community in lieu of payment for their crime, you are in essence, forgiving their debt, and allowing them to further their grasp in a field that has been held by their long time business competitor, Apple Computer, Inc. As a 17 year user of both Window based and MacOS based computers, I find it hard to believe this proposed settlement is plausible or legal.

It negates the penalty of the convicted, allows them a further reach into the pockets of their competitor, and, does so at the consumers expense.

By accepting the Microsoft proposal, you would take revenues from one of the most innovative companies in the computer industry. Apple Computers, Inc. They are known and respected in both the educational and business fields as a forerunner... one to look at, and emulate. Windows itself is an emulation, or, to be more precise, a copy of the Mac Graphic user interface. The reason Apple is known as forerunners is because they "look beyond the box". Apple is known for going to great expense for their research and development. Many competitors in the Windows community openly (and proudly) copy the applications, interface design, or characteristics unique to Apple or Mac Computers. . Apple will not be able to continue its innovative and respected history without sales, and, as you know, Apple sells large amounts of computers in the educational market. they are number one in sales for 16 of 17 years in this field. By allowing Microsoft a 1 billion dollar foothold into this field, you are announcing the downfall of a great computer company.

Thank you for allowing me to share my personal feelings on this matter. Please do NOT allow Microsoft to flood our educational market with outdated systems. Do not allow them to "pay" the public back by granting overcharged tech support. Do not allow them to take highly needed sales from their competitors in lieu of debt repayment. Do not grant them leadership in a field that has never been theirs in computing history, at the public's expense. Lastly, and most importantly, do not insult Justice by saying that granting Microsoft these unfair advantages, that they will have paid for their crime.

Respectfully,
John James Travitzky

MTC-00008774

From: HOWMAR
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am concerned about the Tunney Act which is before the District Court for settlement. It appears to me that the settlement agreed to by Microsoft is adequate. It is beyond me why lawyers and weak competitors have so much influence as to affect how a great company, that has done so much to advance the computer and internet, operates. If you will notice the current economic situation and the attack on Microsoft corresponds. The settlement

should be completed and this should be put behind us so the economy will move forward.

I live in one of the states that has not signed on to the settlement and I can tell you that this is only because of the idiot that serves as our Attorney General and does not reflect the opinion of the people of West Virginia.

Thanks for your consideration
Howard Mays
103 Riverview Lane
Beckley, WV 25801
howmar@inetone.net

MTC-00008775

From: David J. Loomis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:47pm
Subject: USAGLoomis—David—1023—0102
46 Cranberry Road
North Attleboro, Massachusetts 02760
January 4, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to let you know that I was pleased with the actions of your department in reaching a settlement agreement that the states can accept. The settlement is fair and reasonable. Through the agreement, Microsoft will be a more responsible industry leader and can maintain its competitive ability.

I am an avid user of Microsoft products and services, and feel that its innovation has allowed our country to take a lead in the world technology market. I agree that the competition should be protected, but this does not change the fact that Microsoft has achieved success because of the dependability and usefulness of its products. Microsoft will share critical information about the internal workings of Windows; that is enough protection of the competition.

The agreement is mutually beneficial for Microsoft and the competition. As far as I am concerned, I feel it was an overall success. Thank you for your efforts, and taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,
David Loomis

MTC-00008776

From: b—c—dahlberg@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

In my opinion, the entire Microsoft issue is about money and another way for the law profession to "feather their nest". It has nothing to do with antitrust, monopolies or protecting the "John Q Public". Microsoft does NOT have monopoly on anything. There are several other operating system options available for which the end user can use the browser he or she prefers. As a matter of fact, he or she can use the browser of choice with Windows!

I use Microsoft products on a regular basis. It is my choice to use these products because, as a developer, my customer base also uses Microsoft products and in order for my

products to function on my customers equipment, I must produce software that will work on their equipment. If the customer base used Unix, Apple, or O/S 2, I would probably go that route.

Every dollar Microsoft spends to protect itself from frivolous litigation means that I am going to have to spend more for products I use. As with taxes, corporations do not pay for the cost of litigation—their customers do! The only winners going this route are those folks with “Esquire” after their names.

Please end this as soon as possible. “Trickle Down Economics” goes both ways, you know!

Sincerely,
Robert L. Dahlberg
Carol E. Dahlberg
145 W Midway Blvd
Broomfield, CO 80020

MTC-00008777

From: BOBTULL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs & Ladies:

I feel that Microsoft has been unduly charged in this matter. It is my best interest and the USA's that they be allowed to do business as they have in the past. I am Window's user and think that my economic well being is at stake if you punish them to aid others. They must all compete for us consumers, just like all businesses do, let them do just that. Bob Tull

Robert E. Tull
214 Hollow Road
LINCOLNTON, NC 28092, USA
email: bobtull@aol.com

MTC-00008778

From: Wynne Garlow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:59pm
Subject: ... and justice for all

Since when is justice served by punishing the person/company who can do it better? This “lowering of the bar” makes as much sense as flying in an airplane let out to the lowest bidder. If all those self-serving competitors of Microsoft want more business let them invent it, develop it, prove it, manufacture it, and provide it to the market. Right now, the multitude is so pleased with Microsoft's efforts that they wait in line to buy and mark their calendars with proposed release dates for the latest “good stuff” from Microsoft.

Get with the program!!!
—Wynne Garlow
—dimsum2000@earthlink.net

MTC-00008779

From: Nellanana@ao1.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is marked for destruction. over the last 225 years our government has progressively become more of a destroyer than a protector of rights.

Whether the issue involves a whole industry, a single company, or a single individual, the fundamental principle is the same. Either people possess the right to their own life (which includes the right to trade

freely with other men) or, they do not. Increasingly, the government's answer has been that they do not.

The Justice Department's apologists claim that the assault on Microsoft (and on hundreds of other companies now facing antitrust suits) is necessary to encourage innovation. But how can achievement in any field be fostered by attacking and penalizing the achievers? Would anyone accept the principles behind the antitrust laws as the best rule for running one's own company? The principle that one should fire or demote the most successful workers in order to make room for the undistinguished ones?

Would anyone want this to be the standard used by his employer when it comes to judging his own work?

Most people would respond to such a plan with outrage. They would recognize it as a destructive injustice, as an assault on ability and achievement. Because Microsoft has been more successful than its competitors, prosecutors are seeking to impose special restrictions on the production and marketing of its products. Microsoft's competitors won't face these restrictions.

Microsoft must be FORCED (in the words of competitor Jim Barksdale) to “play by a different set of rules.” It is likely that these restrictions will be administered by a federal judge, who will have the authority to block Bill Gates's future business decisions if he decrees that they are “anti-competitive.” Finally, many of Microsoft's competitors have argued that, because Microsoft's Windows operating system is used by so many people, it is an “essential” product and must be handed over to a separate, government-regulated company that will administer it for the “public good.” In other words, because Microsoft has been too successful, it must be hobbled, regulated, and... expropriated.

Is Microsoft a “monopoly” Not in the proper, derogatory, traditional sense of the term.

Unlike the old AT&T Bell monopoly, or today's U.S Post Office monopoly, Microsoft did not gain its market share by having the government outlaw its competitors: Microsoft earned its position in the free-market. By being so efficient, Microsoft has earned a dominant spot in the market, but this does not mean the company has “monopoly power.” Did Microsoft “twist the arms” of its competitors? This sloppy metaphor is a vicious lie. Only the government has the legal power to twist (and even break) arms. The only “twisting” Microsoft engaged in was the legitimate practice of setting the terms of sale for its property. Today the world's wealthiest man, Bill Gates was once an unknown college drop-out with big talent, a big ego, and big ideas, but a fairly small bankroll: the Geek David facing the Goliath IBM.

But in time, the capitol markets recognized the talent and potential in Gates (in his ideas, his products, and his company). The capital markets are a crucial means by which new entrants with good ideas and products grow bigger. Creators like Gates are the fountainheads of human achievement, but they can not and do not create in a vacuum. Workers, suppliers and customers may not

match their talents, but they're important to their commercial success.

Has it been forgotten that Microsoft created the products that made the market in question possible? Has it been forgotten that Microsoft owns the goods it produces? The right to private property means the right to hold it, to alter it, to exchange it, that is, to control it. Is a firm guilty of controlling its own property? It is under antitrust. To prosecute a firm for the right to its own property is to obliterate the right to property as such. If laggards like (disgruntled rival) Netscape truly had a superior, commercially viable array of products, capital would have rushed to its door. That capital did not is no fault of Microsoft and no sign of coercion.

Capitalist competition, despite all the derisive descriptions given it by critics (such as “vicious/cut-throat”), is in fact voluntary and peaceful.

Indeed, it entails a significant degree of cooperation and coordination (among producers, suppliers -and- customers). This does not mean self-sacrifice; capitalist competition is certainly vigorous. It is no tea party; nor should it be. It's a competition of wits and abilities, not a battle of fists or weapons.

By what stretch of the imagination does the Department of Justice conflate “arm-twisting” with Microsoft's refusal to license its products to vendors who do not accept its terms? This is not coercion because:

If a vendor refuses Microsoft's offer and walks away (as he is free to do), the vendor will be no worse off than if he did not deal with Microsoft in the first place. Did Microsoft “hurt” competitors like Netscape by giving away a free Internet browser with its Windows operating system (when Netscape wanted to charge you \$30)? No more so, then when McDonald's bundles its meat patties with a McDonald's bun does it hurt all the bread makers. Such actions may frustrate their competitors' wishes, but their rights are left untouched.

Did Microsoft violate the rules of competition? It is the application of the political principle of individual Rights-to-the-Economic-Realm of production (and trade) that gives rise to the rules of free-competition. To determine whether Microsoft violated the rules of competition; therefore, one has to determine whether Microsoft violated anyone's rights. Clearly, Microsoft did not violate the rights (life, liberty, and property) of anyone.

By allowing judges to sidestep the issue of rights in favor of considerations, such as the “public interest”, the antitrust laws effectively grant government the power to violate Microsoft's rights, i.e. the power to take over and control Microsoft's property and use it against Microsoft's interests.

Thanks to the antitrust laws once a judge has arbitrarily classified a business as a “monopoly”, the government is given free rein to:

—PLUNDER of vast sums of money from Microsoft's bank account (through triple fines for so-called “damages”);

—REPLACE Bill Gates with a government “overseer” who will make the important strategic decisions at Microsoft;

—FORCE Microsoft to advertise and distribute its competitor's products;

—COMPEL Microsoft to give up its “trade secrets” and intellectual property to those who condemn it.

From start to finish, the entire antitrust process is no more than a process of sacrificing and cannibalizing successful American businesses (such as Microsoft, ALCOA, US Steel, Standard Oil) on the guillotine of egalitarianism to appease envious competitors. Or, to quote Alan Greenspan, who (upon a complete examination of the theory and history of the antitrust laws) wrote: “the effective purpose, the hidden intent, -and- the actual practice of the antitrust laws in the United States have led to the condemnation of the productive and efficient members of our society BECAUSE they are productive and efficient.”

KEY ISSUE

Key issue in Microsoft antitrust case is not “consumer welfare” or “innovation” but individual rights. The growing economy has been the result of the simple fact that until now, the government has stayed out of the way of high tech. The creators recognize that wealth is created, not seized.

Did Microsoft halt “innovation”? (the process of discovering a better way to do things)? No private business can stop other companies from innovating except by out-innovating them. Harm to consumers has nothing to do with the purpose of antitrust. One of the government’s main complaints was that Microsoft was providing free copies of its Internet browser. (Only someone working for the government could conclude that free products are bad for consumers). Antitrust case law is replete with examples of companies being punished (not for any alleged harm) but simply for having the acumen to remain successful in their industries. The antitrust laws are intended only to punish “power”. But since economic power is earned on the free market, this means that the purpose of antitrust is to punish successful business practices. Given this legal context, Microsoft was doomed before it even set foot in the courtroom. Applying the underlying anti-success principle of antitrust, the ruling against Microsoft was... without finding ANY harm at all!

The reason that Microsoft is an extremely successful company? Gates is a unique combination of technological genius and businessman, reminiscent of earlier American giants like Thomas Edison. Thus, it was irrelevant how hard Microsoft’s attorneys worked, or how much intellectual vigor they brought to their legal briefs and courtroom arguments.

These things were irrelevant because NO army of lawyers could hide a single, essential fact (the only fact necessary for applying the antitrust laws): Microsoft succeeds at what it does. The punishment doled out for success is paralysis. Judge Jackson’s absurd conclusion? Microsoft must not be permitted to capitalize upon its well-earned success. Because it has created values, it must now... relinquish them. The Microsoft case is (at its heart) an attempt to impose socialist central planning on the computer industry. And worse, to do so in an anarchic, ad-hoc manner, one federal court ruling at a time. Contrary to the statist theories of the

demand-side Keynesian economists (who are quoted daily by the media), it is corporate investment that strengthens America (through the creation of jobs and wealth), NOT spending by the government.

Production drives consumption, not vice versa.

Yet corporate America is derided as “big business” or “the wealthiest 1%”, (make that: the most productive 1%). And some members of Congress would rather fund their “entitlements” on the backs of the most productive group in our nation. It is immoral to penalize corporations -and- the wealthy (the productive) with higher taxes and then redistribute their property (which they earned and others did not) to those who didn’t create it just because “the wealthy” can afford it” (and, therefore, are less equal under the law. Economic power is the power to create and produce. Political power is the power to coerce and punish. Economic power entails intellectual achievement. Political power entails physical aggrandizement.

Economic power involves voluntary trade to mutual advantage, trade with whomever you choose to deal and with whoever chooses to deal with you. Unlike political power, which entails fear and punishment, economic power means the offering of incentives and rewards. Economic power is the power of a dollar (how many you earn and how many you can spend determines the extent of your “power”). Political power involves involuntary subjugation to the state, which has sole discretion over the use of force.

In a free society, government may ONLY use its power in retaliation against those who initiate force or fraud.

Unless it seeks tyranny, no government may use such power to itself initiate force or fraud against innocent parties. To the extent it does, it acts as a robber or a gang. But far worse: a robber or gang with no higher, legal authority above, controlling it. Economic power is wholly innocent of any hint of the initiation of force (or even of retaliatory force). Productive giants such as Carnegie, Ford and Gates don’t just have less power than politicians or pose less danger than tyrants. They have NO political power at all and present no danger whatsoever.

Political power, at root, is the power of a gun, of the police, the military, the taxman, and the jailer. If you flout the law (whether a just law or an anti-trust law) you must submit. But no one “must” submit to a business proposition.

Not even from... Bill Gates.

Capitalism (the social system based on the principle of individual rights), is not merely the “practical”, but the only moral system in history.

No politico-economic system has ever proved its value so eloquently or has benefitted mankind so greatly. And none has ever been attacked so savagely, viciously, and blindly. The flood of misinformation, misrepresentation, distortion, and outright falsehood is a terrible injustice. If they want to break Microsoft, let THEM come in with the guns and do it themselves; let THEM figure out how to do it.

The Microsoft antitrust suit is a case of politicians destroying one of America’s most

successful companies just to satisfy the demands of its rivals. What an obscene travesty! Microsoft, a leading producer using voluntary cooperation is derided as a coercive thug.

Meanwhile its puny rivals (puny because they couldn’t sell their inferior products) are permitted to wield actual coercive power, with the full backing of the world’s most powerful government, worse, from that government’s “Justice” Department.

N. White

MTC-00008781

From: Bob Lindinger

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 7:07pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Department of Justice

re. United States v. Microsoft Settlement

On November 6, 2001, the United States and Microsoft tentatively agreed to the entry of a revised proposed Final Judgment to resolve the United States’ civil antitrust case against Microsoft. Per my rights under the Tunney Act, I am writing to express my opinion that the Microsoft antitrust case should be settled as quickly as possible, rather than litigated further. I am very pleased with the proposed settlement; it is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

I am a consumer that uses many Microsoft products, including their Windows operating system. I have never felt “harmed” by Microsoft, on the contrary, I believe that their business practice is based on a virtuous, positive feed-back, business cycle based on very low price points leading to very high sales volume. This business model ideally suits the consumer who benefits from low prices.

Microsoft has always designed software for mass consumption. Bill Gates realized early on, that if he could design software suitable for a mass market, he could sell it at very low prices and make profits based on large unit sales. Excess profits could be reinvested in innovation and R&D to improve the software and make it more attractive to consumers and businesses. Hence, the positive feedback cycle.

That is why Windows has been such a huge success. Windows is excellent software priced very reasonably. Each version becomes more user-friendly and powerful, with new features to make it easier to browse the Internet, work with digital photographs, digital music, etc.

I believe there can be no monopoly in software. If Microsoft fails to continually improve Windows, a competitor will eventually emerge that offers a better operating system at a lower price. Already we are seeing the emergence of an alternative operating system offered for “free” by Linux. This is gaining wide acceptance in some business circles and, if Microsoft were to stop improving Windows, it would only be a matter of time before Linux or some other alternative from Sun, IBM, Apple, Sony, Computer Associates, SAP (the German software giant), or many other competitors, would start taking market share from Microsoft.

I do not dispute that Microsoft, right now, has a “monopoly” for desktop personal

computer operating systems. However, Microsoft earned it by constantly innovating and keeping prices low. Other competitors have demonstrated that they can compete with Microsoft. Netscape was not inhibited from developing its browser, that threatened Microsoft's position. Sun Microsystems has developed its Java language and is promoting it aggressively.

I believe the saying that high tech is a contact sport that should only be played in the marketplace, not in the courts.

Microsoft's competitors are the one's pushing for further litigation, not consumers or businesses that use Microsoft products.

The competitors would have us believe that no one can compete with the mighty Microsoft. I guess they don't remember all those prime-time TV commercials a few years ago for OS/2, that dandy little operating system from a wee little start-up called International Business Machines (IBM). But guess what? Nobody bought OS/2, because it was expensive and not as good as Windows.

Lindows.com is preparing to launch early next year an operating system that can run both Linux and Windows applications on a PC, or run as a second operating system on a Windows machine. The point: to offer an alternative to Windows, to eliminate the frustrations that Lindows.com's CEO, Robertson, says accompany installation and use of the Linux operating system, and to let Windows users run Linux programs without having to jettison Windows. If that's not different enough, he'll sell the Lindows operating system for just \$99, primarily in digital format, and with flexible licensing.

Clearly, Microsoft must continuously innovate to fend off competition. Those labeling Microsoft a monopolist just do not understand how quickly a "monopoly" can vanish in the world of high technology. Our country would be served well if the antitrust case against Microsoft is settled as quickly as possible. It will be good for our high tech industry, and be in the best interest of consumers' supposedly the intended beneficiaries of any antitrust litigation.

Finally, on a personal note, I think Scott McNealy is the biggest crybaby the business world has ever seen. I also think Larry Ellison should get a life and stop worrying about his relative net worth compared to that of Bill Gates. Neither of these high tech CEOs have Bill Gate's vision for providing software to empower the masses and they both are trying to use the courts to gain a competitive advantage. In the words of our President, George W. Bush, let's innovate, not litigate.

Sincerely,
Robert J. Lindinger
Schenectady, NY
CC:Halpy,Big Al,Anne,BamBam,Barry,Big Ed,Damian Thoma...

MTC-00008782

From: Cre8ivNov8@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. I agree with Microsoft and it's platform users. If the system works and I bought it by choice over all of the other platforms out there why is this settlement still up in the air. I am entitled to buy the

best I can find and it is in my power to use or not to use all of the functions in this system. Settle this and stop throwing my money at the lawyers.

John R. Cox

MTC-00008783

From: Patricia Duchene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think its time we moved on the settlement identified by the Justice department is more than fair for the Federal Government and the States. I resent a few states holding large companies hostage because of their own interests and at the expense of the remaining States and American people. Its your responsibility to see that a minority group does not gain advantage at the expense of the majority. Make them settle or walk away with what they really deserve nothing.

Have a great day
P Duchene

MTC-00008784

From: Margaret Rosser Durso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
USDOJ:

The proposed settlement with Microsoft is very fair and I am outraged that the 9 states are continuing legal action. This is a wonderful company that has made a major contribution to this country and to all consumers.

Please do all possible to settle with Microsoft as recently proposed. This will be good for the economy, the stock market and for all consumers...

Respectfully,
Margaret Durso

MTC-00008785

From: robert garner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:28pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It's time to settle this matter. Further action is detrimental to the economy and the consumer. An all out effort is needed to get the economy growing again.

Thanks,
R.E. Garner

MTC-00008786

From: Uncle Dimi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:47pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
I reside in San Diego and I primarily use my computer for personal home use. I just wanted to send this e-mail to express my opinion that it is time to let this suit against Microsoft come to an end. If indeed this proceeding was begun on the behalf of consumers like me, then consider this CA consumer satisfied. The settlement may not be perfect, but assuming enforcement authorities remain vigilant, I think it's worth taking the risk that Microsoft will behave.

I recently purchased a new Dell laptop and couldn't help but notice the preinstalled shortcuts on my desktop that directed me to Dell associated programs and services. If Dell

can do this, then why is it wrong for Microsoft to incorporate programs and services in their operating system? I'm an average consumer, but I understand that whenever I enter a store or a desktop environment I will be subjected to promotional displays and crossmarketing efforts. Sometimes I may be seduced by these efforts, other times I will ignore them and search for a more satisfactory product or service. The choice is ultimately mine, and regardless of Microsoft's or other tech companies' efforts to direct my choices, the internet still provides unfettered access to an amazingly large and varied "department store" so to speak.

So, I'll wind it up by saying that if this settlement is sufficient to keep Microsoft feeling like the spotlight is always on them, which I think it is, then let's move on. Frankly, I'm getting tired of hearing about this suit. In the overall scheme of things, I may feel annoyed by some of Microsoft's activities and products, but I definitely do not feel gouged or ripped off by them. When it comes down to it, I most likely would not have adopted the use of a computer years ago if Windows had not made it so easy by unifying or monopolizing, if you will, the software world.

Do I want more choice? Probably. Do I want interoperability? Most definitely yes. Do I think I will suddenly get these things by continued efforts to deliver Microsoft's head on a platter. Not really. So I respectfully request that you make this settlement work and let's move on.

Thank you,
Dimitri C. Demopoulos

MTC-00008787

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,

I have been a computer programmer for most of my adult life, and I have seen many operating systems come and go; but I have never seen an environment so restrictive for innovation and competition as the one currently created by Microsoft. It is true that most of the work that I do is based on Windows systems of one kind or another, but it is equally true that most of my clients would benefit greatly if other avenues were available to them on a non-restrictive basis. Please notice that I do not say on a non-competitive basis. Microsoft has managed to negotiate contracts with hardware manufacturers and software developers alike which tend to suppress competitive products—and in many cases more able and far less expensive products.

I encourage you, as a part if this settlement, to not allow Microsoft to strongarm developers so that their products are preferentially available only to Windows users. If a developer has good economic reasons to develop only for Windows, that is one thing, but if the same developer refuses or is not allowed to develop for other environments purely because of financial or public relations threats from Microsoft, it is quite another thing, indeed.

Please pay attention to the evidence presented by the prosecutors in this trial and

equitable and effective controls on the most clear monopoly of our time.

Larry S. Cadle

MTC-00008788

From: Santos, Charles
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/4/02 7:50 pm
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>> "><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,
Charles Santos

MTC-00008789

From: ANGLMARIAH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 7:53 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Get this class action out of the courts. Clinton is gone, why carry on with this. Now we have to contend with all these terrorists being tried in Federal Courts. Make way for them, Leave Bill Gates alone. Get on with your life

MTC-00008790

From: craiggua
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:02 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I read through the Revised Proposed Final Judgement and Competitive Impact Statement.

In the the Revised Proposed Final Judgement, Section III "Prohibited Conduct" should thoroughly prohibit Microsoft from

engaging in these business practices. Also, the "Compliance and Enforcement Procedures" which includes the Technical Committee, should provide enough insight into Microsoft's compliance to the final judgement.

The Revised Proposed Final Judgement also seems to provide a reasonable balance. Consumers receive a widely used operating system platform (i.e: Windows) that an OEM can freely include any number of Microsoft and non-Microsoft applications. It will also allow Microsoft to continue to provide consumers with an innovative operating system and applications in the future.

I encourage you to accept the Revised Proposed Final Judgement.

Thank you,
Craig Guarraci

MTC-00008791

From: Doc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:13 p m
Subject: It's called...

It is called capitalism. And in it's purest form there is a demand, Microsoft meets it and in return: money, power, etc. I am sorry for the competition being behind the curve to the point of helplessness. So be it!

That is life. And many people experience that in far more painful ways everyday. Now, attempting to somehow mangle Microsoft's position via government "intervention" suggest we live in some Orwellian home of the free, land of the brave. So in this beautiful Republic (that we call Democratic) land of existence I leave the following: It is so very pleasant to see the "perceived" economic elite get porked and pissed (without so much as a...hug) by someone of higher economic status than they! Uncle Sammy, please help poor pitiful pampered me!! Ah, those beautiful sounds of children playing; they only squeal when life, on those rare occasions, doesn't go there way.

Take care (and don't forget to write),
Preston Alan Rouse
Citizen

MTC-00008792

From: Christie Sharpe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:13 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion as a computer user that this settlement is a good and necessary end to this case. Schools will benefit which is never a bad thing. Please consider all the positives of bringing this case to an end.

MTC-00008793

From: BGF57@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:27 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

A just and viable settlement has been reached. Enough with this supreme waste of resources litigating this matter. Expend the gov't time and our money on real violations.

Brian Grimm

MTC-00008794

From: Don Conrard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:34 pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madam or Sir
I would like to add my voice to those urging the court to accept the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Federal government in the anti-trust case. With the U.S. under attack by terrorists and our economy in a downturn, a settlement would help to restore confidence in the technology sector when it is needed most. I am concerned that the continuation of this case and the uncertainty it generates will have a very negative effect on any economic recovery. It is time to end this case, which was largely brought by failed competitors of Microsoft. It would be good for the country, good for the economy, good for consumers and benefit the Seattle area. Don Conrard 12021 N.E. 67th. St. Kirkland, WA 98033

MTC-00008795

From: DarStwrt@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:37 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
We support the Microsoft Settlement and want to just move on.
The Stewart Family

MTC-00008796

From: Cheryl A. Shapiro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:45 pm
In my opinion, this settlement is fair an equitable to all parties involved.
Sincerely,
Cheryl A. Shapiro

MTC-00008797

From: Rachel LeVasseur
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:47 pm
Subject: Microsoft
— Rachel LeVasseur
— rachel11@earthlink.net
The time is past due to settle the Microsoft case. This ongoing case is not good for the economy, and we don't need the government interfering with private business because a few private interest are jealous!!!!

MTC-00008798

From: Jamie Rife
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 8:49 pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
The settlement is fair. It should not have dragged on this long. To say one company has a monopoly in this highly technical world is impossible.

MTC-00008799

From: MButler621@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:03 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I feel that the Justice proposal regarding Microsoft is fair and just. I encourage you to accept it as the final solution. R. M. Butler, M.D.

MTC-00008800

From: William Cook
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:08 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Justices

As a Consumer I have been using Microsoft's systems for what seems like forever and have never been forced into purchasing, accepting or being stuck with anything that I did not want, there were always alternative programs and systems available to me as a free consumer if I so chose to do so. As a Small Business Owner and user of Microsoft products and systems that have been made available to me, I found these programs and systems to be less expensive and more user friendly than other non Microsoft programs and systems. My business relies heavily on the cost savings that the Microsoft systems have afforded me and don't understand why Myself and thousands of other small business owners should be penalized to satisfy the desires of a Microsoft Competitor. I feel that it is time to accept the terms set and get on with the job of building the economy back to a point that produces jobs and revenue for the country.

Thank You for Your Time
Bill Cook
Cook Consulting

MTC-00008801

From: Seth Alford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:24 pm
Subject: microsoft settlement insufficient
The proposed DOJ settlement with Microsoft is insufficient. It doesn't punish Microsoft for its past mis-deeds, and in some ways allows them to extend their monopoly further, by allowing them to give their software to poorer schools across the nation.

The proposal by the remaining 9 states who are opposed to the DOJ settlement, written by Sullivan and Kuney of Williams & Connolly LLP, Greene of the California's AG office, and Davis of the West Virginia's AG office, addresses Microsoft's anti-trust violations and offers appropriate remedies.

I read this proposal at <http://www.naag.org/features/microsoft/ms-remedy-filing.pdf> The Sullivan et al. proposed remedy should be applied to Microsoft. That remedy will result in better competition and benefit for consumers.

Sincerely,
Seth D. Alford
sethal@yahoo.com
—Seth Alford
sethal@yahoo.com
CC:sethal@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00008802

From: Raymond Vath
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:30 pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
It has been four years since Microsoft's competitors (not customers) began the attack on Microsoft. It is clear we customers have benefited from the excellence of Microsoft's products and at very low prices. If the competitors could come up with superior products, we would beat a path to their door. The Department of Justice has negotiated an agreement with Microsoft that should be accepted. If others want to continue to harass the company, let them do it in their own trial, with their own funds, not my tax money.

Raymond E. Vath, MD

MTC-00008803

From: Judy & Marko
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:34 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern,
It is about time that the case against Microsoft be closed and settled. Our economic recovery requires that innovative and prosperous companies be allowed to function without unnecessary litigation.
Sincerely,
Mark Monette

MTC-00008804

From: Diana Burton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:35 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
We feel that subject settlement is fair and that should not be further litigated.
Jack Burton
Granbury TX
Diana Burton
Granbury TX

MTC-00008805

From: C. gus St. John
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:42 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Is it coincidence that the current downturn in the economy began when the Clinton/Reno "Justice" Dept began the attack on Microsoft? I have no particular love for Microsoft or Bill Gates, but what is the alternative for Windows? Windows is a God-awful kludge but the alternative, which is a manageable kludge, is used on only about five percent of the worlds computers. Apple is better but the changeover would cost more than Bill Gates has.
Regards,
C. Gus St. John
6449 Elmer Hill Road
Rome, NY 13440
cgsjin@borg.com

MTC-00008806

From: CReylek@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:49 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
to the Dept of Justice; this will define my position on the Microsoft settlement.
I believe that Microsoft is being unfairly punished for acting in the best interest of the business, its shareholders and the public. The accusations of monopolistic business practices have largely come from it's competitors and those with business interests who would best be served if Microsoft were much less successful, as well as those whose political interests would be served by damaging the corporation. There is also a segment of the US population who are opposed to the capitalistic ethic and those who are very successful. The very existence of Microsoft's operating system has created the potential for our economy and the world to finally benefit from the power of computing.
Prior to the Microsoft operating system and ancillary software related to it, there was NO compatibility among hardware, software, peripheral equipment, and communication

systems. IBM, Unisys, NCR, le Machines Bull, RCA, ATT, ITT, and the entire universe of others world-wide, demanded that their own parochial architecture be maintained. By Microsoft creating this "de facto" standard the entire world information arena has been opened to a universal ability to share, communicate, compute, and manipulate information in a way that prior to this standard would have been impossible.

I am astounded that the minds of this political system fail to recognize the subterfuge planned by the anti-microsoft proponents to return us to the neanderthal stonage of incompatibility. The entire computing user universe must have compatibility to continue to exist in our current environment. To require Microsoft to provide interfaceability standards to the user/competitor population is reasonable. To force them to reveal corporate trade secrets is to participate in criminal homicide of successful capitalism by government. What's next, nationalization of our strongest, healthiest corporate entities?

Microsoft is one of the only technology companies which has survived the recent recession. It is because of the inherent value of it's products and services. Please do not commit economic suicide for all of us with unreasonable punishment for crimes not comitted, but cast up by those in the market place who are unable to compete successfully in that market.

Chip Reylek
421 Criswell Drive
Boiling Springs, PA 17007, USA
717.258.5378

MTC-00008807

From: Walabea@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:51 pm
Subject: Microfsoft settlement

I am very much opposed to the government attempting to destroy a wonderful company like Microsoft. It sees as though every time a company manages to grow large on it's own, our government feels it has a duty to destroy it. Take for instance the "Bell System Telephone Company." It was one of the most admired company on the face of the earth, and then our government got in the act and ever since it has become a disaster. There is a saying to which I subscribe. "I love my country, it's the government that I am afraid of." Nothing could be more truthful.

I say "LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE!"
Richard Morgan
Federal Way, Washington

MTC-00008809

From: sandra d shimkus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:00 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I as a concerned citizen would hope that the settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft will finally be settled. Enough time and money has been spent on this subject.

Thank You.
Stanley J. Shimkus
27031-59th. AV. NE.
Arlington, WA. 98223
shimsand@juno.com

MTC-00008810

From: Al Wedekind
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 9:54 pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Litigation of the subject has gone on long enough. In fact I think it should never have started!

MTC-00008811

From: JSReisman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:07 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Gentlemen, my wife and I believe that the proposed settlement if fair and just to not only to Microsoft, but to this Country. Microsoft has been a pillar of this economy over the past years, let this company help us out now.

Marcia & Joseph Reisman,
Brooklyn, NY

MTC-00008812

From: Tcarpentie@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:10 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement To the

Department of Justice:

I am in full agreement that the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Dept. Of Justice and nine states be ratified and settled. This litigation must be settled, so that both Microsoft and consumers can go forward.

Theresa C. Gernhard

MTC-00008813

From: Jsldhl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:12 pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

We think the present settlement should not be further litigated by the nine disgruntled states. If Ford puts a better generator in its cars, General Motors has no right to call "foul" and go to court. The reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling should be the end of the line.

Joseph and Doris
Levine

MTC-00008814

From: avedisusa@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:19 pm
Subject: Please accept the settlement and let us move forward

Please accept the settlement and let us move forward with life!

MTC-00008815

From: Krinka1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:21 pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I say congratulations to the Court and to Microsoft for settling this. I think free enterprise must continue.

Krinka1@aol.com

MTC-00008816

From: Steven Gniazdowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:21 pm
Subject: Microsoft

Hello. My name is Steven Gniazdowski. I am a college student majoring in Computer Systems Engineering. I have used, and will continue to use Microsoft and non-Microsoft products.

Microsoft does put out a quality product. However, just due to the fact that they happen to be the software giant they are does not mean they are allowed to break anti-trust laws. Settling with Microsoft is only surrendering.

Microsoft has committed a crime and should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. I feel that the Department of Justice should continue to prosecute Microsoft. Thank you for your time.

Steven Gniazdowski

MTC-00008817

From: bill conlen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:22 pm
DOJ,

I will be happy to see the MS antitrust case end with the approval of the negotiated settlement. I think the settlement, if enforced, will correct the abuses of MS. The case represents a drag on the economy and on technological inovation. It is time to conclude it.

Bill Conlen
Tacoma WA

MTC-00008818

From: Kenneth McGarvey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If the certain far eastern countries computer industry had succeeded in their attempts at setting the standard in not only computer language/software and also the computers themselves, in the mid 1980s, then the price we all would have to pay for computers and the ancillary equipment would be much higher.

Also the effects on the U.S.A. balance of payments would have been catastrophic. I am speaking with no particular interest to pursue, in that I am a British subject and as such am speaking out for what I believe is the benefit of most of the computer using public. If the proposed break up of Microsoft goes ahead, it will mean higher charges for all of us that use computers, it is only because of the scale of the Microsoft operation that prices can be held so low and that the company can offer what is genuine free software.

Microsoft are not a monopoly and in fact there are many other competing software companies in the market place all offering varying products compatible to and some times superior to Microsoft's. What few in the courts realize is in the mid 1980s around six or seven of the far eastern electronic companies banded together to try and formulate a standard system that as stated above, would then have dominated the whole of the worlds computer industry. If they had succeeded then IBM, Apple, Sun Systems, Java and all the other great US and none Pacific Rim computer makers and software houses would not be in existence today, or if they where they would be mere fractions of the companies they are. So please think on

these points when making your decision on the future of Microsoft. I state once again that it is only by being good at what they do, added to the scale of their enterprise, that enables Microsoft to offer reasonable products at prices the general public can afford. We would all be a lot less comfortable in technical terms if Microsoft had not gained an early lead in computer technology. Again I ask you to bear in mind the fact that Microsoft has earned Billions of dollars for you country, do not kill the hen that has laid the golden eggs for yourselves if you do you risk the threat of all previous great civilizations.

Think of the Greeks, Romans and even ancient Egyptians do not kill what is good not always right but am sure Microsoft does attempt to get it right most times. So should your legislature and rule for the keeping of Microsoft intact as it is. And long my it go from strength to strength.

Ken McGarvey 04.01.02

My phone number 44 1642550833

MTC-00008819

From: Pat Fox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an American consumer, I would like to encourage all parties involved to ACCEPT the proposed settlement between the DOJ, the 9 states, and Microsoft. The settlement seems to be a FAIR COMPROMISE, and it is important for the country and the economy to get this case behind us. Furthermore, I would encourage the judge in the case to compel the non-settling states to join the agreed upon settlement as well.

Sincerely,
Patrick J. Fox
7808 79th Ave SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

MTC-00008820

From: Avedis Garavanian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:25pm
Subject: Please settle and keep innovation ALIVE!

Please settle and keep innovation ALIVE!

MTC-00008821

From: Spbucj@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:31pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think that just because Microsoft is big and successful it has become a target. This company has done more to develop the computer industry than anyone else. Other companies, Sun Microsystems, Oracle, Enron, Lucent, Apple, etc. etc. have been able to compete and be successful too. Leave Microsoft alone and let it put money into research and development, not lawyers pockets. Instead of being jealous and resentful of Microsoft, try buying some stock in it. (I did) I'm a little guy and this lawsuit would be hurting me too. I don't know all the details, but my vote is to please leave this company alone. Enough is enough.

MTC-00008822

From: Bill Eckerich
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/4/02 10:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As ordinary citizens, we feel the current settlement terms are fair, just and send the right message to Microsoft.

Unfortunately, a few people and corporations, for various reasons, are seeking to prolong the proceedings under the guise that the settlement is not fair. We see their reasons much differently. As for the various Attorneys General, we see only a political motive designed toward re-election or a hunger for higher office.

As for the competitors, they found themselves unable to compete and are trying to make up for their lack of ability in this way.

We are particularly chagrined over the stance taken by Senator Hatch. Although he is taking this position to try to gain advantage for one of his constituents, he should be mindful of the economic loss created by the delay and costs for the total economy, as well as the fairness.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

William and Joyce Eckerich

MTC-00008823

From: LMD1418@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone already! They have made concessions to the cry babies both to their competitors and with the state legislators. Let's grow up and stop crying sour grapes that Microsoft and Bill Gates have produced better software than their peers and that the consume wins. Were it not for Microsoft, this would be typed on an old electric typewriter on onion skin paper and stuffed in an envelope sent postage paid through the mail and probably given the US Post office would never be delivered anyway thus stopping the consumers, public, and voters by the way from expressing their opinions under the first amendment, which by the way you can find using Microsoft explorer the defamed browser. Thanks again Bill (Gates not Clinton) for all the great work. Keep it up and keep the US moving forward!

MTC-00008824

From: Bo Yates
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is about time that this circus comes to an end. We now have more urgent problems as a nation. Get it over with already!!!!

MTC-00008825

From: Shirley Sidis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement:

Dear DOJ,

In regard to the Microsoft Litigation which has been going on for almost four years, both my wife and I feel that its about time that both sides settle this case and get on with our daily lives. This case has really hurt the economy, for the sake of our country and the economy it should be settled now.

Sincerely,
Sam and Shirley Sidis

MTC-00008826

From: Larry Putnam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer, I just want to let you know that I feel that it is imperative that the action taken to settle the suit against Microsoft be adhered to as has been put down by the District Court of Appeals. This needs to come to a close so that Microsoft can get back to the business of doing what they do best and the Justice Department can spend its time on more important matters to our country.

Sincerely,
Larry D. Putnam
Chattanooga, Tn 37412

MTC-00008827

From: Robert(u)Jann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer I am concerned that the remedy for the Microsoft anti-trust case will be worse than any harm Microsoft may have caused.

Specifically, I think we all had better phone service before the break-up of AT&T. Now I am diluged with phone companies offering low rates and then once I have changed carriers jacking up the price. I preferred to have my phone service lumped into one seamless bundle, because in the end it is more efficient than the mess we have right now.

I am afraid the same thing will happen with the remedy for Microsoft. I prefer a software package that includes features by one software company because INTEGRATION is do important to software. The more chefs there are the greater the probability for soup bugs and finger pointing.

I think Microsoft is offering a valuable service to the public by offering integrated software solutions.

SYS
Robert—Jann@msn

MTC-00008828

From: david milton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 10:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is good for everyone. lets get this over so we can make the next big leap in tech and pull this country out of this recession.

Thanks
David Milton,
5728 meadowhaven Dr,
Plano, TX 75093

MTC-00008829

From: HJDennis@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:00pm
Subject: (no subject)

As a private citizen, I would like to urge the DOJ to quit working against private business and let free enterprise seek it's own level.

Hal Dennis

MTC-00008830

From: MSpalding@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Good Morning,

Please consider dropping all further action against Microsoft. The free market produced the computer revolution and the tremendous gains to the standard of living of most Americans. Please do nothing to interfere with the free working of the market. And especially stay out of computers and software.

Thanks for your consideration,
Mike Spalding

MTC-00008831

From: Bob Boysen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Education Market Settlement

As a Microsoft Windows XP user and a Macintosh OS X user, and although I enjoy running both operating systems, I think it is a mistake to allow an anti-trust settlement against Microsoft Corp with the result being additional free Windows based computers in our nation's schools. This certainly is a slap in the face of Apple Computer Co who has for years worked tirelessly with the schools to provide educational equipment. If the one of the main concerns in the suit against Microsoft was due to a "perceived" monopolistic endeavor on their part, the solution, in my opinion, is not to provide them with an even greater field of play for their product. This would certainly stifle competition which I believe is the Department's exact opposite position in this matter. If the schools choose PCs with the Windows operating system—so be it.

If they prefer Apple Computer's operating system—so be it. Let the United States Government NOT be a party against open market competition.

Thank you.
Bob Boysen
Las Vegas, Nevada

MTC-00008832

From: Wilsh@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

I wish to express my opinion on the DOJ s trial and settlement. The settlement reached by Microsoft and the DOJ appear to me to be the best compromise to a case that has not hurt the consumer but has hurt "the completion". For the nine States to continue to use the Courts to extend the case beyond the limits prescribed by the Appeals court is in my opinion a grave waste of the taxpayers hard earned money. And a waste of the court's time and energy for the private gains of the companies located in or adjacent to the States not happy with the DOJ Settlement. Please do everything you can to Stop the Litigation of Microsoft and allow them and America to get on with innovations for the next generation of products that revolutionize the USA and the World.

Wilson S Hamilton
Pres.
L and W SERVICES

ISSAQUAH, WA
wilsh@att.net
CC:ptclean@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00008833

From: Joel Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer professional and avid computer user it is obvious to me that Microsoft has been a blessing for many years. The overall quality and consistency of their products make my professional and personal life much easier. The LAST thing in the world I need is lot's of operating systems and web browsers and communications protocols to have to investigate, learn and then choose between. It is my opinion that Microsoft has become as important to the market place as they have, in essence, because they make good products that everyone is basically satisfied using.

The proposal to break Microsoft apart terrified me. What effects would that have had on my business and my personal affairs? It was frightening to consider!

The revised settlement is, in my opinion, still unwarranted but, in the spirit of "getting on" with things I would support executing the current settlement without further delay.

Joel E. Davis
PO Box 6118
Hillsborough, NJ 08844

MTC-00008834

From: Wilbur Goodwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/4/02 11:45pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
To: The US Department of Justice

I am writing to you today to express my opinions in regard to the Microsoft debate in accordance with US law, i.e., the Tunney Act, which requires a public comment period that expires on January 28, 2002. I fully support Microsoft and am anxious to see this protracted three-year dispute between Microsoft and the US Federal Government resolved once and for all. Despite the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors, the US Federal Government and nine states finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the US Court of Appeals ruling. I support the settlement that was reached on November 2, 2001, and sincerely hope that there will be no further action taken against Microsoft at the Federal level.

This settlement is tough, but reasonable, equitable and fair to all parties involved. It has been reached after extensive negotiations, and it allows Microsoft to continue designing and marketing its innovative software, while benefiting the technology industry as a whole. Under this agreement, Microsoft must disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows to competing companies. Microsoft has pledged to carry out all provisions of this agreement, and the government has created a technical oversight committee to insure Microsoft compliance. While I personally am strongly opposed to any company being legally forced to disclose its company sensitive or proprietary

information, I firmly believe that consumers overwhelmingly agree that this settlement is the best alternative for them, the industry and the American economy, under the circumstances.

Unfortunately, a few "special interests" are attempting to use this review period to derail the proposed 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. In my opinion, if Microsoft's competitors had expended more time, energy and financial resources in acquiring, nurturing and maintaining a strong technical base of innovative skills, and less on litigation, they wouldn't have had to resort to such costly legal tactics in the first place. If they can't compete on their own volition, then maybe they shouldn't be in the business!

In closing, I want to reiterate that I strongly believe that this settlement, as opposed to more needless and costly litigation, is in the best interest of, and will benefit, the consumers, the industry and the American economy. Furthermore, I urge you to get on with the process at hand by upholding this agreement, so that Microsoft can prudently devote its invaluable resources to continued innovation rather than further protracted litigation. I will anxiously await your decision. I have the utmost confidence that you will make the only decision that is in the best interest of everyone concerned.

Sincerely,
Wilbur Goodwin (Retired)
Columbia, SC

TC-00008835

From: ChloeCKM@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:30am
Subject: court settlement

the settlement reducing the amount of liability in the court of appeals ruling is reasonable to all parties involved including Microsoft and the American economy. please stop special interests from derailing this settlement. thank you for your attention,

Sincerely
Chloe Murdock

MTC-00008836

From: tom sheller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:33am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs: I am communicating to support the current proposed settlement with Microsoft, I firmly believe that the evidence supports the freedom of enterprise, and I firmly believe that no good would come from any sanctions on the part of Microsoft the concessions that they have agreed too are fair and beneficial to the general populace. Please do not allow special interest groups to degrade the just decision that has already been proposed by the dept. of justice.

Thank you,
Tom Sheller

MTC-00008837

From: DCBosworth@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:46am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Done, mailed 1/5/02.
Dave Bosworth

MTC-00008838

From: mardi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
mb (765)973-8376 Let the settlement go forward so we all can move on with our work and the fine minds can be creative instead of wasting time on this matter.

MTC-00008839

From: Thayne Erickson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:03am
Subject: For Microsoft

I posted this in the Apple Discussion forum after another user post a link to this e-mail address urging everyone to write you against Microsoft: I think the one Jaun posted was a waste of time. How is hurting MS going to help me? I'm against this whole going after MS on principle. It's just wrong. Who's next? Apple? Sun? Last time I checked Sun OS only runs on Sun hardware, sure they put Netscape on it but who cares? What have they done that is so wrong???? Bundle their software on their OS? Big deal. I never wanted Netscape anyway and if I did I could easily download and install it.

Let it be decided by the consumer. If you don't like it don't buy it. We're proof they don't have a monopoly on the market, aren't we? This is no place for the government, they need to be concerned about protecting us from criminals and terrorists, not Bill Gates!!!

Thayne Erickson
Mac User

MTC-00008840

From: modulan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please close this case as fast as possible since: There are zillions of real problems confronting our country which demand better use of taxpayer bucks—and believe me I am paying a bunch—hopefully not squandered on a showcase for high profile lawyers.

Regarding legal rationale, I excerpt from the published text:

Precedent requires that: the balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court's role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is "within the reaches of the public interest."

I think enough time has passed for the DOJ to conclude the case. One would have to be an imbecile to believe that Microsoft's competitors haven't pushed the case for their stockholders not the public's benefit—the whole case is leaving a bad taste for the fairness of the American legal system. Quite

simply, how much of the Microsoft cash can I get by gambling with lawyers in court.

As for Microsoft's mistakes, the proposed settlement gives a lot more than anyone would have envisioned would really arise based on the original complaints.

Folks, the DOJ and its facilities should not be a set for this expensive soap opera—for heaven's sake, someone—just someone just pound down the gavel and stop the legal opera of the century.

On the humorous side, if you folks can't close it out, just send the case to Judge Judy! John D O'Meara Sr.

MTC-00008841

From: RLoveless@fwenc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has been found guilty of using illegal tactics to maintain a monopoly. This is a very serious offense, especially when put into the context of intentionally violating not its first, but its second consent decree. Further evidence that they have not and will not reform their behavior is the fact that they not one, but twice presented fraudulent testimony in Federal Court.

The citizens of the US (and the world) deserve protection from further illegal Microsoft activities. I do not believe the current settlement is sufficient deterrence. I propose:

That Microsoft be REQUIRED to disseminate 95% of its current cash reserves to its stock holders.

This reserve is estimated to be in excess of \$20 Billion. There are approximately 1 Billion shares, so this is \$20/share. No stockholder is harmed by this; it may, in fact, stimulate the economy which would be useful at this time.

This will leave Microsoft with no debt and \$1 Billion in cash reserves. Certainly this is still a strong financial position for any company. The effect with regard to Microsoft tactics will be to reduce (but not eliminate) the ability of Microsoft to purchase (or threaten to purchase) companies that are competing against it. This Microsoft method has been well documented in the various journal and newspapers in the technology field.

Thank you for your consideration.

CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00008842

From: Frank Disparted
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:48am
Subject: MS SETTLEMENT

Microsoft is a great company and should be left alone, so it can direct its energies to making new and better products. I think the issue with Microsoft is like shooting your self in the foot. This is one company that has brought prosperity to our country. As a user of MS products, they are great, work well, and are dependable. That's more than I can say of our government.

MTC-00008843

From: Stephen Jacob
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Greetings!

Please settle this now!

We, the people want to go on without more litigation, lawyers fees and constraints!

Our economy has taken enough of a beating and Microsoft has been a whipping post! Let's drop it and move on, please!

Thanks for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Stephen

Stephen Jacob

email: svj@stephenjacob.com

MTC-00008844

From: Maya Opavska
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department,

I'm a long-time computer user and a concerned citizen writing to express my concern over the prolonged case against Microsoft. The comprehensive agreement that the federal government and the nine states reached with Microsoft is reasonable and fair to all parties involved. This settlement is good for consumers, it's good for the industry, and it's good for the American economy. Please add my voice to the choir of people asking to finally put an end to this matter in the interest of all of us!

Sincerely,

Maya Opavska (mayao@earthlink.net)

MTC-00008845

From: SAMUEL MEDRANO
To: Microsoft ATR,lew@mises.org@inetgw
Date: 1/5/02 2:12am

Persuant to the Tunney Act the following is my opinion as a concerned member of the public in reference to United States vs. Microsoft and its proposed settlement. This lawsuit should never have seen the light of day nor given the attention it had received. It's just consideration should have been as a public example of nuisance lawsuits brought about by inefficient and unworthy, but powerful economic interests as well as sanctimonious politicians seeking greater political power.

Serious study of economics would have revealed that true monopolies exist only where the instruments of political power are used to insulate and protect an area of industry from the brutal and fickle forces of a free market whose only sovereign is the consuming public. A clear example of a true and lasting is the first class delivery monopoly granted to the US Postal Service. (Mises and Rothbard)

Microsoft holds a majority of the market share of operating systems not by state edict but by that brutal and fickle sovereign's choice know as the public. Politicians love speaking out against business "monopolies" but never bring to the discussion the state's monopolies or their personal monopoly in their respective office. They see it as a sign of praise and "a mandate" whenever they manage to gather more than a majority in election polls or public opinion polls.

By including the Internet Explorer with new PCs Microsoft was employing a legitimate business decision calculation by offering more and more for its consumers. Microsoft is as eager to capture a majority

marketshare for internet browsers as its competitors. That is the nature of the free market and the American way. May the fair winner in this never ending struggle be praised. We the sovereign will determine how long we will let this or that supplier will be a majority marketshare winner.

It is unfortunate that our current political and legal system has brought this justly favored company to the point that it has and in the process interfered with the sovereign's task of making rational economic calculations as to the company that serves us better with the most desirable products and services.

While unnecessary it is better for the public's interest that the current lawsuit be brought to a rapid settlement as has been proposed rather than follow the ludicrous and unjust actions sought by the competing and powerful politicoeconomic interests that seek to so call protect us from ourselves or those that serve us by our own encouragement.

Respectfully,
Samuel Medrano. MD

Bibliography:

Mises, Ludwig von—Human Action 1949
Rothbard, Murray N.—Man, Economy and the State

For more on economics in general the Ludwig von Mises Institution is literally the best place on earth to begin and maintain a serious study on the subject.

MTC-00008846

From: WFSSTEVENS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time for big government—at the federal level or the state level—to get out of the business of holding back the Microsoft Corporation from providing competitive products at an attractive pricing level.

Hence, I request the settlement under review be approved and all legation of any sort be stopped.

William F Stevens
wfsstevens@aol.com

MTC-00008847

From: Joel Bramlitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I'd like to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft antitrust lawsuit. I am a citizen who makes his living by supporting Microsoft products. I was very alarmed when I first heard about this lawsuit, because I feared it could possibly affect my livelihood. I have followed it very closely, and was very relieved when I heard a settlement had finally been reached. Now, I am concerned again. The nine states that did not agree with the settlement are jeopardizing the whole deal for what appear to be less than honorable reasons.

The way I understand it, the heart of the antitrust laws are intended to protect the consumer. From what I've read and heard, Microsoft's competitors seem to be the true beneficiaries of the proposed "alternate settlement". Is it a coincidence that they are

mostly headquartered in the holdout states? I think not. To me this clearly political maneuvering on the part of the aforementioned competitors. They are angry at Microsoft, and instead of creating superior products to compete in the marketplace, they want to cripple Microsoft in the courts. The way I see it, if the nine other states and especially the U.S. Government agree on a remedy, that's what it should be. The holdout states obviously have agendas that have nothing to do with what's best for the consumer.

I, along with everyone I talk to feel this has gone on long enough. Our country is in a very different type of crisis right now. One that vastly overshadows this particular case. I hope the court will consider this, and put an end to the vengeful tactics of Microsoft's competitors. We cannot continue to punish success, and reward mediocrity.

Thank you for your time.
Joel Stephen Bramlitt

MTC-00008848

From: K Dyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

My government spent more money prosecuting Microsoft during the Clinton presidency than it spent on anti-terror programs. It spent more on prosecuting Microsoft than it spent equipping our military to conduct a two theater operation. It spent more prosecuting Microsoft than it did on increased research for an AIDS solution.

My counsel to you is simple: STOP IT! I'm mad at you and I vote. And I'll vote against anyone who does not support and vote for an immediate end and settlement to this foolishness.

Don't forget about me, it's my money that pays the bills and I'm not going to forget about you.

William K. Dyer
cxturbo@juno.com

MTC-00008849

From: John Preston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:23am
Subject: DOJ wants to hear from you on MS settlement

I feel that the government should settle in favor of Microsoft. Actually I think the matter should have never come to court. All this crap about the browser being packaged with the OS is nonsense. I use Windows 98 on my home computer and have both Internet Explorer and NetScape on the same computer.

I can choose to use either one. Its up to me. I have said this before. Try to buy a new car from any car dealer with an engine or other parts from a different dealer and see what you get. Its going to be a big nothing that's what. Why? Because business is not done that way. Try to buy a new car without an engine.

They will probably sell it to you but guess what? It will cost a lot more money because of all the special handling that will be required to get it to you.

This whole thing is just the result of some people who weren't in the right place at the right time or didn't make the right decision.

Throw it out of court. Stop wasting my tax dollars on it and lets get on with life.

John Preston

MTC-00008850

From: Alan Feldman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 5:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let this lawsuit go! Let the settlement stand. It is a tough settlement, but fair, and Microsoft is already implementing parts of it.

I, as a consumer and industry partner (software developer for a 3rd party), was very upset to see this lawsuit at all. Right from the get-go it only seemed to help competitors not consumers. Microsoft has continually improved their software and kept prices fair. They have created an industry that I am proud to be a part of. Leave Microsoft alone!

With this settlement Microsoft is already giving in to things they would've never agreed to (and shouldn't), but they have agreed, and are implementing it. And Microsoft's competitor's should be happy about that.

But from now on they should compete in the MARKET PLACE not the courts. And let the CONSUMER decide what is best. They are not so stupid as this lawsuit has made them out to be... they can spot good software when they see it.

Thank you.

Alan Feldman
753 Bellows Way, Apt.# 204
Newport News, VA 23602
757-833-3470

MTC-00008851

From: Leon van Schie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

I am shocked by the recent news regarding the Microsoft settlement. Instead of punishing Microsoft for their monopoly strategy you are giving them a green light to basically kick Apple Computer out of the education market by donating an astronomical amount of money in Microsoft products to this industry, thus giving Microsoft a go ahead to continue to do business as usual. I'm sorry but this goes beyond my comprehension. You are playing Microsoft's cards by making them an offer like this.

To my humble opinion they should be punished not by putting more of their product into the market, especially such a sensitive market like education, but by giving them a punishment that's appropriate. If you want Microsoft to donate zillions of dollars, let them do that to a neutral institution like food for 3rd world countries or something in that order.

What impression do you give Microsoft (and others like them) here? If you monopolize the market by unfair means of business we will reward you by allowing you to do more business and even kill some competition on the way?! By putting more Microsoft products out there you are giving

companies like Apple Computer absolutely no chance what so ever to sell their product in the education industry, hence they start to monopolize that industry as well.

A concerned Dutch citizen.

With kind regards,
Leon van Schie,
Bervoetsbos 189
2134 PP Hoofddorp
The Netherlands

MTC-00008852

From: Jay Greenfield
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The states contesting the settlement are working at the behest of AOL, Oracle and Sun. They want to constrain Microsoft not because it will help the consumer but because it will help their bottom lines.

Microsoft has not always been an engine of innovation. And its business practices have been too aggressive. Nevertheless, today Microsoft with its .NET initiative and the uses it is putting XML to in the service of this initiative has become a real engine of innovation driving Oracle towards XML, Sun into an embrace of web services and making AOL uneasy. This is a good competitive situation. Weakening Microsoft significantly would strengthen AOL. AOL is not an engine of innovation. Imagine no Microsoft and just an alliance between Sun, Oracle and AOL. One doesn't have to be a genius to put together a website using Visual Basic and a Windows 2000 Server. Java programming and Oracle administration are much more demanding and expensive.

We need a strong Microsoft to compete with the AOL/Oracle/Sun alliance.

MTC-00008853

From: CKest@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets move on and financially rape some other evil corporation with deep pockets. What shows the attackers of Microsoft for what they are, despicable whoring thieves, when Microsoft said that they would in essence, give up their code (the original request) by providing FREE software/ computers to schools, it still was not enough—nothing will ever be enough. Have some political balls, now that that embarrassment—Reno is gone, and move and do something important for once in a decade.

Yours truly,
Russell Kestler

MTC-00008854

From: LBritt2314@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:09am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

THIS CASE NEEDS TO BE SETTLED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER LITIGATION. I HAVE TALKED WITH A NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND I HAVE YET TO FIND ONE INDIVIDUAL THAT BELIEVE THAT THIS CASE SHOULD BE CONTINUED. WE BELIEVE THAT A SETTLEMENT WILL BE GOOD FOR THE CONSUMERS. I AM INVOLVED IN COMPUTERS, I WANT TO SEE THIS CASE SETTLED ASAP. WE ARE

INVLOVED IN SOME VERY DIFFICULT TIMES AT THIS DATE AND WE DON'T NEED TO FURTHER DESTROY OUR ECONOMY BY FURTHER CONTINUING THIS CASE.

I HOPE THAT SOMEONE TAKE THE TIME TO READ THIS E-MAIL.

LARRY L. BRITAIN,
CPA,CFP,CLU,ChFC,CCIM

MTC-00008855

From: Jeff Oberst
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear U.S. Dept. of Justice,
I think the proposed settlement with Microsoft Corp. is fair for customers of Microsoft, its competitors and the general public. I believe this case has dragged on too long it should be promptly brought to a close.

Sincerely,
Jeff Oberst

MTC-00008856

From: MUNNEKE3@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:15am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I want to go on record as one who believes that settlement of the Microsoft case is paramount to healing much of the economic trevails that we face as a nation and indeed, the world. No more litigation, please, to serve the selfish interests of competitors and stifle innovation within the industry. This freedom is still what makes America a great and shining beacon to the rest of the world.

This entire trumped up charade should have never happened in the first place. Now that we are back to reality with the current administration, let us not belabor a moot point. Let us move forward and support a thriving desire to innovate, putting people to work, assisting the public interest in attaining useful tools for the tech world that moves us forward. Let go of Microsoft and stop the strangulation! Now!

MTC-00008857

From: DParr1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough money and time has been spent on this. The government needs to conclude this case with the settlement agreed upon by both parties. Further prolonging this case is not in the best interests of the consumer. Finish it...

MTC-00008858

From: Bill Fulmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Microsoft settlement is fair and equitable for all concerned.

MTC-00008859

From: Llanddr@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department,
Not all Americans regard Microsoft as an "evil empire." Many citizens appreciate the initiative, brilliance and hard work of Mr.

Gates and company. Further, they do not regard Microsoft as a criminal enterprise, but rather as a heroic one. It is not my intention to change your mind on the specific charges you have leveled at Microsoft, although it would be great if you did reconsider. Anti-trust law is notoriously vague and non-objective. My intention is to ask you, please, as a citizen, voter and tax payer to leave the case as is, and to not support any worse sanctions against this company. Further, if there is any opportunity to reduce current sanctions or proposed sanctions against Microsoft, I urge you to take these opportunities. In essence, I believe Microsoft has been punished enough. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Joseph McHugh
Malden, Massachusetts

MTC-00008860

From: John Sweeney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the proposed Microsoft settlement.

John Sweeney
Lansdale PA

MTC-00008861

From: FRED SIMMONS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:08am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
MICROSOFT HAS DONE MORE FOR THE TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY AND OUR ECONOMY THAN ANY OTHER. THEY ARE AN INDUSTRY LEADER AND HAVE CREATED MORE OPPORTUNITY FOR MORE PEOPLE THAN MANY BEFORE THEM. IT AMAZES ME THAT MY GOVERNMENT HAS TAKEN ISSUE WITH MICROSOFT. WHO IS REALLY BENEFITING FROM CONTINUED LITIGATION? MAYBE IT IS TIME FOR INDIVIDUALS LIKE MYSELF TO BEGIN ASKING WHO AND WHY? I HAVE SENT COMMUNICATIONS TO MY STATE REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATORS. I WILL EXERCISE MY RIGHT TO JUDGE THEIR ACTIONS COME NEXT ELECTION DAY!

IT IS TIME TO STOP THIS LITIGATION. I REQUEST MY VOICE BE COUNTED IN FAVOR OF SETTLEMENT. NOW!

REGARDS,
FRED SIMMONS
293 WILSON BUTTE ROAD
GREAT FALLS, MONTANA 59405

MTC-00008862

From: E.L. Pietrowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As the usual cry by the Clinton gang was "s Time to move on" that time has been reached in the Microsoft case.

No one will become a winner if this settlement continues to drag on and on. As I see the settlement before the court neither side is really happy with the settlement. To me that indicates the settlement is as fair as it will get. It is time to turn our efforts to something constructive and stop wasting tax

payer money on something that does not have a right answer.

E.L. Pietrowski

MTC-00008863

From: Herb Cilley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:24am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear People,
since 1933 I have been in business, one way or another. I believe Microsoft has developed the system of E-mail and should be allowed to profit from it.... It is my hope that You will rule in favor of them, for what it is worth. Drug companies and others patent their discoveries or inventions, and profit from it for a period of time. Thanks for reading this.

Herbert L. Cilley
60 Middle Road—#319-B
Dover, NH 03820-4146
nhloonranger@yahoo.com
(603) 749-5904

MTC-00008864

From: Brett McDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/31/01 10:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement.
Brett McDonald
38602 Lancaster Drive
Farmington Hills, MI 48331
Owner
BFM Software

MTC-00008865

From: SFoxRun1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to add my voice to the comments the Court may consider in reviewing the proposed settlement between the Justice Department and several of the State plaintiffs and Microsoft. First, it should be clear that consumers have overwhelmingly selected Microsoft products over others. It is disdainful of the public to assume that this preference is not knowing or intended. Second, it should be equally clear from the public whining that many of Microsoft's competitors (and there are many, a testament to the strong competitive environment in this industry), that this litigation has been used as a substitute for competition by the providers of less desirable products (the many published interviews with Scott McNealy of Sun Microsystems, for example, are a testament to this, as is the relative performance of the competitors in the stock market). Third, it is transparent that the unreasonable and intransigent position taken by the nonsettling parties, Connecticut Attorney General Blumenthal being a prime example, as reported in the national press in various out of court statements by Mr. Blumenthal and others, is primarily motivated by politics, not economics or law. This case has been used to bash the success and innovation of Microsoft (a fat target because of its superiority) by those seeking a populist platform for their political ambitions. I urge the Court not to allow those whose motives have nothing to do with fair and open competition to hold back American

technological competitiveness in the world market (note that when the shoe is on the other foot, as in the case of opponent America Online, no interference with its own instant messaging system is allowed).

The notion of natural monopoly due to superior insight and innovation should not be frustrated by "wannabees" who are merely jealous of Microsoft's success or by politicians playing the fundraising and campaign rhetoric games—Mr. Blumenthal can set national antitrust policy if he is ever the Attorney General of the United States (or President). This case has done its public service in reaching a just and fair settlement which the Justice Department and a significant portion of the complaining States have freely negotiated for the benefit of the consuming public. It is time to get on with the next generation of technology and leave this case for the historical landmark it is. There can be no doubt that by the time the trial court has finished with this matter the entire context of the technology which it addresses will have changed without regard to legal principles as is only natural, for, to quote Abraham Lincoln, "... we have added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius." I urge the Court to sustain the settlement, as proposed.

Steven A. Diaz,
3022 Fox Den Lane,
Oakton, VA 22124.

MTC-00008866

From: Avperrella@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think settlement still too hard on Microsoft! Government should get off the backs of companies that get a lions share of the market because they are good at what they do—go after the real law breakers!

MTC-00008867

From: Delpha Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:50am
Subject: Microsoft

313 N Mississippi Street
Blue Grass, IA 52726-9731
January 5, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing you to express my feelings on the Microsoft settlement issue. I believe the settlement that was reached with Microsoft is thorough and sufficient. Please continue to support it.

I am a strong supporter of Microsoft, and I think that it has done quite a bit to help our economy. I want this case to be settled so that the people at the company may continue going on about their business and inventing superior products that will continue to improve the industry. My hope is that once this case is over the benefits that Microsoft, its competitors, and consumers will see will help improve our economy in these hard times. After all, Microsoft has bent over backwards to accommodate the millions of fans of Netscape, AOL, and other software-

related companies, including non-retaliatory agreements against software companies that develop products that compete with Microsoft.

This settlement is a step in the right direction. Thank you for settling with Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Delpha Wagner

MTC-00008868

From: Leslie Duncan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:52am
Subject: settlement

1414 Arlene Street,
Redlands, CA 92374.
January 5, 2002,

Dear Department of Justice, Senate,
Congress and The States of Our Union,

This letter confirms my total agreement to settle the lawsuits against Microsoft. As a U.S. Citizen and consumer who regularly purchases numerous Microsoft products, I can attest that Microsoft has dealt fairly with me by their pricing and business practices. I have never been forced to purchase their products through any kind of illegal business practices. As a result I find that any and all accusations made against this company on my behalf as a consumer very frivolous and false. Therefore I humbly request that the Justice Department and the United States Senate, Congress and the States of our union, proceed with all speed in the interest of our economy and Constitution to settle any and all lawsuits that arise from the alleged false accusations.

Sincerely,
Leslie A.I. Duncan

MTC-00008869

From: PHIL BASHAM
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:
It is past time to end the pursuit of Microsoft. A settlement must be reached quickly. This was a lawsuit that never should have happened. Microsoft has served its customers well and in the process has brought computer use technology to the present high state. I for one have no inclination to use other products and find the software offered by Microsoft to fit my needs exactly.

Thank you,
Phil Basham
9787 Cypress Point Cir
Lone Tree, CO 80124-3105
303 799-1074
303 799-0613 data
303 885-9809 cell
pnzbash@msn.com

MTC-00008870

From: Bettyhu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We were so pleased when the first settlement was made. It is hard to imagine how the States could have been hurt. It seems to us they are just being greedy.

Our country needs Microsoft to be able to continue to improve its products. Please reject the States suits.

MTC-00008871

From: WynLsk@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement was fair, and it's time to leave them alone. My tax dollars can be spent on something better, like investigating Janet Reno. She is a crook, and has got away with a lot. She spent eight years covering up for Bill Clinton. I waited eight years for justice and I don't see it yet. Do you ever plan on looking into her obstruction of the truth.

Wayne

CC:WynLsk@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00008872

From: Dick H.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:10am
Subject: microsoft settlement

please recognize that it is everyone's best interest to get this settled now. let's do it !!

MTC-00008873

From: Ralph Rebandt Sr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:29am
Subject: SETTLE QUICKLY

The longer it takes to settle this—it will continue to hurt the economy. Microsoft is in the right.

Ralph Rebandt

MTC-00008874

From: Marion Behlert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wind up the Microsoft case! The lawyers are the only ones winning. Get it finished! If Ashcroft has something to do w/it, I'm sure it will be fair.

Marion Behlert

5926 Price Rd.

Milford, OH 45150

MTC-00008875

From: Jiri Bures
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned consumer and citizen I overwhelmingly agree that a settlement in the Microsoft case is good and fair to all parties involved including the industry and American economy.

From: George Bures, geobu@mymail.cz

MTC-00008876

From: Jay Burch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the DOJ has not represented the interests of the American consumer in the DOJ's pursuit of Microsoft. Therefore, any agreement that Microsoft finds acceptable is fine with me. The motivation of the DOJ is what needs to be questioned here; not the practices of Microsoft.

Jay Burch

MTC-00008877

From: Lelachance@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:14pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sirs,

As a concerned citizen I strongly believe this case has dragged on long enough and should be settled immediately. The settlement accepted by other States is just and fair and should be acceptable to all! Time to stop messing around and move on!!!!

Leo and Joan LaChance

MTC-00008878

From: Charlotte Venner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

This is a good settlement. It is not in the public interest to delay this any further. We need certainty in the marketplace. Also, I believe that technology has moved beyond the issues in the case. It needs to be closed.

Thank you, Charlotte Venner

Charlotte M. Venner, Esq.

VENNERADR

MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION

One Sansome St., 20th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Phone: (415) 733-7858

Fax: (415) 388-1036

E-Mail: venneradr@msn.com

Web Site: www.venneradr.com

MTC-00008879

From: Allen L Plitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs, Please put a quick end to this case. I think a lot of people are sick and tired of hearing the competitors of Microsoft dictate to our government what to do to hurt this corporation just so they may more quickly gain more of the pie. If they cannot beat Microsoft with a better product, then they should not be allowed to beat Microsoft (period). How next will it be possible to get subsidization from our government.

MTC-00008880

From: Dan Rohr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello Department of Justice,

It is my understanding that the DOJ is accepting public comment on the case against Micro-Soft. I have, for years, been annoyed about the injustice that MS has had to bear:

* They create products that have been used by the public and government to attack them—people use Word to write documents used in court to prosecute MS, people use MS's versions of email and Internet Explorer to send messages promoting the destruction of MS; I'm sure you can think of more examples.

* They are largely instrumental in the proliferation of cheaper and cheaper, yet more powerful home/business computers. And yet, they are attacked for harming the public.

As the fictional Howard Roark pointed out in his defense, in Ayn Rand's *The Fountain Head*, long ago, someone discovered fire, and he was probably burned at the stake by his contemporaries that benefited from that very discovery. We haven't come very far, sacrificing great men for the satisfaction of the mob; or have we?

The corrupt Clinton administration devoted, and diverted, great resources toward the torture and destruction of the popular boogie-man, Bill Gates, while ignoring the paramount responsibility of defending the country from violent attack. I have been encouraged by the Bush administrations apparent change in course against MS. I urge you to open the jaws and let them free. The West's greatest country, with its technology and her heroes that create it, have enough enemies (foreign and internal) without the DOJ going after it too.

Best regards,

Dan Rohr

2304 Gross Point Lane

Wildwood, MO 63011

MTC-00008881

From: Jim Engler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:27pm
Subject: MICROSOFT Settlement

I wanted to take a moment to tell you that as a 3 year employee of Microsoft's Federal division and 24 year officer and tactical jet pilot in the United States Navy, that I understand integrity very well, and have seen Microsoft always act with integrity and always go well beyond what's expected of a company always trying to do the right thing for its customers.

Please seriously consider ending this political abuse of arguably one of the most important companies in the United States. Microsoft can significantly help lead this country out of recession if it's given the chance. Thank you! Jim

James Engler

Federal Defense Agencies Manager (DOD/USAF)

Wk: (980) 776-9809

Cell: (704) 277-5758

“You have not only the right to be an individual, you have an obligation to be one”—Eleanor Roosevelt

CC:Jim Engler

MTC-00008882

From: Lawrence MacDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

It is time to settle this case on a federal & statewide basis. The proposed settlement seems fair & should be implemented.

The nation has more important things to do than to continue this contentious litigation.

Lawrence E. MacDonald

Crossville, TN.

MTC-00008883

From: Jim Oliver
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am concerned about the lengthy court battles of the government vs. Microsoft. I

believe it is in the best interest of the economy and the future of technology that this be settled immediately.

Our economy is still very fragile and we need a boost. An immediate settlement of the Microsoft case would be that boost. Microsoft, as a company, has done more for technology in the last 15 years than any other company. Let's put the company back to work, take this distraction away from them, and see what they can do for us over the next 15 years. Thank you for your attention.

Jim Oliver
Colby, KS

MTC-00008884

From: William Bennett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

Many thanks for the fair Microsoft settlement. It is good to have closure so that the country can go forward to solve the present economic downturn without the distraction of the politics associated with the Microsoft settlement. Hopefully the interests who wish to keep this settlement open interminably will be thwarted and the country move ahead economically.

Yours sincerely,
William B. Bennett

MTC-00008885

From: Don Rahl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 12:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please complete this settlement as outlined in the present proposal. I believe it is time to get on with business. It seems to me that Microsoft is a vital part of our national economy and should continue to add it's part to our national product totals. Let's wind up the settlement and stop the sidetracking of Government resources at Justice so they can concentrate on more important activities.

Sincerely,
Don Rahl
107 Blencowe Court
Folsom CA 95630

MTC-00008886

From: Mike Shreve
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please proceed with the settlement of the Microsoft case. Despite the hype, ALL software prices have decreased where Microsoft products are offered.

As far as being a monopoly, Apple, Sun, and Oracle have monopolies in their fields, AND charge higher prices.

Microsofts only real impropriety has been controlling manufacturer and distributor sales of their product. They've agreed to stop doing that. END OF STORY.

Mike Shreve
727-539-6498

MTC-00008887

From: John H. Gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Dear Sirs;

I am writing in support of the Microsoft Settlement agreement the Federal Government and nine states have endorsed. I believe this settlement is in the public interest. It is time to put this litigation to rest and move on. It is certainly important for technology companies to have the freedom to innovate.

Thank you.
John H. Gardner
560 S. Belvedere Blvd.
Memphis, TN 38104

MTC-00008888

From: web blank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:16pm
Subject: e-atm integer mint budget case
01245

the money is mine not microsoft the worlds and i have the freedom of my business and govt to by the banking titles and copyright title to do such the monetary decree and desision i want is that it is mine for the first offer and the year 2002.

signed RICHARD JOHN FRANK AND I
HAVE NOT POBOX AND NO ADDRESS
EXCEPT THE GENERAL DELIVERY
OLYMPIA WA 98501 RESPOND IF
NECESSARY

THANK YOU ..

MTC-00008889

From: sparky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sir;

Please stop the ongoing litigation and bring closure for the sake of our public and country.

I personally admire the direction of Microsoft and it's innovations which enhances our growth in the technology and software leadership. Our country needs to unite in these times to move ahead and continue to show the world of our advancement to society as a whole.

Sam Green
West Bloomfield, Mi

MTC-00008890

From: AANDJMARVAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer, I have always felt that I had the freedom to choose whatever I wanted, whenever I wanted it, and, to a certain extent, however I wanted it. I strongly believe that Microsoft is a victim of it's own success. Some people, the majority of them being Microsoft's competitor's, complain that Microsoft's success was a result of foul play. That is totally untrue. Microsoft is a leader in it's field because of a vision, hard work to implement the vision, and innovation to remain a competitive force.

These are not acts of crime or foul play, these are acts of the American dream. Let's not penalize successful, hard working people, let us simply allow them to thrive. Government intervention, in order to level the playing field, has almost always historically resulted in hurting the people the government was trying to protect, the consumer. Do we so quickly forget how

Microsoft has contributed to the explosion of the computer industry, and do we also forget how many jobs they have created not only at Microsoft but also at a plethora of other companies that started up as a result of their success? This whole case is a big let down and a real slap in the face to Microsoft and aspiring Americans who want to live out the American dream to it's full potential. Don't forget, Microsoft isn't just Bill Gates, it's a corporation with many employees and many business owners in the form of shareholders. Please be very careful and very wise in considering this settlement. People are being hurt because this case is costing a great deal of money in tax revenue and in company revenue. Who is really winning here if tax paying consumers are dumping money into this case over many years? The obvious answer is that no one is. All of us are losing money in one form or another. Please resolve this matter as soon as possible so everyone can get on with business and put this senseless debate behind us. I appreciate your attention to my concerns.

Have a great new year.
Anthony F. Marvan

MTC-00008891

From: Kenneth Hopping
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:33pm
Subject: Comment on Proposed Settlement

The proposed settlement does not impose any substantive penalty on Microsoft for its past monopolistic behavior. It also does not implement any real corrective actions other than promises by Microsoft to be less evil in the future. The entire package has the appearance of a political buyout with DoJ becoming little more than employees of Microsoft. I urge the rejection of this travesty of justice. The public is in no way served by the anemic measures proposed and in fact will be irreparably harmed by what is, in effect, a government certification of Microsoft as a legal monopoly.

Kenneth Hopping
4117 145th Ave. NE
Bellevue, WA. 98007

MTC-00008892

From: Marvin Francis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:33pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe that Microsoft has been harrassed enough. For the good of the economy, please let the present settlement stand. Any further litigation will only hurt the company and have an adverse effect on the hopefully recovering economy.

Sincerely
Marvin H. Francis.

MTC-00008893

From: JINTAG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I believe it is about time that this case is finaly put to rest. The public interest is being served with the appellate courts decision.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.
Sincerly,
John Intagliata

MTC-00008894

From: Jean Valleroy
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do delay this settlement. Everyone has worked very hard and diligently for a long time. There will never be a time when everyone is content. The DOJ can use its time and energy more effectively for other concerns of Americans. Get on with it!

MTC-00008895

From: Matthias Schonder
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 1:45pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen, some friends informed me, that you are "listening to the voices of non-Microsoft users" which makes me very happy as it shows that you really care about users.

My friends showed me a sample of a good writing to you and I think it is so good that I just copied and pasted it. This is not because I'm lazy or something it is very close to my statement and as my english is poor it think this is the best way.

But I also want you to know, that Microsoft "one-OS-boot"-license is one of the factors why Be, Inc. failed and is now history.

Thank you very much for taking time reading this.

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

BeHappy
 Matthias "LoCal" Schonder
 BeDev#: E-18032
<http://www.schonder.com/matthias.schonder>

MTC-00008896

From: Dave C. Hill
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 1:50pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Here's another copy of a recent internal e-mail, Good OP Monopolistic/Anti-Trust Violating Microsoft, sent out to it's people urging them to, again, use whatever means they can think of to "Crush" the competition.

The U.S. Government has the "Obligation" to properly punish this company because of it's court conviction on "Anti-Trust" violations. Don't let these people off! They've already driven many companies with great products and ideas out of business. They've already stolen many technologies invented

by other companies, changed them to be "Proprietary" to Microsoft, and marketed them as their own ideas to further their economic/technological stranglehold on the world.

Prosecute them, don't strike deals!
 From: Brian Valentine
 Sent: Wed 12/26/2001 7:14 PM
 To: WW Sales, Marketing & Services Group
 Subject: Me again—Linux updates

Microsoft Confidential—Do not print, copy or forward this email and do not share this email with anyone outside the company. For internal use only!

Now that the whole world knows we are taking Linux seriously based on the leak of my last email... Wait—stop there -since when did they think we weren't taking them serious?!? Did they think we are not going to build the best products possible? Did they think we were going to just be fat, dumb and happy and not continue to win business? Did they think we were going to forget about taking care of our customers??? NO!

Who do they think we are? We have the best d*mn sales force in the world backed by the best engineers in the world—of course we will take any non-Windows OS serious. The thing about the leak that made me mad was not that we would legitimize Linux, etc. it's good in some places, we are better, and it's not very good in other places and we are much better, but they are a competitor and we will compete. What made me mad was that my friends—some of you and some of our customer's names where in that email and then available for all to see on the web.

That made me mad. I want you selling and supporting our products—not having to take random calls, emails, etc from the press and others and I know what our customers share with us is in confidence that we will keep it internal. I have no problem any random Linux person sending me hate mail, junk mail, adding my email address to every list server out there, you name it—that comes with the job, but I don't want my friends to have to deal with the same junk.

Ok, Ok, enough of that. On to some new things we are doing for you around Linux. Linux is out there in some of your accounts and you may not know it. The ground up nature of how Linux is introduced into our accounts means that we need to modify our traditional approaches of finding out about Linux in our customer base. We have to be more hands on and dig deeper in your accounts!

Many Linux projects in CAS and Depth accounts happen below the IT Manager/BDM level. It's crucial that you get out there with your TSP/SE/MCS folks and do actual walkthroughs in your accounts. Ask open ended questions; find out what they're evaluating for both key projects as well as smaller, more tactical projects. Ask about the 'connector' pieces—you'll potentially find Linux in these areas. This is a great way to not only find out about Linux, but also other IT projects that may include Novell, Sun, Oracle, and other competitors! If you are struggling with how to do this, then do the simple exercise of walking through you accounts data centers and when you see a Sun or IBM machine, ask what it's used for, if you see some strange servers you don't

what they are doing—ask what is running on them and take notes. I would like to challenge each of you to have these conversations with your customer as soon as you can. Oh—and you can bet anyplace IBM is talking to your accounts, they are saying Linux and switching to higher end non-pc systems. With the current economic times we are living in, just about every customer is looking into how they can get rid of those over-priced, legacy Unix systems and ride the PC economics wave. We need to be there when they are making these decisions and prove to them the Windows platform is the best platform for them across any aspect of their business. I want you to know just how seriously we're taking Linux here in Redmond. We're investing major efforts in creating easier processes and resources for you.

I. To start, we have expanded the in-field Linux Competitive Champ program and renamed it "Linux Insiders" Like the other TSP Champs programs, it has been changed to use the new TSP role-based database and will be ready to roll out with its new name at the Envision event in January. It is up to each regional TSP manager to select or assign each member; therefore, anyone wishing to become an Insider should see their manager to be signed up. Much like the support "communities" that define the Linux experience, the FCS team will strive to build a community to cooperate in winning business against Linux. By building a virtual team of field staff and corporate resources, we will enable the field to have one place to go for communication and competitive information. The Linux Insiders will have access to a centralized web site where personnel can request help, route issues, and share best practices that the entire field can leverage. This site, a restricted sub-set of the <http://infoweb/linux> site, will be accessible by all "Insiders," for items such as SLT reviews, web-casts, notes from conference calls and other sensitive information. If you have questions about the Insiders program, please email Kelly File of the FCS team at <mailto:kellyfi>.

II. Second, I'd like to announce the new Linux/UNIX escalation process that is being headed up by IMS Enterprise & Partner Group VPJ Charles Stevens' organization. Here's how it works: a. First, make sure you check out the latest additions to the Web sites: <http://infoweb/linux> and <http://infoweb/sundown>.

b. If you can't find what you need there, involve your local expert: the district Linux or Sun Insider (TSPs with Linux and/or Sun competitive responsibilities). These Insiders have the expertise and the resources to help you win. You can find your local Insider on the web sites.

c. If you still need help for Global, Strategic and Major accounts, the Linux/Sun Insiders (or your GM) can escalate the issue to the new corporate Linux/Unix Escalation Team. Let me emphasize that you need to work with your local Insider or your GM because they have direct access to this escalation team. The team is committed to provide an initial response within one working day. These guys have in-depth UNIX industry backgrounds and have been winning against UNIX and

Linux. The product development organization will be working closely with this team to make sure you have all the resources you need.

III. Finally, we're working hard to debunk the myths around Linux. We're approaching this in waves.

a. The first wave will attack the perception that Linux is free. To that effect, we'll have an independent analysis commissioned by DH Brown looking at a very popular topic these days—server consolidation. If you're not seeing this yet, you probably will. IBM is proposing to use Mainframes running many virtual instances of Linux as a low cost server consolidation scenario for file and print, messaging, and database activities. The DH Brown report will be customer ready and will help your customer understand just how competitive Microsoft is in this arena.

b. The second wave will be a full blown cost analysis comparison case study between Linux and Windows in a variety of usage scenarios (web, file and print, etc.) done independently by the analysts for us. ETA for this tool is in May and it will be a great tool to help you sell the value of Windows solutions over Linux. If you have any questions on this study, please email the mailto: ??nxteam alias.

You can expect us to turn up the volume on winning against Linux, as well as IBM. There is some great cross team work between PMG, SMG, and CMG marketing groups to ensure we're addressing your needs and believe me, that feedback goes directly to me and the senior leadership team so we can build better products to help you win against Linux!

Thanks,
Brian

Microsoft Confidential—Do not print, copy or forward this email and do not share this email with anyone outside the company. For internal use only!

PS: I used to run Exchange—so if you think I am not tracking this message, think again. Don't forward it! And if you have forward rules that have forwarded this message, then perhaps you should think again about forwarding internal email with those rules. I want to give you folks all the information I can in a very open way. If we continue to have bad apples or careless people out there, I will not be able to help you by sending this kind of information!

"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 <dchilll@qwest.net>:-)

MTC-00008897

From: Bonnie L. Irwin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:05pm
Subject: Opinion on Agreement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
The Department of Justice and Microsoft recently reached an agreement after a long

battle over antitrust practices. This agreement was equitable; both sides getting something each wanted. I was relieved to see the final chapter of a case that had costs millions of dollars and untold hours.

Now it appears Microsoft will have to share coding information with its competitors, and allow companies to promote its competitors' products unhindered. It is time to move on. We have spent enough time and money on this case. Microsoft is a solid, profitable, well-managed company, unlike some airline companies I know. As a grateful long-time user of Microsoft products, I find it ironic that those who seek to hinder innovation are often those folks whose secretaries have to print out their email.

Why is it that Congress bails out ill-managed companies, but yet goes after well-managed companies?

We need to let the terms of the settlement take hold and allow our IT sector to move forward.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Irwin
Bonnie L. Irwin
IRWIN MANUFACTURING
266 Highway 128
Wilson, WI 54027
phone: (715) 772-3120
e-mail: bonnie@irwinman.com
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00008898

From: cynthia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:10pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
TO whom it may concern, I sincerely hope the microsoft settlement is final and we can get on with business.
Let innovation continue.
CYNTHIA THOMAS
ATLANTA GEORGIA

MTC-00008899

From: Curtis Rey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 2:16pm
Subject: Competitive Impact Statement
I am writing to your team to voice some concerns I have about the proposed settlement in the Microsoft v D.O.J. case. I understand that you have, more than likely, received countless communiques regarding this issue. However, I feel compelled to write to you in regards to possible, if not probable, negative outcomes of the present state of the proposed settlement.

Mr. Cringley did an interesting analysis of the MS Settlement that I thought of particular interest to the Open Source community, and to the Department of Justice' team. But his opinions are not pertinent to just the Open Source community, but also relate to commercial and public interest regarding the competitive business and market arena.

"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 . . . 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. . . .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" (as in protocol and API 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." . . . Yet, when we look in the footnotes at the legal definitions for these outfits, we find the definitions specify commercial concerns only. "

"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."

My concerns, and the concerns of many others are that "... 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."

To be specific. Such companies as Sun, Oracle, not to mention IBM stand to loss greatly. I would like to remind the ATR-team that IBM alone has invested over \$1 billion in open source developments and products. Granted it is not the function of the D.O.J. to secure the profitability of private industry. However, correct me please if I am mistaken, but the purpose of the case was to curtail the illegitimate business practices of Microsoft and to afford a more level and competitive environment for private industry and business. Also, the cases underlying function was to further provide an equitable market place for the consumer.

I fail to see how it is expected that Microsoft will "meet reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business, ..." I believe a independent standard should be the criteria under which Microsoft may "certifying the authenticity and viability of its business [products and services]." This is because, having been found unanimously guilty of being a monopoly and all the aspects of the aforementioned, it is incumbent upon Microsoft to continue, in part or in whole, to conduct its' business as it did prior to any adjudication of guilt, penalty, or constraints.

Microsoft products, such as "Office", have become a quasi-standard simply by its'

ubiquity in the market place. And furthermore, Microsoft's ubiquity in the market place has been deemed to have been established by leveraging its' monopoly position in combination with unfair, and now deemed by "fact of law", illegal business practices. Hence, if such products and their underlying technology (in the form of source code, API's, protocols, etc..) has become the aforementioned "quasi-standard" does it not seem reasonable and prudent to formalize said standard and allow governance of this standard to be done by a consortium of independent agencies. And that the underlying technology involved in this standard be made open, insofar as to afford competing business and developers (commercial or research based) the opportunities to provide the consumers and businesses relying on these product with greater choice, stability, "security" and flexibility of products to choose from and implement.

I strongly urge the ATR-team handling the Microsoft case and settlement to redirect their efforts in refining the conditions, stipulations, and mandates of the agreement in order to provide a more suitable framework for the use and development of information technology and computing products and markets. I fear that in its' present form the proposed settlement will only further entrench Microsoft's position in the market place. And it will lead to further and costly litigation in the future.

Thank You.

Respectfully,

Curtis Rey R.N. B.S.N.

MTC-00008900

From: FABEYBABY@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:11pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern

I would like it known that I feel this issue should be settled as soon as possible. I believe that it is hurting the economy greatly and is a waste of tax payer dollars. Money that could be used in many other places where it is greatly needed. This is and has been one of the biggest scandals in the history of business. For the good of all people in the United States of America please settle this so Microsoft can get on with business. Business that helps our Nation stay on top.

Sincerely,

Shirley J. Fabian

MTC-00008901

From: Thomas Grayson

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:15pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

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.

Please send the special interest parties back to where they came from, accept the

settlement, and let Microsoft's competitors compete in the marketplace instead of the courtroom.

Sincerely,

Tom Grayson

MTC-00008902

From: Gadiant2PB@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:17pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

2165 W George Washington Boulevard

Davenport, Iowa 52804

January 5, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I have never agreed with the government's decision to sue Microsoft, and that is why I support the government's decision to settle this case. I am relieved to see this three-year long dispute resolved.

Microsoft needs to be allowed to go back to its own business without having to worry about court costs, and strategies to keep the products that they themselves invented. The company has already agreed to share information and help other companies compete, and this is more than enough to warrant the government ending litigation. By settling we can now see positive effects on our economy and technology industry. If other companies are concerned about Microsoft obeying the settlement, a technical review committee will make sure that Microsoft does.

Thank you for settling with Microsoft and allowing this company to devote its resources to more productive activities instead of litigation. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

Patrick Gadiant

CC:Gadiant2PB@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00008903

From: Donald A McMahon

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:31pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

I believe the current settlement agreement between Microsoft and the U.S. Justice Dept. is fair and just for the American consumer and Microsoft Company. I believe one of the main objectives of the U.S. Justice Dept. is to review policy of any company or persons doing business in the United States with the purpose to protect the American consumer against unfair trade or fraud. The current settlement with its required set conditions for the Microsoft Company meets the above objectives. Any revision as requested by those States and/or Company not in agreement would send the balance of the scale to one side, thus causing an unfair condition to the American consumer.

Sincerely,

Donald A. McMahon

MTC-00008904

From: Merlin DuVall

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:40pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir/Ms,

This message is probably one that would be agreed with by the majority of business owners world wide.

The user ability of a computer and software is all important in the daily survival of small and large businesses.

The compatibility of the programs in MS Office is all important, and is not duplicated elsewhere although they are getting better. That is competition at it's best.

The problem of hackers and viruses today would be magnified greatly is the windows information was made available for industry use.

Although the legal process is primarily concerned with domestic monopolies I would like to make the point that the world market is getting smaller fast, and even the events September 11th illustrate how we cannot help but look beyond the boundaries of the USA when considering what the ramifications are decision made here.

Foreign computer hard ware and soft ware manufactures are going to benefit most by any information that is made non proprietary by the court decisions.

Keeping technology in this country should be the primary concern. The settlement must take these points into consideration and not just the complaints of computer companies in this country that have put their ladders against the wrong wall as far as illustrating that they cannot operate their businesses without gaining ms proprietary information. Thank you in advance for considering my opinion.

Merlin D. DuVall CEO

The MERLIN Process

MTC-00008905

From: Mike Ervin

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:48pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In regards to the settlement I am unsure if this is supposed to be a letter of agreement to the settlement or a forum to complain about the way microsoft has integrated its software. But from my point of view I would like to air a complaint about the way microsoft has integrated its mail client "Outlook" with its instant messenger product. The Instant messenger is launched everytime I launch Outlook and I consider this to be a possible security problem and a resource hog. I have written to microsoft and they have informed me that thier is no way to separate them.

Please let me know if other avenues are available or if I have done this properly, thank you

Mike Ervin

MTC-00008906

From: Eric Rodriguez

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 2:46pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Usually I take a passive approach, but recent MICROSOFT ACTIONS ARE OUT OF ETHICAL LINES. I'm not sure if you've heard but MS is now advertising that you better have MS licenses or face steep fines and/or jail time. I'm not pro-SUN or pro-MS. I am for individuals and business to be rewarded fairly for intellectual and business properties, but I think all of these companies have scum

bag business practices. In fact because I work as a net admin in a Cisco/Sun/MS shop and have been working on upgrades I've recently had to deal with Sun no prime no vaseline fu\$% - Ng. In the Sun case the company went in search of needed upgrades. What MS is basically doing is saying that they are going to come to your place of business and force you to upgrade to their latest software platforms. Of course MS are not directly saying that. Their taking the moral stance of appointing themselves as the software Gestapo who claims every company is using MS software illegally. The company I currently work for is a softwares company and believes highly that all software developed for business initiatives should be paid for. If they didn't they wouldn't be in business. I've been working in the technology field for over ten years with the last six directly involved in information systems. I have worked for many companies within that period of time and I have yet to work for one company that did not make it top priority to have software licenses for all software in use by the company. What MS is doing is wrong and even though it is NOT in the public's best interest it is supported by our government.

Should we allow one company to force their software on the entire computing community? The government thinks so because they have sponsored Microsoft's business practices, which have made it so other companies can not compete with Microsoft desktop office and Internet software, which in turn will make these forced Microsoft upgrades policies possible. Maybe the government should allow every company in the world to come to your home or place of business to force you to show them receipts for every item that you have in your possession. If you don't have a receipt for the item in your possession than the manufacturing company can confiscate any and all items and can willfully impose a fine unless you buy the companies latest product. Looks like the government loves this idea...

CC:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC-00008907

From: Ty Vore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:19pm
Subject: I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the mar

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

It has to carry a competitive impact statement, explaining how MS damaged Be and the BeOS with its tactics. It should also say that the current "remedy" the DOJ is suggesting is far too weak and that it doesn't carry all areas.

I truly believe that competition in computer operating systems is a good thing. Watching the number of computers constantly being attacked by hackers makes me believe that more diversity means more security.

Ty S. Vore

MTC-00008908

From: jim (sparky)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

James E. Cliff Jr.
11808 Liming-Van Thompson Road
Hamersville, Ohio 45130
January 5, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

The settlement offered by the Department of Justice, and accepted by Microsoft, to settle the antitrust case seems to be about all that can be hoped for in today's political climate.

My personal preference would have been for the government to stay out of the mix altogether. After three plus years and untold millions it is time to end this case.

I have a great deal of trepidation anytime I see government mixing in subjects that can only cause technological stagnation and higher costs in the long term.

I am in support of the decision of the Department of Justice to settle this case. Please, end this case now.

Sincerely,
James E. Cliff Jr.

MTC-00008909

From: Bigtalk02@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the U.S.Gov't:

Please "get off the back of Bill Gates". Because of Bill Gates and the "Windows" operating system, he has made available to the common man and senior citizens in particular, the wonders of the internet and computers in generals. He has provided many jobs for many people and is blessing to America. That is what America is—most anybody can succeed is they work hard and have a little sense.

Those who are complaining don't really care about the rest of us—they only care that someone else is making more money than them and are jealous they didn't create windows first.

Thank you.

MTC-00008910

From: Virginia Vietz

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion a settlement between all parties would be in the best interest of everyone, Microsoft, the DOJ and most of all the consumers. Please don't drag this out any longer.

Virginia Vietz
4680 Wornath Rd.
Missoula, MT 59804

MTC-00008911

From: lcueroni(a)gate.net
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: As a computer user, and a concerned US citizen, I am delighted that the Microsoft case is near settlement. In my opinion a final settlement in favor of Microsoft is overdue. A favorable settlement would allow Microsoft to return fully to the business of developing more beneficial software and operating systems in the computer industry, and would certainly have a positive and stimulating effect on the US economy. I am fairly familiar with the nearly four year litigation against Microsoft, and at no time have I felt that there was a viable anti-trust case against them. Discussions with my computer literate, and non computer literate friends, overwhelmingly agree that a settlement is good for them, the industry, and the US economy. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Lee A. Cueroni,
Commander, USN (ret.) God Bless

America.

CC:lee
cueroni,MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00008912

From: yergan john
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to express my opinion concerning the pending microsoft case. The proposed settlement between microsoft and doj is more than fair to consumers. The best thing for consumers is to let microsoft move on, providing consumers worldwide with the kind of software it has been producing for years.

Microsoft competitors need to compete on their own, not with the aid of even more government intervention.

Microsoft is the best thing that has happened to the US economy in the last quarter century. It is time for everyone to move on. The already proposed remedies are more than sufficient. People like Larry Ellison and Scott McNeely have no interest in fairness. All they care about is winning. The state attorney generals who are not accepting of the doj settlement are responding to biased interests.

John Yergan

MTC-00008913

From: Rodger Small
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that Microsoft is displaying monopolistically in the marketplace. The fact there is no alternative PC operating system widely used is simple recognition of that behavior. Another indication of monopolistic behavior is no price competition in the marketplace. Win98se has been around \$90 retail even with the advent of two successive operating systems and one year later.

Microsoft has removed all competitors and has no need to be price competitive. I feel a fine of \$10 billion would not be excessive. The fact that Microsoft has four times that much short term cash available means something is lacking on the competitive side of things, and also on the DOJ side of things watching the marketplace too.

Microsoft makes good products, but they are too proud of their products.

Thanks.

Rodger Small

MTC-00008914

From: Linda Mattox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

As a longtime user of Microsoft products, I am very disturbed by the intransigence of special interests in resisting the proposed settlement. The continued unwillingness of some to accept a reasonable settlement is a drain on resources that could well be spent on other matters. The seemingly endless churning of matters is only good for the attorneys and the super-egos who can't seem to let go. It is time to move on.

Linda Mattox
2591 Perkins Lane West
Seattle, WA 98199
(206)283-9216

MTC-00008915

From: ARone10171@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

In accordance with the recently passed Tunney Act, this e-mail is a public comment on the Microsoft settlement. As an American citizen, I believe that prolonging the litigation against the Microsoft Corporation is not conducive to our country's economic wellbeing. I would like to see a settlement reached quickly and decisively. Such a speedy resolution is in the best interests of the public. Thank you for your time and consideration of public opinion.

Sincerely,
Allison K. Rone

MTC-00008916

From: tupler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:40pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Enough is enough!

Get off the back of MSFT and get back protecting the country. This whole suit was a pathetic attempt by the liberal, intrusive, Clinton-ites to stifle business and free markets. MSFT is NOT a monopoly, has NOT hurt consumers, and HAS wasted enough \$\$ (along with the DOJ wasting enough of MY tax dollars). If you dont like MSFT products,

dont use them!! There really are other alternatives!!

MY DEMANDS AS A US CITIZEN AND TAX PAYER: PLEASE END THIS NONSENSE NOW!!!

Regards,
Marc Tupler
Santa Fe, NM

MTC-00008917

From: Charles Karney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: Charles Karney
702 Prospect Ave.
Princeton, NJ 08540-4037
E-mail: charles@karney.com (not for publication)

To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001
E-mail: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Date: January 5, 2002
Re: Proposed Settlement in United States vs Microsoft

I have used computers professionally for the past 30 years. Currently I am employed by Sarnoff Corporation, Princeton, NJ. In this position, I have, for the past two years, coordinated the research computing needs of a start-up company, Locus Discovery, Inc. Locus Discovery uses novel computational techniques to design small-molecule drugs, and at the core of this method is software running on a 2000-processor computer cluster running the Linux operating system.

Linux has provided an incredible opportunities to deploy massive computing resources in an extremely cost-effective manner. This has resulted in great opportunities for America's small companies to realize innovative technologies.

In this context, I find that the proposed settlement in the United States vs Microsoft to be too narrowly drawn and to allow Microsoft too many opportunities to interpret the settlement to its advantage and to the detriment of the consumer.

The proposed settlement governs the market in desktop PCs running the Windows operating system. In most companies, this computing environment coexists with other platforms: Windows and non-Windows servers, desktop systems running other operating systems, handheld computing devices, etc. With the settlement of this case, the U.S. has an opportunity to foster as wide a range of choice as possible in all these areas of computing and to prevent Microsoft from extending its illegally maintained monopoly. This will allow U.S. companies choose the best tools for a particular job enhancing the overall competitiveness of the U.S. economy.

I believe that there is a straightforward way for the U.S. to ensure this while allowing Microsoft the continued "freedom to innovate":

Microsoft should be required to publish technical specifications for all its network protocols, all its data formats, and all its application programming interfaces. The specifications should be sufficiently detailed

to allow others to offer competing implementations and Microsoft should explicitly allow such implementations, providing, if necessary, royalty-free licenses to permit this.

Let me provide two examples:

(1) Microsoft should publish the specifications of the file formats using by its "Microsoft Office" suite. This will enable other office suites to read and write files in a compatible way. These office suites will likely be available on non-Windows platforms, and this will mean that consumer will not be forced to purchase a Windows platform merely because of the need to read documents produced by Microsoft Office. A consumer may still choose to use Microsoft Office (because he perceives that it provides to the best way to produce his documents) and he may choose to use Windows because of his perception of its benefits. However, he will now have a choice. This will be at no cost to Microsoft's flexibility to create good software. On the contrary, it will offer an incentive to Microsoft to improve the implementation of its office suite since it will now need to compete against comparable compatible products.

(2) Microsoft created a protocol called "Server Message Block" to permit files and printers to be shared between Windows systems. There is a free implementation of this protocol called Samba which allows the sharing to take place between Windows and non-Windows platform. This offers a clear benefit to consumers. Unfortunately, the Samba implementation is hampered by the need to "reverse engineer" the details of the protocol. Microsoft should remove this impediment by publishing the protocol and specifications of additional protocols, e.g., for user authentication.

Some of the restrictions in the proposed settlement are overly restrictive and should be removed. Two such examples are: (1) The proposed settlement limits the provision of information to companies which Microsoft considers to be bona fide businesses. This restriction would exclude the "Open Source" community which is responsible for Samba and Linux. Microsoft should make the information available to all, e.g., by publishing it on a publicly available web site, and the needed royalty-free licenses should permit implementations by anyone.

(2) The proposed settlement also allows Microsoft to avoid disclosure of information which would "compromise security". Unfortunately, this provision is open to abuse by Microsoft. Good security protocols can be (and are) published in full without compromising their security. This provision creates a perverse incentive to Microsoft to craft poor security protocols which rely on "security through obscurity", a rightly derided mechanism for computer security. By requiring the publication this information, the U.S. would be stimulating innovation in the entire computer industry. The situation would be similar to two other periods where the establishment of computing standards lead to explosive growth: the creation of the PC market by the publication of the hardware standards for PCs, and the creation of the world wide web by the publication of standards for HTML and the underlying networking protocols.

I urge the U.S. to reject the proposed settlement and to create one which will have a clear benefit to the consumer.

MTC-00008918

From: Anonymous
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 3:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have read through the settlement and agree. It seems fair without being destructive to Microsoft and outlines fair business practices and treatment of competitors, OEM's, etc. I would not have agreed with splitting the company or forcing it to release it's code, which would be unfairly advantageous to Microsoft's competitors.

I also think the settlement will help Microsoft's products and other software products to work better together, enabling computer software technology to advance at a faster pace, which, of course, is advantageous to consumers.

MTC-00008919

From: Repairman Jack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings,

The current Microsoft settlement is inadequate punishment for a company that leverage brute force and illegal tactics to gain control of 95% of the computer market with an inferior product. The notion that making Microsoft give away computers does nothing to punish them, it only allows them to market their products to an ever younger and impressionable consumers. Such a settlement only rewards this company and gives it free marketing rights inside schools.

I am part of a worldwide network of computer users that is working on getting and alternative operating system into the market place. Free competition is the backbone of the American way of life. Having a choice of what I will purchase and what I will use is my right as an American. By leveraging their market dominance against hardware manufacturers and other computer software makers, Microsoft controls the computer market. This much is known. There is no question of Microsoft's guilt. Now that they have been found guilty, they want to settle and get off with a slap on the wrist, even a reward for their crimes.

Microsoft should pay for what they have done, and the damage they have inflicted on computer users and companies that have suffered as a result of Microsoft's crimes. The DOJ should FORCE Microsoft to "play fairly" with other companies. A fair and just ruling against Microsoft should address the following issues:

*MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers and other software makers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users. The control MS has exerted it akin to forcing everyone to use their brand of pen and paper, and making it incompatible with every other type of pen

and paper available. This puts our private information into a box that can only be opened with a MS-brand key.

*The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that programs like WINE can be successfully ported to other OS. Almost every computer program written now can only be run on MS windows. Microsoft controls our data.

*The MS file system needs to be opened, so that users of programs other than Windows can access their data.

*The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to allow the option of a loading and/or booting an alternative operating system.

*This ruling must carry a competitive impact statement, explaining how MS damaged Be Inc. and other companies with its tactics. It should also say that the current "remedy" the DOJ is suggesting is far too weak and that it doesn't carry all areas.

Only by addressing this issues will Microsoft be truly held accountable for their actions.

Microsoft must be made to understand that they must run their business in a manner consistent with the laws of our country, and that if they want to continue to do business here, they must respect the right of consumers to NOT use MS products if they so choose.

Thank you for your time,
Nathan Babcock
St. Louis, MO

MTC-00008920

From: Tom Kirk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement and Free Trade

I agree with the settlement reached to allow Microsoft the 'right of freedom to innovate' and not have their hands tied in markets due to interest groups and government interference. It is the right decision for an open and free market and for consumers world wide.

On another note, I want to comment on the US government's sanctions (through countervail and anti-dumping actions) on Canadian softwood lumber industry. Rich interest groups in the US (with the US government support) are trying to place ARTIFICIAL economic barriers on Canadian softwood lumber entering the US. Lumber that is required for the housing in the US. This practice raises the cost of housing in the US and keeps Americans out of the housing market.

If the US truly believes in free and open markets (a comment that Americans make all the time), then interest groups should not be able to put barriers on products needed by the US. The US and Canada are the largest traders in the world and the sanctions imposed on the Canadian softwood industry is a slap in the face of a country that supports the United States of America. In my mind, the softwood lumber issue should be settled once and for all—a product that is part of the free and open market between Canada and the US.

Tom Kirk
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00008921

From: Pokey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion the Dept. of Justice case was a case where Microsoft's competition and the greedy lawyers used the tort system in an unwarranted attack on Microsoft. The only thing they accomplished was to temporarily destroy the technology industry and thus help precipitate the recession which this country is still in.

I believe the Justice Dept. case settlement was fair and that the 9 states still proceeding against Microsoft are just more of the same legal greed for money and fame, and that the sooner their case is dropped, the sooner this country and the economy will benefit.

MTC-00008922

From: Pokey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion the Dept. of Justice case was a case where Microsoft's competition and the greedy lawyers used the tort system in an unwarranted attack on Microsoft. The only thing they accomplished was to temporarily destroy the technology industry and thus help precipitate the recession which this country is still in.

I believe the Justice Dept. case settlement was fair and that the 9 states still proceeding against Microsoft are just more of the same legal greed for money and fame, and that the sooner their case is dropped, the sooner this country and the economy will benefit.

Marvin Weisbard
Tucson, AZ

MTC-00008923

From: W2EARS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

Please accept the government settlement and do not involve anything further with the states.

Thank You
Roger E. Wehrs M.D.

MTC-00008924

From: RosemaryL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the proposed settlement is fair to all concerned and should be ratified. The Tunney Act should be passed. The economy does not need the government fighting one of our most successful corporations. I urge you to settle with Microsoft, and let all companies compete and continue the innovations which propelled our economy for so long.

Thank you,
Rosemary Loven
Bishop, CA

MTC-00008925

From: Doug Singer
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/5/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to put this behind us, the citizens do not need government prosecuting companies because a few competitors feel they are unable to compete in the marketplace. Most of the states still pushing for a court date are doing so because they have a vested interest in one of the competitors of Microsoft. I as a consumer feel Microsoft has offered to me the products I want and need, at a competitive price. I would like to see my tax dollars at work helping to rebuild the economy, not trying to tear down a strong part of the economy. Enough is enough, please settle this now so we can move on!

Douglas C. Singer, MBA CIC
Hall-Conway-Jackson, Inc.
Insurance Brokers
206-527-2444

MTC-00008926

From: Jim Bode
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In regards to the proposed settlement, I am for it. Please do not give in to Microsoft's competitors and end up drawing this frivolous lawsuit out any longer. It is in the best interest of the consumer and the United States of America in general for this lawsuit to be settled.

Sincerely,
James J. Bode

MTC-00008927

From: Judy (038) Kevin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My husband and I wholeheartedly support the settlement toward Microsoft. Too many companies in our country have been derailed because of deregulation. Microsoft is an innovative, aggressive leader in the world of cyber technology. Continue to let this company blossom and create ways for all citizens to benefit from the headway that is already in place. Do not take the wind from beneath its sails!!!

MTC-00008928

From: Burd, Noreen (ING)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/5/02 4:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 7, 2002

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:

It is my understanding that the Department of Justice is now accepting public comment on the Microsoft settlement. I write in support of the proposal.

As our nation's economy continues to slow, many consumers are out of work and businesses must do more with less. I am concerned that if we continue to pursue the government's case against Microsoft, further tying the hands of technology, we will make it less and less attractive for investment in this industry. We cannot afford to have this

happen. We need to encourage investment in order to spur an upturn in the economy.

I believe it is time for the government to stop spending taxpayer's dollars on this case and allow both the judicial system and Microsoft to get back to work on more pressing matters. During this time of recession and national insecurity, the government's efforts could be better spent prosecuting criminals that truly endanger the American people and their economy rather than Microsoft.

I am certain that the regulations put forth in the decision will ease the government's concerns about a Microsoft monopoly and should allow Microsoft's competitors and consumers themselves some additional benefits. However further regulations and/or restrictions may result in inferior, expensive products and complicated internet access.

Continued litigation against Microsoft at this time would be unnecessary and ultimately harmful to the American people.

Sincerely,
Noreen Burd
39 Blackwater Road
Penacook, NH 03303

MTC-00008929

From: Wagner Investments
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please be advised that I agree with the proposed settlement. The case has nothing to do with protecting the consumer, and is strictly driven by competitors who can or could not compete. In the age of a global economy the US need as many powerful and large companies as possible. Look at the mess telecom is in due to the break up of AT&T.

Ronald E Wagner
Barbara F. Wagner

MTC-00008930

From: Trg129@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

My vote goes to settle the Microsoft case as proposed. Further litigation is costly, time consuming, anti-big business, and does not represent our democratic society.

Thank you.
Terry R. Glass

MTC-00008931

From: YBHW@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For gosh sakes, get off Microsoft's back. Microsoft's competitors are and have been trying to use antitrust to do what they couldn't do in the market place. Maybe Microsoft does dominate the operating system market. But how did they get there—by having the best product. Does the government penalize free enterprise? Looks that way.

Approve the settlement and let Microsoft get on with their business.

Boyd Wilkes
13911 Aspen Cove Drive
Houston, Texas 77077-1521

MTC-00008932

From: Paul Tholfson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'd like to see this suit settled as quickly as possible. I don't understand the entire logic behind it. I have repeatedly read that the purpose of anti-trust legislation is to protect the consumer public. Yet all the objections to the settlement proposal seem to be based on protecting the competitors of Microsoft, at the expense of the consumer.

I've been a CPA for thirty years. During this time our firm has gone through the entire range of business software, beginning with Wordstar word processor, Visicalc spreadsheet, DBase-2 database, as well as the CPM and Apple operating systems. We made a number of costly migrations along the way, including Wordperfect, Lotus 123, R-Base, and Harvard Graphics. Eventually, and for the past six years, we have settled on all Microsoft software: Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint and Windows operating system.

The point is that we did this for three very good reasons, and without any coercion:

- 1.. The MS products, while initially inferior to their predecessor rivals, gradually improved and overcame them.
- 2.. As more and more of our clients and other people with whom we do business apparently made the same choices, it became easier and easier for us to share files, send e-mail, etc.. It's hard to imagine how we made it in the days when there were at least half a dozen different and incompatible word processors, spreadsheets and databases available. In fact, the one relevant area which MS doesn't dominate is accounting software. Here, we're still faced with having to deal with over a dozen different packages, to the detriment of our clients.

3.. The cost of the software is negligible when measured against the utility and ability to improve our own efficiency.

Some of the demands I see being made by the plaintiffs and their witnesses seem absurd. The compatibility benefits resulting from Microsoft's dominance in office software is an obvious advantage to all users. To return to the relative chaos of multiple operating systems, and word processing and other office software in the hope of creating what some university economists see as a theoretically beneficial competitive environment, makes as much sense as requiring each telephone company to use its own incompatible communication system, or each railroad to select its own rail gauge.

This case should be settled as expeditiously as possible. If the US and Microsoft have come to an agreeable settlement, the Court should accept it and not prolong this case any further.

Paul Tholfson
2626 South Park Drive
Bellingham, WA 98225-2524
360-734-9343
ptholfson@netos.com

MTC-00008933

From: James Bach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my humble opinion, the settlement with Microsoft is fair and equitable. Give it a rest, and let MS get back to supplying the products that people want to buy and use!

Of course, I don't think the DOJ should have been picking-on Microsoft in the first place it is just another example of the sore losers of the country (Netscape, Lotus, Oracle, etc.) whining and complaining about not being able to compete and needing the government to come-in an "level the playing field" like affirmative action. Again, another case of someone having a dream, working hard, making a product (or products) that people want to buy/use, and then being punished because they were TOO successful. Certainly a lesson (to NOT work hard for fear of being persecuted by those who don't/can't) I do NOT want to teach my kids.

Did Microsoft strong-arm OEM suppliers to install his operating system and web-browser on their newly-sold systems? Yes. Did he FORCE them to do it? No. They DID have options and alternatives. They could have offered other operating systems, or even NO operating system. They could have charged a bit more per system to sell it with JUST Windows and NOT Internet Explorer. There was nothing that Microsoft did that prevented computer makers from selling systems configured how they (or the buying public) wanted them. There is nothing in Windows that prevents users from installing other office suite or web-browsers. I've been using Netscape for years and years. Netscape and IE both co-exist quite nicely.

I've built my own systems from scratch, and I could (and did) put ANY operating system, office suite, and/or browser on them that I wanted. I chose Windows because it is easy to use, and ALL of the software in the world (that I want to use) runs on Windows. I chose Internet Explorer for web-browsing because of some of it's better features/capabilities. I chose Netscape for e-mail because of some of it's better features/capabilities (and because there are fewer viruses and hacks against it), instead of MS Outlook. Yes, I use MS Office (Word and Excel) at home, but I could have bought Lotus or WordPerfect. I chose Office because that's what I use at work, and I do NOT want to learn two different packages. But, that was MY choice. Nobody put a gun against my head. I could have installed LINUX or OS2, but then I'd only be able to run about 5% of software I desire.

The computing world is better-off because of Microsoft, precisely BECAUSE of the benefits that a centralized, core, standards-based OpSys can provide. At work I'm forced to use a UNIX workstation.

Unfortunately, UNIX is not UNIX is not UNIX; it is different from platform (machine) to machine. In the UNIX workstation world you are FORCED to use the UNIX (and the related "Window Manager") that is shipped by the hardware maker. I have an HP machine, so I have to use Hewlett Packards' (gag me with a fork!) version of UNIX and "Desktop Environment". The software engineer who sits across from me uses a Sun workstation, and has to use Solaris (luck him!). Because there is no "core" or "standards setting" entity in the UNIX world, UNIX applications suck when it comes to

consistent look/feel, modus operandi, and data-exchange between applications. Copy and Paste of formatted data??? What is THAT??? Doesn't exist on UNIX. All you can copy/paste is raw ASCII text. Jeez, thanx. Because Microsoft dictates how the Windows environment works, on ALL platforms that run it, the vast majority of PC applications look/feel/act/behave the same (or VERY similar). Because Microsoft dictates how the Windows environment works, virtually ALL applications can copy/paste formatted text and tabular or image data back/forth between themselves. I hate the "Tower of Babel" that exists in UNIXland so much (as do my fellow engineers in my company) that we've been pushing our IT folks for years to throw-away UNIX in favor of WindowsNT. Our dream is starting to come true.

Engineering management, who PAYS for the computers in our department, finally told the IT folks to buy Windows2000 machines, and to exchange our UNIX software licenses for NT licenses. UNIX has been around longer than Microsoft, and UNIX IS more stable (crash-proof) than Windows .-.-. however, because there is no centralized core of "standards setters", it has never, and never will, become as user-friendly and easy-to-use as Windows. I don't mind having to reboot my system every once in a while if while I'm using it I'm much more productive than the rock-solid, stable system!

James C. (Jim) Bach
Westfield, IN
Ham Radio: WY9F

MTC-00008934

From: Joyce
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please DO NOT let a few special interest people create more problems for Microsoft AND the American consumer. We DO NOT need more litigation in this case. Let the settlement take affect as stated. This country has enough economic problems. We do not need to cater to special interest people who care only about themselves and not America as a whole.

Thank You.
Sincerely,
Joyce P. Johnson
5031 Regalo Dr.
Pensacola, FL 32526-1602

MTC-00008935

From: GaardeGang@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone. They have a great product, great customer support, and have done wrong. They are good business people, and deserve whatever fortune they have gained.

Gaardegang@aol.com

MTC-00008936

From: The Dews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 5:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Dew
5564 Ribbon Rose Drive
Jacksonville, Florida 32258

January 5, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Competition is the driving force behind a free market capitalist society. Without competition the entire system is unworkable. I believe that the antitrust lawsuit filed against Microsoft almost seriously threatened to hinder competition within the information technology market. I was relieved when a settlement was finally reached in November.

The agreement drafted in November is quite positive. Some of the beneficial terms in the settlement are; the settlement provides for the increase in competition among software companies by prohibiting Microsoft from entering into any agreements with third parties that would restrict the third party to distributing exclusively Microsoft software, the settlement further lends to an increase in competition by requiring Microsoft to share interface capabilities with other competitor software companies.

Clearly, this settlement promotes competition, and competition is good. By not overly restricting Microsoft or the information technology market, this settlement is going to be beneficial for the economy. No changes need to be made. I urge you to keep the settlement in its current form.

Sincerely,
Robert Dew
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00008937

From: Mauijpn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle the case as now the court has ruled. Microsoft has been subject to too much hassle from competitors and their representatives. James P. Nieuwkirk.

Email at <mauijpn@aol.com

MTC-00008939

From: DanRoloff@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 5:12pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
To Justice Dept.,

I want to encourage the government to settle the lawsuit with Microsoft as soon as possible. Please except the Tunney agreement. Thank You.

Dan Roloff
945 Hillandale Dr. E.
Port Orchard, WA 98366
Danroloff@AOL.com

MTC-00008940

From: PAUL KIRTON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft case pending

Microsoft has done more good than harm. Ease up on them and allow a great company to operate as they have agreed too.

Paul A. Kirton
Managing Director
Kirton & Associates

MTC-00008941

From: Jcdomingue@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 5:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

First let me state that the trial which led to a requirement to break Microsoft into some number of companies to be an absolute travesty of Justice. I do not see Microsoft to be any more of a monopoly than IBM was in the late 1960's and 1970's as regards to mainframes. Were any actions ever taken against IBM? Whatever happened to UNIVAC, XEROX, and a myriad of other mainframe builders? I consider myself a data processing professional, and not only do I agree with the proposed settlement, but I would be in favor of dropping all charges against Microsoft. If you believe Microsoft is a monopoly how do you explain the successes of Apple OS and LINUX.

Jules C. Domingue

MTC-00008942

From: DEELEN123@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 5:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I know of nothing Microsoft has done wrong. Please just leave them alone and get on with the next case. I hate your waste of our tax money like this. How can our next innovator stand a chance in such an atmosphere?

Len Rutledge

MTC-00008943

From: FlyingNuts
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 5:43pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern,

I have watched the wonderful things Microsoft has done for our Industry, our Government and our lives over the last 20 years. Were it not for Microsoft's inovative products we would still be in the dark ages in home and business computing.

The objective of any business is to beat their competitors. However you overlook the merger of Netscape and AOL, and the merger of Time Warner and AOL. You let the oil companies merge and monopolize our resources.

Stop the insanity and leave microsoft alone. You have cost the Country "billions", and bankrupted the small investors in your "take down of the microsoft and tech companies."

It's time to set aside this case and let wounds heal. Let Microsoft advance us into the new century!

Douglas Harper

MTC-00008944

From: JOY BROWN
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 5:51pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice,

We feel the proposed settlement for Microsoft and the states is as just as can be expected and would like to see it proceed to a conclusion. To try to make the settlement tougher or prolong it more would not be in the best interest of the economy or the consumers. Sincerely,

Joy R. Brown
 Lila M. Brown
 1526 Thomas St. SW
 Olympia, WA 98502

MTC-00008945

From: GEORGE PORZUC
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:03pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 5951 Price Road
 Milford, Ohio 45150
 January 5, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my opinion and to thank you for settling the Microsoft suit. It is a step in the right direction. I believe that the settlement is more than adequate. It forces Microsoft to share proprietary information that will allow other companies the more easily implant their software on the Windows operating system. The settlement will also create a technical oversight committee that will ensure Microsoft behaves properly for the duration of the settlement. The government should take no further action on this matter.

This suit has had a very negative impact on the marketplace and me personally. We are in midst of a recession—in my case a depression. Now is the time to rebuild our economy by supporting American businesses. We should reward those who contribute to our economy. After all, our nation was built on principles of free enterprise, and since I have been out of work since July, I want to get back to being a contributing member of society.

Thank you for resolving this issue. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this matter.

Sincerely,
 George A. Porzuc

MTC-00008946

From: Alan Simkatis
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:06pm
 Subject: Settlement

To whom it may concern,

My husband and I both feel strongly that this suit against Microsoft has been going on long enough. It is not in the good of the country for us to be hanging our own out to dry. It is time to settle this suit, and see if we can't help ourselves to help our economy, in the process. Please, settle now!

Sincerely,
 Anne & Alan Simkatis

MTC-00008947

From: Joseph Wang
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:24pm
 Subject: Settlement for microsoft

Dear Person:

I do think it is for the everage americian citizens interest to settle the case with Microsoft inc. God bless American

Joseph Wang

MTC-00008948

From: Martin Caron

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:21pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

1.. MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

2.. The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

3.. The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

4.. The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with

HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

In other word, i want microsoft to have right only "inside" their software but allow all API, audi/video codec, file format etc... to be public. They can keep the source to themself i don't care (i don't want their buggy software anyway) but all programing hook and protocol should be public and available under a NDA if it pose security problems.

Martin Caron, hurted: shareholder, consumer, hobbyist, programmer, student by Microsoft practice.

MTC-00008949

From: JBareuther@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:23pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I'm totally against any further legal action against Microsoft. This action has been perpetrated by lawyers and liberals that want to destroy our vibrant market economy.

This action will not benefit the consumer nor the economy. I strongly urge the court to bring to a close this damaging and wasteful fraud on our legal and economic systems.

MTC-00008950

From: Herb Himmelfarb
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/5/02 6:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement Sirs,

Mrs. Himmelfarb and I believe the proposed settlement fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting the illegal conduct of Microsoft, promoting competition in this industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains. Perhaps we are just whistling in the dark, what with there being a Republican, therefore business oriented, administration in the White House. However, we do believe that Justice should triumph over naked greed.

In a case of this magnitude, what is best for our country as a whole should prevail over what has become convenient. It is our hope that Justice will succeed.

Cynthia P. Himmelfarb
Herbert S. Himmelfarb
615 19th Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-2713
(503) 375-2934
himby@open.org

MTC-00008951

From: OWENSJOWENS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:26pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
I agree with the settlement.
Joyce Owens

MTC-00008952

From: kathy baker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
PLEASE END THIS CASE WITH THE
SETTLEMENT IN FAVOR OF MICROSOFT!!!
PLEASE!!!!
Thank You,
Kathy Baker

MTC-00008954

From: Jerry Kreps
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:31pm
Subject: Respect for law will disappear
One outstanding result of this sham settlement will be that it will legalize Microsoft's illegal behavior, which will lead common citizens to conclude that the law is merely an inconvenience that can be ignored, if not circumvented.

Even after the conviction was upheld in circuit court, the DOJ seems bent on grasping defeat from the jaws of victory by agreeing to this sham settlement.

Will Microsoft be punished for their previous crimes or the crimes cited in this conviction? NO!

No punishment is proposed. Microsoft gets to keep their ill gotten gain, while lessor criminals pay grievously in fines, penalties and prison time. This is injustice defined! Apparently wealth now puts one above the law. All it takes is enough cash to buy high powered attorneys and grease politicians.

Will Microsoft be restrained from continuing their illegal behavior? NO!

In fact, this sham settlement LEGITIMIZES Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior toward the only segment of the software market that has been even slightly successful competing against it, the Open Source segment. The sham settlement give Microsoft the right to determine, by its own definitions, what is a business and what it not. No superior intelligence is required to realize what Microsoft will do with that power. Why would the DOJ agree to such a stipulation? The whole purpose of the litigation was to break the monopolistic business practices and level the playing field for ALL players. Now the DOJ is helping Microsoft to jack up Microsoft's end of the field to unreachable heights, ensuring their illegal dominance. It is as if the Feds began brewing beer to GIVE to Al Capone's speak easyies, and destroy his competition, as punishment for Capone's illegal manufacture and distribution of alcohol. Or, as if the Feds not only gave the Mafia a free pass on extortion, racketeering, prostitution, and the numbers, but gave a

blind eye and tacit approval to 'hits' on their competition.

Does the settlement contain any power of restraint or enforcement? NO! Microsoft gets to pick one monitor and have a say in the second. That effectively splits the monitors decision process and renders them powerless to make critical support decisions. How effective would the war in Afghanistan be if half of President's War Council were Taliban? The 'teeth' merely extends the toothless settlement two more years. Two more years of nothing is still nothing. This one condition alone proves that the settlement is a "FIX", as sham.

The net result of the phoney settlement is that the American Citizens will no longer support the law in jury rooms across the country. Why should they convict lesser criminals when the bigger ones walk free with DOJ HELP? They will see the DOJ not as helpers of the helpless, but as aiding and abetting lawlessness. This settlement, if upheld, will prove to the American people that the DOJ is really DOJ Inc. and it reduce the American legal system to the status of 3rd world kangaroo courts run by and for corporations and politicians for their own greedy purposes. Recent political payoffs, such as the DMCA, and court decisions which make Microsoft's EULA a one-way document (they can sue the consumer, but the consumer can sue them for breach of contract) have already disgraced the judicial branch.

The forced resolution toward this sham settlement to alleviate the grief and economic woes of the nation is laughable. Microsoft has already pillaged our economy for billions and billions of profits made possible only by illegal monopolistic behavior. This settlement will merely put the country at the mercy of even more outrageous economic extortions. Even now Microsoft is proposing unbelievable licensing fee structures that would be impossible if the consumer had access to an alternate choice. But, since the OEM agreements with Microsoft, along with their secret side agreements, prevents the OEMs from even putting alternate operating system on their PCs in dual boot mode, or even putting icons to other software on their Windows desktops, other browsers, operating systems and software have no easy access to public markets.

So, how does it feel to be a pawn? Maybe Watts will give you an idea of what happens to a country when a citizenry loses respect for the law because it offers no redress for grievances. Or even worse, Argentina. The most favorable reason for supporting this agreement would be if one held stocks, options and retirement funds mainly in Microsoft. But then, this would be a conflict of interest wouldn't it?

For your even suggesting such a despicable settlement I am not so respectfully,

Jerry Kreps
521 West Garber Avenue
Lincoln, NE 68521

MTC-00008955

From: Daniel C King
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Daniel C. King
5531 Burnham Court
Fort Myers, Florida 33903
January 5, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

My name is Daniel King and the purpose of this letter is to express my concern about the Microsoft Antitrust lawsuit. I understand that a settlement on this case has been reached and that public opinion is being taken into account in the final decision. I hope to see this settlement reach a conclusion as three years of legal action is quite adequate.

In this case, it seems difficult not to mention the AT&T issue. Like AT&T, Microsoft is a very successful business and it is disconcerting to see that these days, success is punished rather than rewarded. I would like to see this case settled in a timely fashion. Microsoft has agreed to respect the terms of the settlement as well as fair competition and has even already taken action to release a new version of Windows that will be more amenable to working with other companies' software.

It is obvious that Microsoft is more than willing to abide by the rules of fair competition and I believe that this settlement is in the best interest of the public. I appreciate your interest in the public opinion.

Sincerely,
Daniel King
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00008956

From: RFC-822=Derek—Stevens/Intalco/
Primary@intalco.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:22pm
Subject: MICROSOFT CASE

DEAR SIRs:

WE ARE WRITING ON BEHALF OF THE MICROSOFT CORP. WE BELIEVE IT IS HIGH TIME THIS THING GOT SETTLED AND PUT BEHIND US. WE THINK OUR ECONOMY AND OUR COUNTRY HAS SUFFERED ENOUGH THROUGH THE LAST 3-4 YEARS, NOT TO MENTION THE PLAINTIFFS. WE THINK THE SETTLEMENT IS A FAIR ONE FOR ALL INVOLVED, THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

SINCERELY,
DEREK G. & LATRICIA J. STEVENS

MTC-00008957

From: William Upham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I believe the proposed settlement agreement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft is in best interest of both the public and the high-tech industry.

This lawsuit has dragged on far too long and needs to be settled soon before still further damage is caused to the U.S. economy and consumers.

With the country now on a war footing, the last thing it needs is the ongoing uncertainty

regarding the outcome of this lawsuit. It is in everyone's best interest to settle this case and settle it soon.

Bill Upham
Americas Channel Communications
T/L 542-1205, (972) 280-1205
FAX: 542-1980, (972) 280-1980
upham@us.ibm.com

MTC-00008958

From: John Renk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:50pm
Subject: Leave Microsoft alone and let the economy be on with it. Microsoft never let

Leave Microsoft alone and let the economy be on with it. Microsoft never let me down and gives me updates when I need them. You will never get that from another software company.

The government went after Microsoft because they did not donate enough to the Democratic Party.
johnner@att.net

MTC-00008959

From: Francesca Ball
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

In a world where there is the AOL/Time-Warner monstrosity, it is quite beyond me how someone like Microsoft could be considered to practice unfair business practices. I have worked with Netscape on my computer, and frankly, it takes over, worse than Explorer ever did. My ex-husband downloaded AOL for his computer. Just AOL... And got in the deal the automatic usage of Netscape. It took several clicks of a mouse and a couple of deep searches just to turn off Netscape. Frankly, it's quite easy to switch 'off' Explorer. And, Microsoft doesn't monopolize the 'instant messaging' craze. It disturbed me greatly when AOL purchased ICQ... And barely even announced it to the world.

In this world, the United States... Microsoft is playing as fair a ball as the AOL/Netscape/Sun group of companies that made the attempt to gang up on the best programs on the planet.

Just my two cents
A concerned US Military Member
Francesca Ball
Misawa AB, Japan

MTC-00008960

From: Orlene McCarthy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 7:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please Please for the good of the country settle this dispute once and forever This is the best company in the world and you are trying to destroy it WHY? The economy started downward the minute this happened it is so sad what has happened. They have created more jobs and made the technical industry.

What are the younger generation thinking work hard and if you do well the govt. gets involved and try's to destroy you. You should be backing them in any way possible not trying to destroy them.

Live, Love, Laugh

MTC-00008961

From: Allan Corrin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:01pm
Subject: d.o.j. settlement
TO THE D.O.J.

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE MICROSOFT CASE WITH THE DOJ NEEDS TO BE FINALIZED . THOSE STATES THAT ARE KEEPING

THIS CASE OPEN ARE NOT ACTING FOR THE PEOPLES INTREST. I REQUEST IT BE FINLIZED

ALLAN A. CORRIN REEDLEY CA.

MTC-00008962

From: Ken Dacey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs,

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair and in the best interests of all parties involved. Taxpayer money should not be spent in any further proceedings. Allow the remedies to set in and the market and consumers will do the rest. It's time to stop catering to Microsoft's competitors.

Thank you,
Ken Dacey

MTC-00008963

From: gope mirchandani
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:12pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The very fact DOJ has setteled the case putting the necessary and fair penallities,my views may appear superfluos.However reiteration by general public should only convince the authorities that any further changes will delay the settlement,adversely affecting the sinking economy and interests of pubic at large.

In the free economy, local, state and federal governments must do what benefits the mijority.

gope mirchandani

MTC-00008964

From: MatrixDLJ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement of the Microsoft litigation is O.K., albeit unnecessary in the first place. We urge approval; avoid wasting resources on further litigation.

Doug & Jan Jonas

MTC-00008965

From: Mabarreiro@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:25pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
DEAR SIRS:

I AM NOT A STOCKHOLDER OF MS I AM AN INMIGRANT-ENTERPRENEUR PLEASE LEAVE MS ALONE AND LET THE MARKET RULE MAKE MONEY OUT OF MICROSOFT THROUGH THEIR EVER-INCREASING PAYROLL TAX, OR PROFIT-TAXES, NOT THROUGH BACKWARD UN-AMERICAN PENALTIES.

MARCELO BARREIRO

MTC-00008966

From: Barm644@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the microsoft settlement and allow them to continue with their good products and let the economy flourish. Microsoft is a great company and have done wonderful thing for the technology industry.

MTC-00008967

From: Felicity Marsh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is in the interest of the general public for several reasons:

1. The whole dispute has been about political interference at the behest of companies who needed to use politics when they failed in the market place.

2. Much of this dispute is an effort to prevent Microsoft's best product coming to market as competitors know the significance of what is taking place and fear they cannot keep up.

3. The public is feeling the consequences of this maneuvering of the market and is certainly not benefiting.

4. Microsoft has not used its supposed monopoly to hike prices and has kept its products reasonably priced.

5. microsoft works with most companies to get their products working well together , it is generally in Microsoft's interest to have many products working well together as that inevitably means more users total.

6. Microsoft has given access to education and information and communications that would be out of reach of the vast majority of the public worldwide. It may not have invented all the current technology but it has brought it to market and given the public access at a very reasonable price.

7. to have a multi layer system with different companies trying to destroy competitors by preventing the intermixing of products would cause confusion with less savvy computer users, a waste of much money by people buying products that are quickly obsolete, or do not work with some other products, so interrupting the flow of information.

8. The economy is in no shape to continue with a dispute which holds up the range of new products which depend on Microsoft's operating system to be of use, the sale of which will help rev up the economy.

9. The Microsoft products are aimed at making life easy for the consumer. It is to the consumers benefit to have features added to the operating system which are easy to access without 'having' to go out and seek other products. More experienced users have plenty of scope for using other products on the operating system, and those other companies are themselves vigorous competitors, some of whom endeavor to cause difficulty in using Microsoft products

10. Microsoft products will obviously fit well together as they are designed to, and this is good for the many consumers who are not so computer savvy and able to seek other options.

11. Other products such as Real Networks music and video products are easily

downloadable and work well for anyone who chooses to use that in preference to Microsoft's products. In fact many sites including Britain's BBC front page and news uses Real networks as its default media and I have not been able to choose to use Microsoft's media to view BBC videos, so much for choice for the consumer, I see no objection raised to this and similar bias against Microsoft.

12. America generally has gained from Microsoft's vision. it would behoove the economy to not interrupt that vision. it has not seen much of a challenge from within the states and the last thing you want is a foreign challenger taking the lead, as this economy could then lose its world lead as others have in the past when they became complacent or squabbled among themselves!

member of the public
felicity marsh

MTC-00008968

From: R.C.
To: Microsoft ATR,piu@doj.ca.gov
@inetgw,attorney.gener...
Date: 1/5/02 8:36pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Monopoly

I have been using personal computers for 14 years and have seen Microsoft outmaneuver its opponents in the marketplace. I have seen the use of Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt by Microsoft to excellent advantage. The finding of the court in the settlement were common knowledge 6/7 years ago and much commented on in the computer magazines, at least until Microsoft got control.

I urge you all to hold firm against the bully from Redmond and to pursue the monopoly until it is no more.

Thank you.
R.C. Johnston
7674 Rotherton Way
Sacramento CA 95823

MTC-00008969

From: Tom Salvador
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen,

I am not a legal authority. I cannot say what is and what is not a monopoly. What I do know, however, is that Microsoft purchased the legal rights to the "wheel." This is not their fault.

A lot of businesses went along for the ride and profited. Some businesses did not and they are the ones who believe Microsoft is wrong.

The public of which I am a member, also profited. Because of Microsoft, we could easily exchange data.

We did not have five different operating systems. We all spoke the same language. As DOS was upgraded and later Windows, the charges were minimal. Twenty dollars, thirty dollars at the most, sometimes less. Windows a little more, but not out of the range of the buyer. Did the competition want them to give out the upgrades at no charge? Their products were certainly not free!

Did Microsoft violate any laws or did they practice tough business procedures? I don't know.

Did they cross over the line and hurt the public. I don't think so. It is my understanding that our system of justice is to protect the citizens and not to help one business over the other.

MTC-00008970

From: Arlene Marie Levy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Tunny Act settlement is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

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. Stick with the settlement.

MTC-00008971

From: Peter357@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

stop wasting time negotiating and start litigating!

MTC-00008972

From: Ralph Hahn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After reading and reviewing the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case, I feel that sufficient hearing have been held.

Those organizations that are pursuing further litigations are greedy and have no just cause for purposed injuries.

I feel the comprehensive agreement reached by the Federal Government and the nine States is fair and should be settled and concluded on that bases.

Ralph and Estella Hahn

MTC-00008974

From: Del
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I would like to say it is time to stop flogging the dead horse.

End this disruption of free enterprise, don't continue to pacify the whiners.

Enough is enough!

D. M. Townley

MTC-00008975

From: bleimeister
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:33pm
Subject: Microsoft

Enough is enough, as an American Tax Payer its high time to settle with Microsoft ! Microsoft products have helped more individual citizens, small businesses and developers of new businesses than any other software company.

With Microsoft's "User Friendly" software [the best available] countless millions of Americans enjoy and personally benefit from the resources available from their computers and their corresponding access to the internet.

Microsoft has brought a "new world" to a vast number of Americans. We must allow them to continue to invent and bring new beneficial products to market.

Our Country is now at war and we can no longer afford to seek frivolous, politically induced, judicial remedies for manufacturers of inferior products. Let the disgruntled competitors produce something better—and let the market place [the everyday buyers and users] make the ultimate decision as to which product will help them the most.

Thank you,
W.C. Bleimeister
Hilton Head Island
South Carolina

MTC-00008976

From: Kyle Waters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The current settlement is too little too late. Please make Microsoft open up their proprietary formats for their office suits and hold them responsible to past and current rulings by putting in place observers who can comment directly to the public and the press not just a federal judge or committee. It is us the citizens of this country who brought the lawsuit against Microsoft through our state governments. The observer should report to us.

Kyle Waters
Utah

MTC-00008977

From: Joseph Alcott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:43pm
Subject: govt protection?

This is always a way of generating political capital to finance campaigns and to line legal pockets of legal lobbyists.

May your blessings be eternal.
Joseph (Senior) Alcott

MTC-00008978

From: Michael Graham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:58pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please end the litigation against Microsoft—the settlement that has been agreed to is in the public interest.

Michael Graham, Ph.D.
235 Pinetree Lane
Richland, WA 99352

MTC-00008979

From: Willis S Lemmon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 9:59pm
Subject: prolonged litigation

Prolonged litigation is a nice word for the lawyers involved. I doubt that it will help any taxpayers who eventually pay their fees. Microsoft is an innovator supplying US with benefits much too valuable for chastisements by "government employees".

MTC-00008980

From: Robert Daniel Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:00pm
Subject: MS Settlement Issue—PLEASE
resolve and settle as soon as possible!

Greetings,

In accordance with the pending DOJ litigation matters under review, please be advised that I wholeheartedly feel that it is in the best interest of the general public, the US economy (including the world economy as well), and private industry also that the US DOJ expedite a swift and effective settlement of this current litigation with Microsoft as soon as possible.

In fact, I feel that this lingering cloud that the DOJ has had over this matter has had one very detrimental effect on our economy, and should be resolved a.s.a.p.

Your consideration of this appeal is very appreciated.

Sincerely,

R. Daniel Smith,
rsmith47@hotmail.com

MTC-00008981

From: Dennis Myers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:17pm
Subject: Judgement of Microsoft

I am writing this e-mail due to a sense of duty and alarm. I feel it is my duty as an American and internet user to express my grave concern that the DOJ has given up in a battle that was needed to be fought to the maximum. I express my alarm that a company such as Microsoft could be allowed to continue to operate a damaging monopoly under the guise of "just being competitive". I will make two points in this comment: 1. Microsoft is a monopoly in the most damning sense. 2. They must be brought under control.

Microsoft has been in a position to place their internet browser on every desk top computer sold with windows OS. No choice it's there. They have also obviously required that if a Computer manufacturer or reseller places Windows OS on the computer then no other operating system can be on that computer at the time of sale. I have no proof of this as in a copy of a contract but the DOJ should if they have done their homework. This requirement would lead to a breach of contract if broken and most small computer makers would not have the resources or energy to fight MS.

Microsoft professes to embrace the XML open source protocol, and yet they embed it in HTML so that only a Microsoft browser can properly read it? Microsoft must be brought under control to allow the internet, computing in general and the world to progress as it should without being shackled by a proprietary system that only the "corporate programmers" are allowed access to and the privilege of improvement. Their are other systems out there, UNIX, Linux, OS/2, and MacIntosh systems that are just as good but don't even stand a chance of competing if MS is allowed to continue with their practices.

I am obviously not a lawyer nor in a computer related field, but I am very concerned that the U.S. will not reign in the MS Monopoly as has been done to other monopolies in the past. Please do not let the slap on the wrist, that it appears Microsoft will get, stand.

Respectfully,
Dennis Myers

Citizen of the United States of America

MTC-00008982

From: Gerald Adcock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 10:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the interests of all concerned and the American economy this lawsuit should be settled now. Special interest groups AND the justice department have cost the American economy enough. Through the years Microsoft has risen from a fledgling company to a dominant force in our economy. This has been accomplished through good old American free market competition and Microsoft has put out a product that left the competition behind. To punish a company and long with it the economy and small and large investors alike is un-American.

Jerry Adcock,
Orange Park, FL
Full Moon

MTC-00008983

From: Oberkosten@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a former Seattle resident and admirer and mother of a former Microsoft intern and mother in law of a Microsoft worker, I am very concerned about the government involvement in a successful company. If it is the competitors that are unhappy with the legal settlement, why is this not finished with?

Competitors are always trying to get ahead of the game and are envious of success. The government got involved in the telephone company and look where they are now. Let Microsoft be innovative and don't "cramp their style".

Julia Peterson

MTC-00008984

From: JLCORTESE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern, I have reviewed the planned settlement of the Microsoft case and find it reasonable and fair. I speak in favor of continuing as planned.

Thank you.
Dr. Jack Cortese.
Corpus Christi, TX.

MTC-00008985

From: AToll1211@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:27pm
Subject: RE: MICROSOFT

LEAVE THEM ALONE. GET OUT OF THEIR WAY. THIS IS AMERICA'S GREATEST COMPANY WHAT IS THE GOVERNMENT DOING TO IT'S BEST AND MOST PRODUCTIVE? SENDING A MESSAGE THAT IF YOU GET TOO GOOD WE'LL PUNISH YOU. IT'S ANTI-AMERICAN.

AGAIN LEAVE THIS COMPANY ALONE! AND FOR THAT MATTER—ALL COMPANIES.

MTC-00008986

From: RLopez9153@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/5/02 11:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not delay any more on settling this case. It is too costly to the economy.

Thanks

MTC-00008987

From: Mike and Sandy Wenberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I just wanted to express my satisfaction with the settlement that the DOJ has worked out with the Microsoft Corporation. I think the remedies are fair and do an equitable job of penalizing the company without tilting the scale too much in favor of its competitors. Frankly, I've been concerned that the DOJ has been acting too much on the behalf of Microsoft competitors, who through mistakes of their own, found themselves at a competitive disadvantage, and not the American consumer. The settlement that has been worked out has alleviated that concern. Now it's time to settle this and let these companies get back to competing.

Sincerely yours,
Michael C. Wenberg
1160 Magnolia Dr.
Walla Walla, WA 99360

MTC-00008988

From: Eric A Nordin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:51pm
Subject: United States v Microsoft

The problem here is that a universal operating system is not necessarily a bad thing. Government interference in the market place is not necessarily a good thing either. It is not uncommon for the heavy hand of governmental power to actually bring about an undesirable outcome, though good was intended. If the Windows operating system is so bad, then why does the government express no confidence in the ability of the market place to spawn a remedy? Linux is an alternative to Windows and enjoys growing acceptance as well as ongoing development. The government also seems to ignore the fact that personal computers can be set up to use multiple operating systems. So what is the problem? The charge against Microsoft which characterizes the integral nature of Internet Explorer as somehow illegal completely fails to recognize an important fact; every time a browser is launched a user chooses to click on an icon. My computer has icons for three different internet browsers and I am free to select whichever one I choose. To say Microsoft has a monopoly because their browser cannot be removed is simply ridiculous.

Another absurdity in these proceedings is that nowhere does the government explore the benefits consumers reap from an integral browser. This case is a total waste of taxpayer money and should be dropped altogether. It is an embarrassment to our country to have conducted this trial in the first place. Such a suit is yet another hallmark of a truly misguided and ignorant administration. The current administration would do well to get as much distance as possible from the

prosecution of this case. It is not something to be bragged about or pointed to as an example of responsible discharge of public duty.

Eric Nordin
17191 Langford Blvd.
Prior Lake, MN 55372
952-447-2785

MTC-00008989

From: Nina Snyder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 11:59pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I understand that the Department of Justice is receiving comments from the public about the Microsoft settlement. I believe that the settlement, though hard on Microsoft, is more than fair to their opponents. Finally putting an end to this issue will be good for consumers like myself who greatly benefit from the creative design of Microsoft's products. I also believe it would be injurious to our national economy if legal action were to resume against Microsoft. Hopefully, this will not happen.

Sincerely,
Agatha N. Snyder
435 Crossbeam Circle E.
Casselberry, FL 32707
nina@cfl.rr.com <mailto:nina@cfl.rr.com>

MTC-00008990

From: Dariusz Jarzynski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a Microsoft software user, and a citizen of this great country, I support the US government and Microsoft efforts to settle the current lawsuit to the benefit of the consumer. I strongly support this settlement which allows the best and most innovative corporations to continue to develop the best software programs as a result of their creativity, their consumer-oriented research and their willingness to contribute to develop a more efficient work environment.

Darek Jarzynski
Issaquah, WA

MTC-00008991

From: Rick Girdner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
Please do whatever is necessary to end this Microsoft fiasco. The time and energy could well be spent in other areas.

Thank you,
Rick Girdner

MTC-00008992

From: Charles Coon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:09am
Subject: An End to the Microsoft Case

It is time to end the seemingly never-ending legal actions against Microsoft. The initial legal action by the Department of Justice accelerated the technology downturn, eventually resulting in our current recession. The settlement in place now is more than adequate, and the economic recovery depends on a quick termination of the unjustified continuing actions by some states.

Thanks,
Charles Coon

MTC-00008993

From: Susan Sheridan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't believe that anti-trust laws are constitutional. The government should not be involved in economics. Please repeal the Sherman Antitrust laws.

Susan Sheridan

MTC-00008994

From: ACORNK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:21am
Subject: Please Allow Microsoft to Operate Without Penalties

Capitalist America is supposed to boost Capitalism, not destroy it. Many of us profit when Microsoft profits. Employees, customers, investors all benefit. This action should not have been taken to advance the competitors who instigated it. Settle it now and let Microsoft and its beneficiaries get on with their business.

Pat and Fred Carlson,
766 Calle Pecos,
Thousand Oaks, ca 91360.
acornk@aol.com

MTC-00008995

From: Fabiano Moya
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Att. To Whom it May Concern
As many others Alternative Operational Systems that have been hurt by the monopolistic policies of MicroSoft. We received the request from the headers of various projects to manifest ourselves and let our minds be known, so here it is, agreeing to the last ii and jj to the requests being made by many users all over the world.

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

*MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code license or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

*The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

*The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

*The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

MTC-00008996

From: Stu Adler
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/6/02 1:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough! Microsoft provides excellent product support at no charge, while their competitors don't even know what the term means. Microsoft has EARNED their position by savvy marketing, customer support and reasonable prices. The agreement with the DOJ was fair. What the states want is the destruction of Microsoft so that their home town losers can form a new monopoly of high priced products with lousy service. This is NOT in the best interest of the community of users!

Stu Adler
14914 Mayall St.
Mission Hills, CA 91345

MTC-00008997

From: Jack O'Leery
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:45am
Subject: settlement

B.Gates, et al:
MSFT uber alles!! Don't give up the ship. The whole US is sick and tired of the DOJ hammering MSFT with no real objective other than to inflate the egos of its zealot lawyers. All the best, and happy new year!! OPHTH1, an admirer.

MTC-00008998

From: Ben
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a Microsoft "Consumer", as well as a Microsoft shareholder in my IRA. I am retired and a Social Security recipient. And I guess that this is my only opportunity to say what I think re the DOJ vs. Microsoft settlement. So here it is.

If Netscape, Sun Microsystems, et al, think that they have been "screwed", how about me? As I recall, Netscape joined with AOL in a deal that paid Netscape appx. four billion dollars. Now isn't that a sad story! But I had Microsoft stock in my IRA for my retirement days (I am now 73 years of age), and I lost 50% of my retirement fund within days of the time that Judge Jackson, extremely biased against Microsoft by anybody's standards, decided to rule that the company that has done more for the U.S. economy than any other in recent history should be split apart. My retirement funds, along with those of thousands of others, were lost apparently because Microsoft's competitors opted to pressure Congress (Orrin Hatch, for one) and the Department of Justice to make their businesses successful, rather than to achieve comparable success through their own brain power and effort.

I owned my own small business and no Attorney General, lawyers or courts helped me. My company provided good products and good service. And when I installed a Microsoft system (that makes me a "Consumer") I did not feel cheated. I was happy with the product I purchased and am still happy with the equipment I still use at home in my retirement years. But my retirement prospects are not nearly such a pretty sight due to this litigation that is going on and on and on.

The proposed settlement appears to be a good one for all concerned. My

congratulations to both the Department of Justice and Microsoft for that. But what right do those still opposing the settlement have to harm me further for their own selfish interests? Let them get to work, just as I did (on a smaller basis, of course), and make it on their own merits instead of sponging off of someone else's intelligence and hard work.

In this time of national stress this country and all of us need all of the incentive our economy and our stock market can get. Our President is right! Our economy needs a stimulus—and it won't come by cow-towing to limited selfish interests by such as those refusing to accept the proposed settlement and vowing to pursue further litigation. Let's get on with what's best for our country, our elderly (myself and my wife included), and all others with retirement programs of all ages, our military men and women, and those who are just plain happy with their Microsoft products.

Enough of this particular hassling and litigation. Bill and Melinda Gates have set an outstanding example by donating over a billion dollars of their personal income (undoubtedly mostly from Microsoft profits) to very worthy charities throughout the world. How rewarding it would be if some of these litigation-happy competitors would do likewise with even a small fraction of the big bucks they are contributing to big-name trial lawyers!!

God Bless America.
Respectfully Submitted,
S. Ben Riva
Bellevue, Washington .

MTC-00008999

From: COLLINSF3@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would just like to say that Microsoft should not be broken up by any means. It's not the jurisdiction of our government to define competition as total equality. It would be punishing people who have worked hard to create a product that people like and buy. The government does not have the right to say who prospers or define one's earnings. Now that Explorer is free it forces Netscape to be original, provide the consumer with something new that Explorer does not allow. It forces other people to create, to strive. You do not punish Gates for being successful. Apple computer still has a wonderful product which they sell. The government suppressing individuals ability to create is everything the framers of our constitution would go against. Gates has the right to his property. This is the equivalent of if I owned large amounts of land so I could sell it at lower prices hurting real estate companies, so the government took my land. That says that my property is not mine, but rather everything I own is up to the discretion of the state to take. We do not live in a socialist government, and I fear that this decision would be another attempt for the government to define our lives as a collective regime to help one another. Look the government cannot violate ones property rights. If this decision goes through then that says that the government can control ones property which is strait communist no doubt.

There's no violation of the law unless Microsoft hurts the rights of another. The constitution says we as individuals have the right in the pursuit of happiness. That does not mean happiness is guaranteed to the individual. Neither does it mean the state has the right to define the level of happiness we're allowed. Please please please do not break up Microsoft.

MTC-00009000

From: The Talleys
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:52am
Subject: microsoft settlement
I agree with the terms of the settlement.

MTC-00009001

From: fred@seahawk.localdomain@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:30am
Subject: Comment on proposed settlement

Microsoft continues to misbehave. I have become aware of additional problems with the company that were not even addressed in the initial complaint. Specifically I have become employed in Korea and it seems that the Korean keyboards are designed to only switch to Korean if used under the Windows operating system. Such behavior is proof that the company will do anything it feels it can get away with while others are not looking.

Please open your eyes to reality! Do you really want Microsoft software running on your systems? You'll permit them to sabotage the government through their own software and operating systems if you don't watch out! It seems also that somehow the hidden hand of Microsoft is at work with various sites on the web, getting them to switch from Real Player which is cross-platform compatible to Windows media player for streaming media files which require the user to connect through Windows, despite the fact that numerous Unix web browsers exist.

You've got to force them to reveal source code to ALL who require it to create applications to work with Microsoft-generated files (WMA, AVI, etc), and not just to companies that operate for profit but open-source developers as well, many of whom do what they do in order to build up credentials to be hired as experienced programmers. (Or do you want to continue to import H1-Bs?)

Sincerely,
Frederick L Artiss

MTC-00009002

From: Jwelsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You're wasting time and money. Microsoft has advanced civilization and the "sharks" are looking for a pay day. You're attempting to punish genius and reward those who refuse or can't recognize it.

JWelsch
CC: 'Microsoft'

MTC-00009003

From: Linda Paul
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

Please, please for the good of this country and our economy, let's accept the Microsoft settlement and stop further litigation. This should have never happened in the first place. Our economy needs a strong microsoft. This settlement is in the best interest of us all. NO MORE LITIGATION.

THANK YOU,
Linda Paul

P.S. I am not even a PC user—I prefer Macs. See, we all do have free choice. No one twists anyone's arm to buy or use just one companies goods.

MTC-00009004

From: ARTISTLSH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets settle this case as decided and move on!! Laurie Snow Hein

MTC-00009005

From: Michael Korbekian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/5/02 1:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle the Microsoft case and move on with business. Microsoft has been innovative in providing consumers with the products they desire. A few non competitive companies want to hold Microsoft responsible for giving consumers what they want. In light of the tragic events and the slowdown in the U.S. economy, its time to settle this case and move on to more important things.

MTC-00009006

From: scottmc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel the current settlement will not go far enough. There needs to be made a level playing field where other Operating Systems will get a fair chance at being preloaded on PCs from the OEMs. I worked for Zenith Data Systems from 1989 to 1996 when they shut the plant down. I saw Microsoft Products being installed on almost every PC going through the factory. I was told that even WHEN we installed another OS such as Novell on servers, that Zenith was having to pay Microsoft a fee based on the number of PCs sold with or WITHOUT Microsoft software on them!! What BS! Now here is a good chance to make Microsoft and the OEMs out there for that matter, allow PCs to be preloaded with BeOS (perhaps from Palm Inc or BeUnited's group), Linux, Novell, or one of the many others who could step up. Gobe has released an office suite which is very comparable to Microsoft's Office product, but I fear that it won't get a chance due to Microsoft power to control the OEMs and the PC world in general. Please do something to change all this.

Scottmc
Scott McCreary
2389 McBride Lane Apt 82
Santa Rosa CA 95403

MTC-00009007

From: CaptainHealey@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:20am

Subject: TUNNEY ACT

IT IS TIME FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO STOP PERSECUTING MICROSOFT. WHY DOES THE GOVERNMENT WANT TO STOP INOVATION AND INGENUITY? BILL GATES AND HIS ASSOCIATES HAVE CONTRIBUTED MORE TO THE WELFARE THAN ALL OF CONGRESS PUT TOGETHER. THERE IS NO MONOPOLY— JUST GOOD BUSINESS DONE IN THE AMERICAN WAY. I RESENT HAVING MY TAX MONEY SPENT IN THIS MANNER. GET OFF MICROSOFT'S CASE. CONGRESS SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED FOR GIVING 1.6 MILLION DOLLARS TO PEOPLE IN NEW YORK WHO LOST SOMEONE IN THE ATTACK ON 9/11. STOP THE PERSECUTION OF MICROSOFT NOW. LET IT GO NO FURTHER. MARTIN L. HEALEY

MTC-00009008

From: jody yanovich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:50am
Subject: MS vs DOJ Settlement

I beleive the settlement that you have reached with Microsoft is fair and the courts should accept it as the best option for all parties involved including the 9 state AG that are still holding out. There is no question that the remaining 9 state AGs are continuing this litigation for the best interest of Microsoft's competitors and not to benefit consumers. Please ask the court to accept your settlement as the best option for consumers like myself, the economy, and the company.

Thanks

MTC-00009009

From: Bill Dunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:53am
Subject: Microsoft settlement 5 Bayberry Drive Amherst, NH 03031-2513 January 2, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft, I am writing you this brief letter to urge you, the Justice Department, and the federal government as a whole to suspend any further deliberations on the Microsoft antitrust case, adopt the proposed settlement and lay this long suffering to rest. The settlement fairly addresses the major complaints of Microsoft's competitors. Computer manufacturers will have rights to configure Windows in order to promote non- Microsoft software programs. The company will design future Windows versions in a manner to make it easy for software developers to promote use of non-Microsoft software. These and many accommodations will surely open up the IT field to greater competition and innovation.

I simply think it's time to allow Microsoft to get back to work. Please continue to support your department's settlement plan, and don't let the special interests sway you toward another round of selfish negotiation and opportunistic exploitation of a large company.

Sincerely,
William Dunn
wdunn@xtddl.com

CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00009010

From: Tomkare@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement reached with Microsoft, while it represents an unnecessary and dangerous incursion into the marketplace, is much more fair than the actions that could have been taken. I use Microsoft's products and respect that company's competence in its field. Therefore, my wife and I are very much in favor of the current settlement (the Tunney Act) and wish to see it completed and gotten out of the way so this company and others like it can get on with business.

Thomas D. and Karen K. Gensler
412 Sunset Bay Rd
Hot Springs, AR 71913

MTC-00009011

From: Randy Marcoline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:08am
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement Is EGREGIOUS and GISGRACEFUL to the Citizens of America!!!!!!!

You all should hang your heads in disgrace. You are a DISGRACE to the justice system!!! on you!!!!!!!

Signed,
A Law Abiding American Businessman.

MTC-00009012

From: LBIFAN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:10am
Subject: (no subject)
enough already.....you are hurting the economy with this consumers are not hurt....just lousy companies that don't make better products.microsoft has made the computer Easier to use. enough already

MTC-00009013

From: Rob Judd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'll keep this brief, since I'm sure you're getting lots of mail. Microsoft's handling of competing products has destroyed my business, which was developing software for BeOS (the Be Operating System). Be, Inc found they could no longer market their product in the opressive environment set up by the monolith of the industry and turned up its toes last year. While many of us are trying to revive the BeOS, our real projects fall further behind.

If Bill Gates and his cohorts manage to weasel their way out of this case, I'll be very disappointed. All right, there's no point having power unless one can abuse it to some degree, but this has gone too far, too long and hurt too many. I should note that both myself and an associate in another electronics business have also been hurt by Microsoft's voracious acquisition of high-tech hardware companies, including those in the chip manufacturing and audio areas.

Rob Judd
Judd Electronics
Melbourne, Australia

MTC-00009014

From: Rich Riffle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do what you can to ensure that the Microsoft litigation settlement continues on schedule. Now that there is an agreement in place, let it be finalized. Further delays won't benefit consumers like me.

Thanks.
Rich Riffle

MTC-00009015

From: Jim Hassan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the time has come to end all of the litigation. An end-user such as myself is not benefiting at all from this suit! The only winners in all of this are the lawyers who will reap millions. Why is the DOJ wasting our taxpayer money on something as ridiculous as this? All of this has absolutely no impact or benefit to end users! So end it now and start doing something of importance.

MTC-00009016

From: C. Gamester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

The following briefly summarizes my opinions and conclusions concerning the Microsoft anti-trust case(s), from my perspective as a consumer, shareholder and patriotic American. I believe they are shared by many others like me. It is time to end the legal war on Microsoft for the following reasons:

1. The attack on Microsoft by the Reno/Klein DOJ was misguided from the start. American anti-trust laws are meant to protect consumers, not businesses losing in open market competition. Consumers benefit when business seek to "level their competitors" not when governments seek to "level the playing-field." Protect the businesses and you get Europe.

2. I believe the attack on Microsoft was motivated to a significant degree by issues of political contributions and personal career aspirations. Microsoft failed to lobby government entities on the same scale as its competitors. Some politicians collaborated with Microsoft's competitors, who they considered constituents. I believe others saw Microsoft's balance sheet as a "giant honey pot" and wanted to "wet their beak." I believe some State Attorneys General sought to further their personal careers via the publicity that came with pursuing a lawsuit against Microsoft.

3. The results to date have been profoundly damaging to the U.S. economy and millions of savers and investors. The financial losses in the retirement accounts of millions of workers and retirees, while incalculable, must far, far outweigh any possible benefits to consumers in general. How have consumers benefited at all?

Just stop it!
Charles Gamester

Mesa, Arizona

MTC-00009017

From: lee innocent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am definately in favor of the settlement. It is a fair one and we need to get on with the business of rebuilding our economy, of which Microsoft is a big part.

Sincerely,
Lee Innocent
Suffern, New York

MTC-00009018

From: Bob Olsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:09am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

TWIMC,
It is my opinion that the Microsoft Settlement should be settled as proposed by the DOJ. Further litigation by special interests, that only weight the competitive discussions in the favor of those entities that have inferior products, must be stopped. Let us, the users of these products be the judge (in the free market) of which products best suit our needs and pocketbook. DO NOT PROLONG litigation any further and stop the stifling of innovation.

Martin R. Olsen
Heavy Computer User
49 Stratford Place
New City, NY 10956-4666

MTC-00009019

From: Albert Lowe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement To Whom it may Concern at the US Dept. of Justice: Re: Microsoft Settlement

While I think the final judgement is fair, I also think that this lawsuit should have NEVER been brought against Microsoft in the first place. Especially considering the bias of the prosecuting attorney and the presiding judge in the original case.

It was quite obvious that the prosecutor was out to get Microsoft from the very beginning. That is not the job of a prosecutor. His job is to seek justice, whether criminal or civil. The type of justice the original prosecutor was seeking was criminal in HIS intent. His intent was obviously to destroy Microsoft.

While I'm sure that something needed to be done so that Microsoft did not unfairly punish OEM's, I think it could have been worked out in a less expensive manner to U.S. Taxpayers. This lawsuit will ultimately cost the consumer in increased prices for Microsoft product to cover the expense of the trial, and to US taxpayers for the government's cost. As a US taxpayer, I am upset, angry and appalled at the U.S. Government's total disregard for my fiscal well being. But I guess I should be used to it by now. For at least 80 years, the Federal government doesn't really care about the individual Citizen, only the country as a whole.

But when you diminish me, as an individual, do you not diminish the whole? Settle the case as is, and find different ways

to attack my wallet. And For Your Information, I am not now, nor have I ever been an employee of Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Albert Lowe (Out of work PC Tech)
4400 Edgar Rd. Trlr 29
Leslie, MI 49251
517-589-6962

MTC-00009020

From: Lyle F Neff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to move on and put this Microsoft litigation behind us. The self serving States Attorney General have spent enough taxpayers money for their own glorification. Accept the settlement, end the litigation, and let us return the business of business. This litigation, started by the Clinton administration, has been a disaster to the economy of the country.

Thank you for your consideration.
Lyle F. Neff

MTC-00009021

From: Bobby Schulman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:31am
Subject: Comment on the Settlement with Microsoft

I have followed the government action against the Microsoft Corporation since it began. When the settlement was finally reached, I was surprised and quite pleased with the method by which the matter was concluded.

This settlement which benefits school children is a wonderful idea. Further, I believe it's a thoughtful and very positive way to penalize an offender. We Americans recognize that there are very few priorities more important that our children's future. The penalty while costly to Microsoft, becomes a very rich blessing for the children ... wrapped inside of a valuable lesson about our laws. I salute those of you in the Department of Justice who helped to craft this settlement. Please continue your fine and creative work.

Robert Schulman
4425 NW 65th Ave.
Lauderhill, FL 33319

MTC-00009022

From: M. Cassidy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:51am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern: We believe the Microsoft settlement is fair and should not be further drawn out with more litigation by the Government and special interest groups at the expense of American Taxpayers.

J and M Cassidy
Marilyn Cassidy
780 Brentwood Point
Naples, Florida 34110-7910

MTC-00009023

From: Jerry Kreps
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:53am
Subject: Internet will become Microsoft's pesonal property

An additional comment:

The Internet became practical when a CERN researcher developed the HTTP protocol and put it into the public domain. Had he patented it instead, the HTTP protocol would have joined the numerous other networking protocols that languished. The others were languishing because they were controlled by patents. Folks were not interested in paying a fee to be able to use a network that they already owned by virtue of the taxes they paid which allowed our government to develop the precursor to the internet.

HOWEVER, THE INTERNET IS STILL NOT SAFE FROM CAPTURE by greedy corporations that have no respect for the law, i.e., Microsoft. Protecting a protocol, so-called 'intellectual property', as apposed to a tangible invention, with patents will absolutely kill it dead, as the numerous but unused networking protocols prove. A patented protocol gives the holder of the protocol absolute power of monopoly over the users/adopters of that protocol backed by the law. The patent holder can charge whatever he likes and can blackmail or put anybody using it out business if he likes—you can't reverse engineer it and you can't code around it. Very few companies will willingly choose such an option.

It was this patenting madness, motivated by greed, which stifled the development of the Unix operating system, and it's desktop, the CDE. These events allowed a new software company, which relied heavily on OPEN SOURCE software made available to the public domain by the Regents of the University of California, to take advantage of the greed gridlock and develop a product called 'Windows'. Even today, Microsoft borrows heavily from the Open Source community, without returning anything of value, to extend the functionality of its software at little expense to itself. With clever marketing, aided by illegal contracts and business practices, Microsoft was able to develop something the Unix companies couldn't, a monopoly. In the early days, purchasers of Windows could move their copy of Windows from an old machine, which they were selling or discarding, to their new machine. Or, if they had two machines they could use a single copy of Windows on both machines. Or, they could sell the PC and the Windows on it, to another person. Or, they could give the PC and Windows to a charity. When Microsoft became secure in its monopoly position it changed the lease to FORCE users to purchase a NEW copy of Windows if they bought a new machine. or purchased a used one.

They forced OEM's to sell a copy of Windows with each PC they sold, EVEN IF THE CUSTOMER DIDN'T WANT IT, a blatant violation of the Sherman—Clayton Anti-Trust act, and one so obvious it is amazing that the DOJ never bothered to enforce the Act against Microsoft, but chose a lame 'bundling' issue instead. HAD THE DOJ DONE ITS JOB the monopoly would not have existed and consumers would have had other Operating System options which would have allowed them to avoid the "Microsoft Tax".

The only company that can benefit from software patents is one which already has a monopoly eg. Microsoft. In this case a protocol such as .Net can be forced onto users, developers and deployers by virtue of Microsoft's desktop monopoly, and this monopoly can be extended to servers and Internet by using software patents to exercise monopoly control over everyone who talks to any desktop, include Linux KDE desktops, all servers and the Internet itself. This is Microsoft's big plan for the future.

This sham settlement will assure the success of Bill Gate's 'dream', which will become our nightmare. The Internet will be divided into two camps, one controlled by Microsoft, and the other controlled by tyrannical governments. The hard part will be trying to tell the difference. Doubt this? Then consider that in a blatant attempt to control and/or manipulate the political climate Microsoft has unilaterally removed certain politically incorrect words from the Microsoft Office Dictionary. Or, consider that Microsoft released an 'upgrade' to Internet Explorer (their browser) which automatically rewrote web pages on the fly, inserting Microsoft URLs and ad banners, without the permission of the site creators. You are a third party and have a site selling a software application that competes with one of Microsoft's software products. When visitors display your website ads for Microsoft's product appear on/over your own product on your own site. Such is the power of a monopoly. What's next? Releasing an 'upgrade' to Microsoft Money that certain stocks from being added to a portfolio? Controlling online political discussions or contents of emails?

Communist governments control their citizens directly by decree. Fascist governments control the cartels which control the citizens. The difference is cosmetic. Your sham settlement will allow an uncontrolled cartel, Microsoft, to control public discourse and commerce on the Internet by giving ownership of the Internet to Microsoft, lock, stock and barrel, via its ".NET" protocols.

Jerry Kreps

MTC-00009024

From: H Tavassolie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:01am
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

As an American citizen I would like to settle this prolong and somewhat unfair litigation that has been proven of harming the public interest. Microsoft innovations has created enormous public benefit, and facilitated our life. I give you an example, I purchased Microsoft word, but my computer didn't have enough memory, after a month, I had a chance to return it, the store said "We usually do not accept this late soft weir return, but because of Microsoft policy we will accept it". The price was near \$400.00.

Therefore, I urge you and ask you to please settle this unfair to public litigation as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

MTC-00009025

From: GFoye@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:05am
Subject: microsoft settlement-from citizen
Issue of microsoft/government lawsuit: 01-05-02

As a tax paying citizen I feel the time is overdue to settle the microsoft vs government lawsuit issue. I cannot comprehend the reality of the suit regarding so-called microsoft monopoly when monopolies of far greater caliber are being perpetrated by giant industries that will have a far more significant and sinister impact on people of the world. What about the creation of monopolies formed by union of various components of the medical system, pharmaceutical and petroleum giants and energy companies? What efforts are being made to control them?

Personally, if I never had a computer I could live without it. My life would not be affected! But, my life is being effected right now, and more so in the near future by cost and availability of pretroleum products, energy sources and worst of all, horrific increase in cost of medical services and medications. These industries, through costly lobbying, control the political system of the U.S. which is not in the best interest of people like me—the people who pay the bills.

Gerald Foye
9857 Old Ridge Road
Spring Valley, CA 91977
GFoye@AOL.com
619-465-2094

MTC-00009026

From: Steve Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,
I feel that the settlement with Microsoft is a very fair one. There will be many individuals and companies that will write to the contrary but I think that there are many things influencing them other than what is fair. Microsoft has been a major force in our economy in the past and if given the chance may contribute in pulling us out of this down turn.

Thank you,
Steve Robinson
srrobi1@pacbell.net
4958 Monaco Drive
Pleasanton, CA 94566

MTC-00009027

From: Russell Caldwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:17am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:
I'm not happy with the settlement you made with Microsoft. It seems like you are allowing them to do the same business practices that brought on the litigation in the first place. Please do not allow them to squash the competition the way they have in the past.

Thanks.
Russel Caldwell

MTC-00009028

From: Ted Leeuwesteijn
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/6/02 11:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ,

"I am part of a worldwide network of business that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code license or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too. The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions. The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS and lots of others in the past.

Personally to my business MS has endorsed to get me to be a OEM dealer providing i won't sell other or at least load up other OSes onto my systems. So theorectly i would not be able to serve my clients wishes to the fullest just because MS won't allow me to. Well in my opinion it's up to the client to decide which services and tools they like to use and not the ones MS want me to upload on a PC. There are several cases known about simulair issues, i name a few Hitachi has encountered it as wel as compaq.

Now if i buy a car at a certen dealer, the manufacturer may advize in the brand and type of fuel i will be charging it but in the end it's certainly my choice which one to choose from as long as the fuel complies to their recommendations and technological specs.

And then not to mention that they are distributing unsafe and unstable software and so to speak a less superior product than many others o know and have used. They knowingly abuse this so called features to rule the world on a certen market.

If a car company do such a thing(GoodYear) they get the largest trouble at their adress but it seems that MS can get away with anything in that area. I like to refer to a few articles which may have escaped your attention and i like you to study them.

<http://www.byte.com/documents/s=1115/byt20010824s0001/>
<http://usvms.gpo.gov/findfact.html>
<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/4/22670.html>
<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/archive/21410.html>
<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/4/21347.html>
<http://www.kuro5hin.org/story/2001/10/23/13219/110> and some information about beos
<http://www.gcn.com/vol19-no23/reviews/2637-1.html>
With the kindest regards and respect,
Ted Leeuwesteijn

managing director
BeOS oem dealer for the Netherlands & Europe.

MTC-00009029

From: Owie Jaggi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:19am
Subject: microsoft

If microsoft is charged then so should AOL
I believe microsoft has been unduly charged. I have tried to use aol programs while subscribed to microsoft; they either would not work or they screwed up my MS programs. I believe this was intentional on the part of aol. On the other hand MS has given away more free software programs to the public than any other provider; especially aol. People who have a little knowledge of cp.s choose MS because they know it is a much better product with with better service; while aol has a clientel of mostly people who have very little or no knowledge of computers. But then it pays to advertise (which aol does a lot of) which MS does little of ;like on public tv. When aol users gain a little knowledge about CP,s they usually switch to MICROSOFT. I for one wished there was some way to keep aol products completley off of my CP; but for some reason aol seems to show up in my software every now and then and I have to delete it.

MTC-00009030

From: CAROCK2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

No further litigation is necessary. Settle the case. Settlement is the best thing for American consumers
Respectfully
An American voter and taxpayer
C.A. Rockefeller

MTC-00009031

From: Frank Byrd
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

Please support an expeditious close to the folly of the Microsoft case, which has made a mockery of the spirit and proper application of US anti-trust laws.

It is harmful enough that competitors who are losing their battles in the free market are increasingly attempting to manipulate the DOJ to their advantage. Now state politicians, who have such obvious agendas, have made this an even more ludicrous circus. The DOJ serves so many noble purposes in this country. Artificially "managing" our economy should not be one of them.

Respectfully,
Frank Byrd, CFA
212-697-2886
Midtown Capital Partners
565 5th Avenue, 11th Floor
New York, NY 10017

MTC-00009033

From: WILENSD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:04pm
Subject: Public interest

LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. THEY DIDN'T DO ANYTHING WRONG. THE ANTITRUST LAWS ARE NON-OBJECTIVE. ALL THEY'RE FOR IS GIVING ENVIOUS COMPETITORS TRUMPED UP GROUNDS TO GO AFTER THE BEST AND BRIGHTEST. IF YOU DON'T COLLABORATE WITH YOUR COMPETITION UNDER ANTI-TRUST, YOU'RE "GUILTY" OF "CUTTHROAT COMPETITION". IF YOU DO COLLABORATE WITH YOUR COMPETITION UNDER ANTI-TRUST, YOU'RE "GUILTY" OF "PRICE-FIXING". THE ANTITRUST LAWS GET YOU COMING AND GOING AND ARE A FRAUD!!! REPEAL ANTITRUST!!!!!!

MTC-00009034

From: luckinh nguyen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone to do its business. The U.S.A. and the whole world need a leader in software business. We sure don't want to have to learn 100 different ways to use our computer just because U.S.J.D wants to have 100 strong companies.

Without Microsoft and Intel companies, the U.S. which has been way behind the Japanese in the 80%, would never have a chance to go back to be the world leader again since the 90's. I don't understand why we want to weaken our own strength to give the Europeans and the Japanese a new chance to get ahead (example Boeing vs Airbus in airplane business, and the Toyota vs Ford in car business).

My opinion is if the U.S. government will not support Microsoft (or any of the industry leader), it should not constrain it either. The United States of America is strong and will be a strong country because its citizens and corporates are allowed to have the freedom to think and to act. GOD BLESS AMERICA FOREVER. An Immigrant from Vietnam Ken Nguyen e-mail address: Luckinhn@hotmail.com

MTC-00009035

From: htd1
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:08pm
Subject: Microsof Settlement

Gentlemen:
Please proceed with finalizing settlement agreed upon between DOJ, States and Microsoft.

George Gundersen

MTC-00009036

From: Timemach55@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer, I use windows-98, AOL for Internet access and the yahoo search engine. That combo works for me. I own a lot of tech stocks and like the freedom we have to get out and make the next "widget." I support the Microsoft settlement, and look forward to the next innovation in technology wherever it comes from.

Let all of us get back to the business of living our lives and paying to many taxes.
Christina Staib
Carmel, CA

MTC-00009037

From: LW
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Gentlemen:

I believe the Microsoft settlement should be finalized as presented to the Dept. Of Justice. The case has gone on too long, it is not clear to me that the company has done anything criminal, and it is time to end the costly litigation.

Sincerely,
Les Weinberg

MTC-00009038

From: Insurwhiz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I applaud all parties to the litigation for settling the Microsoft case. It is best for the Country, for our economy and for the technology sector of our economy. I am happy that the Department of Justice, Microsoft and the States have arrived at this settlement. It gives me a great deal of confidence for our economy in 2000 and the years beyond.

George Staib

MTC-00009039

From: WoodRuss@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case has gone on far too long and needs to be settled soon without negatively impacting Microsoft. Breaking up the company is a bad idea and should not be pursued nor should protracted legal action. Get this behind us with a process to insure review and monitoring of their actions so that they don't take undue advantage of their past success.

You have spent far too much of my money (tax dollars) on this case and I hope you go after the real bad guys.

Sincerely,
Russ Wood
1211 224th PL NE
Samammish, WA 98074
425-868-7200

MTC-00009040

From: TACBOYER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ref: Public Input

Lets settle the issue now! It has gone on long enough, the point has been made and we need to move on to more critical things.

The settlement is one of the lowest items on my personal radar and we have things to attend to that are so much more critical that I consider any further delay of this settlement to be malfeasance of office on the part of the DOJ.

Signed,
Thomas Boyer
TACBOYER@AOL.com

MTC-00009041

From: Joe K
To: Microsoft ATR

(older versions OR the new XP version released last Fall) offers more flexibility, choice of using other products with it, etc., than any of the following that I use:

1. My utilities. ANY of them.
2. My healthcare benefits, including choice of a physician.
3. My America Online account (a member for six years).
4. My local and long distance telephone carrier.

And consider this: I can add products to my PC, made by someone other than Microsoft, and do it easily, ONLY because Microsoft has brought standardization to the industry. They brought the concept of "Plug and Play" to the PC world, which means: Buy someone else's products and Microsoft software actually assists your computer to make sure it works, by identifying the drivers needed and making all the interconnections necessary to connect it to your monitor, printer, scanner or other peripherals!

Do that with any of the items listed above. Try to "plug and play" a different electricity company this month because you are tired of using the one you currently have. And then plug another one in if that one doesn't suit you after a day of using it. Or try that with your health plan. Or the physician you just used, and wish to use another one for your visit next week. Good luck trying.

The point is, their software is theirs and in the opinion of most PC-literate people out there, they have already gone out of their way to accommodate other companies by allowing virtually any software to be used in conjunction with it.

So the next argument is that even though it is possible to do, it might be too difficult to use another software product with it? Well let me tell you this...if you have just basic PC skills, it is not that hard to substitute another product for the ones that come with the Microsoft software packages. But let's just assume that it takes a little effort to figure out how to do it... If you had the option to do that with your health plan or your utilities would you take the time to learn how to do it? You can bet your bottom dollar that you would.

Now consider this: Millions of PC-literate people out there DO know how to do this switch in products, but like me, they do not. Because they don't want to.

That brings me back to my original comment: once you experiment with the other products out there, you come back to the Microsoft ones because they are the best. Why do you think their products are used by virtually everyone out there? Because they were FORCED to use them? Heaven knows that I have every capability of purchasing the Lotus/WordPerfect suite of office software for work or at home, but I wouldn't because I like the Microsoft Office package better. And I could change my browser today to be Netscape's... but I won't because I like the Internet Explorer.

It is time that the politicians quit making issues where there aren't issues.

The focus on trying to find problems with Microsoft should be left in the past with the inept administration that started it. We should be thankful that this country is being led today by people with true honor and

dignity, who are bringing us together, united in the quest for Freedom. And that means the freedom to choose the Microsoft products, because they are superior to others, even if every single PC owner in the world does so and the Microsoft products become synonymous with "Kleenex" or "Xerox." After all, those companies MADE the markets that they still compete in. Perhaps through other informed PC users out there, we can tell the Senator Schumers and the lawyers representing Microsoft's competitors to get with it and leave Microsoft alone. Microsoft has done more good for this country, by bringing productivity enhancements to the business world, and more information via PCs/PC software advancements to people in their homes, than most of our politicians could ever hope to do in their lifetime.

Sincerely,
Alan House
4858 Dublin Drive
North Royalton, OH 44133
CC:Houseman40@aol.com@inetgw

MTC-00009048

From: Mary L. Snyder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft—Settlement?
Sirs:

ANY indictment of Microsoft under such an abomination as "The Anti-Trust Law" is a criminal act, as much as imposed on colonial America by the British which precipitated the American Revolution. As there should be NO INDICTMENT, there can then be NO SETTLEMENT, therefore it should be a NON-ISSUE. To REPEAL "The Anti-Trust Law" is the only action to be taken at this time. Any so-called "Settlement" toward Microsoft by our United States government is punishing the GOOD for BEING the GOOD!

Because a business is more profitable in its field than any other is because it earned it. No government can call itself JUST by intruding on this business! Because other businesses cry like the babies they are, the government should pay them NO attention. Let them compete as they can through their own intelligence with their own new ideas. NO one is telling them not to do this. "The Anti-Trust Law" it's hurting consumers by inhibiting progress in designing BETTER products—yes, BETTER even than Microsoft. Bill Gates has said that he has to keep updating, inventing new products etc., as he knows that at any time he could be topped by someone else, and THAT'S the ONLY RIGHT anyone else has.

THINK your best premises, and quit badgering those who make life better for each and every one of us—Microsoft competitors included!

Mary Lou Snyder
mlobjst@sprintmail.com

MTC-00009049

From: douglasleifeste
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:29pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
To Whom U.S Government,
GET OFF THE BACK OF MICROSOFT
CORP. YOU HAVE DONE ENOUGH TO

HURT ALL THE SMALL INVESTERS, AND STIFFLE FREE ENTERPRISE IN THIS FINE COUNTRY.

DOUGLAS LEIFESTE
1214 VINE AVE
SUNNYSIDE WASH

MTC-00009050

From: hairdoc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:31pm
Subject: Settlement with Microsoft Computer should be accepted.

I do now and always have felt that the DOJ's and various state attorneys suits against Microsoft Corp. are the result of the prejudiced views of elected officials from states where Microsoft's competition reside. This constitutes what I and everyone I speak to considers an injustice perpetrated against Microsoft Corp. As you know millions of our tax dollars have already been wasted in an attempt to wrongfully punish this company. I and most Americans who used P.C's. before the advent of Windows hold Microsoft in the highest regard. I am proud of it's performance in dominating it's field because in doing so it took us out of the realm of cryptic DOS code and into the future of computing. Lets face it, the driving force behind any great advancement has always been profit. By punishing Microsoft for doing exactly what any other large corporation or small businessman would do in it's place sends a bad signal to those of us who have the nerve to gamble in the high stakes world of business. By the way what would the trade deficit have been last quarter if Microsoft did not sell software worldwide?

Please stop this nonsense and accept this settlement that is already much larger than the so-called (but in my mind fabricated) harm done to the ?public? Let this great American company thrive and grow.

Thank you for considering my position.
Stephen F. Dasaro

MTC-00009051

From: LAWRENCE SHER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There is no need to prolong the litigation against the Microsoft Corporation. It was an ill-conceived action to begin with and sends the wrong message to highly innovative companies that advance technology and our economy and provide continued world leadership for the United States. The DOJ needs to be able to sort out the whining of Microsoft's competitors vs. real potential damage from one of the most successful technology innovators the country has seen. Let's get on with it.

Lawrence Sher
14028 wind mountain Rd
Albuquerque NM 87112

MTC-00009052

From: Douglas Lipton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft

Gentlemen: Right now in January 2002 the last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors of Microsoft and stifles

the enormous potential for innovation that Microsoft has always led the way on.

Douglas Lipton
doughlipton@earthlink.net

MTC-00009053

From: JDinsfrien@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:16pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Enough already. Let the settlement proceed. It may not be perfect, but it's adequate. Close the deal and let's move on.
Jack Dinsfriend

MTC-00009054

From: DBen341144@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the entire matter has been a witch hunt and that Microsoft has been unfairly targeted because it did it's job better than it's competition. As a consumer, I never minded that Internet Explorer has come loaded in all of my computers... and guess what? I've never used it! The governments meddling in private industry has cost millions and millions of dollars, and saddled Microsoft with a tremendous burden that will ultimately be passed on to consumers. How has the public interest really been served?

The reduced liability settlement is as fair as can be expected after so much time and resources spent. As a citizen and consumer, I believe enough is enough. If Microsoft has actually committed a violation of anti-trust statutes, they have well paid a sufficient penalty. I urge all parties to this matter to act quickly to bring this unfortunate experience to a close.

MTC-00009055

From: mahria day
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs or Madam,
I am writing to let the judge know of my views regarding the Department of Justice's settlement regarding the Microsoft case. I have submitted several emails to various Attorney Generals regarding the Microsoft case. I am glad that some Attorney Generals have decided not to join the settlement reached between the U.S. Department of Justice and Microsoft. And I also concur that the proposed settlement fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting the illegal conduct, promoting competition, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains. I am writing to let the judge to know of my views regarding the Department of Justice's settlement.

Sincerely,
Mahria Day

MTC-00009056

From: NEWISLER@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 2:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Secretary Ashcroft:
I firmly believe the Microsoft case should be closed without further hardship or penalty to Microsoft. Microsoft is only guilty of being an aggressive competitor and a successful

business organization. Aggressive competition is nothing new. I face it everyday in my business. Aggressive competition is quite American. It is encouraged in schools, sports, games and, yes, in business. Success comes only through hard work, creativity, innovation and market acceptance. Market acceptance is key and the federal government should not punish businesses with products that are accepted by consumers. I am hopeful the Microsoft Settlement will come to a rapid disposition with no further penalty to Microsoft.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Norman E. Wisler

MTC-00009057

From: B. Hanford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I have purchased and used every version of Microsoft Windows. I currently own and use Microsoft Office and several other lesser Microsoft programs. I have never felt that I was charged too much for any of these products. To the contrary, I feel I'm being charged far too much by the government's continued prosecution of the Microsoft Anti-Trust case. I never felt there was a valid case to begin with, but be that as it may, I now feel you have reached the a point of diminishing returns. Please accept the current settlement and stop waisting my tax money.

BH...

MTC-00009058

From: Matthew Harding, P.E
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:01 pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Mr. Ascroft, thank you for your consideration. Matt Harding Matthew L. Harding 1428 S, Lindenwood Drive Olathe, Kansas 66062 January 5, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft US Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing you today, to express my support for the recent antitrust settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. I feel the stipulations of the recent settlement are sufficient and that no further actions be taken against Microsoft. Currently, Microsoft has agreed to many stipulations some of which I feel to be too drastic. However, due to the fact that Microsoft agreed to comply is reason enough to let this matter stand where it is. This settlement was reached after extensive negotiations with a court appointed mediator. Microsoft has agreed to compromise much more than I would have if I were in their shoes. The sharing of codes and more software information will be given to competitors, thus creating more opportunities for other companies and providing the consumer with even more choices.

After three long years of court battles, Microsoft and the Government have settled the antitrust suit. Now more than ever our economy needs to allow this settlement to end here. Money and other resources need to

be spent on more important issues currently facing our nation. Please, let's allow Microsoft to focus on innovation, rather than litigation.

Sincerely,
Matthew Harding

MTC-00009059

From: Ronald M. North
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:05pm
Subject: For years I have supported Microsoft as a user and as a believer in the

For years I have supported Microsoft as a user and as a believer in the integrity of the private sector. After December 3rd, 2001, when Microsoft forced me to adopt their "Hotmail" and "Passport" garbage in order to get email I have been using for decades I have changed my outlook. This change was a disaster for me and many others whose Microsoft loaded computers crashed, were unable to access any internet service and were insulted by Microsoft's incompetent technicians (so incompetent they all refused to give their names "for security"). I now and for a long time in the future urge the Justice Department to prosecute Microsoft to the limits and them some until they realize their responsibilities to their customers and to the larger good of the economy. Their irresponsible behavior in putting out and forcing all customers to adopt this disastrous "downgrade" in MSN service, which for me resulted in 3 weeks of no service, \$800 to fix my crashed computer, a large business loss due to Microsoft management's arrogance and incompetence should not go unresolved. Even today I and others I know are unable to efficiently use non-microsoft utilities to conduct our business.

Thanks.
S Ronald M. North,
165 Rocky Branch Road,
Athens GA 30605.
(706)548-2675

MTC-00009060

From: Michael O'Flaherty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
As an independent software developer in the software industry who utilizes both Microsoft software as well as software from other competitors of Microsoft's, I wanted to send you a message telling you that I feel that your handling of the Microsoft Antitrust case and the settlement you and your department arrived at is very good. I am alarmed that there are 9 states that appear to be holding out for a more severe punishment, and I can tell you I feel any further delay or change to this settlement can only hurt the economy at this point. The business climate is already fragile (though improving), and it is vital that a company such as Microsoft's be allowed to move on. We need stability in this field at this point—allowing this case to go further can only hurt this economy.

I encourage you to end this if possible, and focus your attention where we really need it—the fight on terrorism (where I feel you are doing a superb job!)

God bless you!

Michael O'Flaherty
eInvasion, Inc.
8580 Deer Meadow Blvd.
Streetsboro, OH 44241

MTC-00009061

From: William Franklin
To: Microsoft ATR, Jim Bunning, Mitch
McConnel, president...
Date: 1/6/02 1:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After careful review of the proposed settlement I judge it to be fair to all parties and especially the public.

Bill Franklin,
4 Westview Drive,
Madisonville, KY 42431
(270) 825-8719

MTC-00009062

From: GEAUXLDEN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen:
It is time to end the prosecution (persecution) of MICROSOFT CORPORATION. Is the next step to require MCDONALDS to sell WENDY'S french fries? Get real, the cost of computers has come down ... computer literacy is at an all time high, the computer you are receiving this message on probably has a MICROSOFT operating system. What it boils down to is that while Washington spends it's every waking hour figuring out how to keep things status quo— MICROSOFT has become successful by giving the average citizen a tool to change his or her life—at a reasonable cost.

We should be thankful for the contributions of this great company instead of trying to find ways to penalize them for their success. You owe Bill Gates and Company a big public apology for the harassment.

Mike Winski
103 Sundance Pass
Lafayette, LA 70508

MTC-00009063

From: Joel Krist
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice,
Please uphold the proposed settlement agreed to by the federal government, Microsoft, and the nine states. The proposed settlement is in the best interest of consumers. The states who continue to oppose the settlement are doing so simply to protect the interests of the businesses located within their borders. They are not truly concerned with what's in the "public interest, as the Tunney Act requires. Microsoft's competitors claim that Microsoft's business practices have stifled innovation and reduced choices for consumers yet they have failed to show that consumers have been harmed. While it's true that the technology agendas offered by Microsoft's competitors face a fierce challenge, sometimes leading to their failure, it's important to remember that the failure of a technology or platform by itself does not necessarily mean consumers lose. Not all technologies or platforms should succeed

and it is the marketplace and the consumer who should decide the winners and losers. The proposed settlement offers tough, reasonable remedies while at the same time it avoids destroying the freedom of Microsoft, and its competitors, to innovate.

Sincerely,
Joel Krist

MTC-00009064

From: Dorscarjon@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 3:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My wife, Carole G. Dorsey, and I (John W. Dorsey) would like to voice our support for the provisions of the Tunney Act during the public comment period. We feel that this settlement is tough but reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

MTC-00009065

From: Jack Gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:16pm
Subject: Microsoft is right!

Microsoft is wholly in the right, and the Justice Department is wholly in the wrong. Microsoft benefits the nation, the government regulations of business harm the nation. But that is not the justification for Microsoft's right to exercise its own judgement in producing and marketing its products. The justification is the same as for my right to live my own life by my judgement. Them that don't like me can leave me alone. Success in a free market legal system is not an act of aggression—it is a badge of honor.

Jack Gardner
11212 Hidden Bluff Dr.
Austin, TX 78754

MTC-00009066

From: Edward B. Riggio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: US DOJ

It is time to finalize the Microsoft Settlement. Lets not prolong this expensive Microsoft settlement any further. The actions agreed to by Microsoft, Justice Department and nine states including New York where I live, are fair and good for consumers. The other plaintiffs are just trying to gain a competitive edge by delaying the settlement. We need to get on with strengthening the economy and one way to do this is to finalize the Microsoft Settlement by February 1, 2002.

Respectively,
Ed Riggio
Woodstock, NY 12498

MTC-00009067

From: Joan and Dick Hinman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle Now. Do not drag this on any longer as it should have never been done in the first place.

J. Hinman

MTC-00009068

From: Michael J. Hutchinson
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 4:44pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement
Please approve the settlement.

MTC-00009069

From: Surge02@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Bennett Fisher
Johns Hopkins University
1/6/02

Microsoft Settlement

Bill Gates is one of the greatest business leaders in the history of our capitalist country. He helped Microsoft gain monopolistic power by using great business tactics and had the power to use anticompetitive acts to preserve it. In United States v. Microsoft, remedies are needed in order to lessen Microsoft's control and increase competition. The remedies that the government proposed are solid, but still allow Microsoft to act anticompetitively. Noticing this lack of enforcement, Microsoft jumped on the government's proposal. They even offered to donate equipment and programs to needy schools in order to cover up their excitement and show some remorse. The only effective solution in this case is to have Microsoft license their technology to competitors. This will avoid further problems and make consumers better off.

By producing a Windows operating system that is cheaper, more prevalent, and has more capabilities and potential than any other operating system yet developed, Microsoft was able to capture an incredible amount of the market share. More specifically, Microsoft controlled an impressive 95% of the market. The court hearings and proceedings stemmed not from the fact that they had this power, but from their actions taken in order to maintain and preserve it. More important than the anticompetitive acts themselves is the realization that this type of market structure alone produces power in that it creates natural barriers of entry. These natural barriers result from the preferences of developers to work for an operating system with a strong consumer base.

It is well known that Microsoft is a monopoly and controls enough market power to effectively be considered one. Therefore, that is not an issue that needs to be discussed. The reason it is mentioned is that the more of the market that Microsoft controls, the more power they have to dictate prices or exclude competition. In other words, they have the ability to engage in anticompetitive acts in order to maintain their power. As a direct result, the government's main objective in proposing remedies was to lessen Microsoft's control over the market and allow other software makers to compete. More specifically, they wanted to discourage Microsoft from developing software that other companies had already developed for the Windows operating system and they wanted to stop Microsoft from forcing dealings through exclusionary acts. The remedies proposed by the government were not done so in order to knock Microsoft completely out of the market. With the hope of giving all software developers a fair chance, the government's proposal has good core ideas, but lacks

execution. One of the proposals assures that competitor manufacturers and software vendors remain free to offer and support non-Microsoft software without the fear of punishment by Microsoft. In other words, they can bundle Netscape and other non-associated explorers to the Windows operating system. By giving competitors the freedom to choose which software is built in, they control how the technology evolves. The government's proposal also states that Microsoft is not permitted to retaliate against software or hardware vendors that are developing, using, distributing, permitting, or supporting any software that competes with Microsoft. But, because of the wording in these proposals, Microsoft can bypass this. For example, they can retaliate against developers or vendors that are not competitors. In addition, what constitutes retaliation? If Microsoft produces a program for windows that has already been designed to work with windows, is that considered retaliation?

Even the three person technical committee established to prevent these problems is useless here because the power is based on their personal interpretation of the decree. As a result, the decree does nothing to establish a more efficient or direct way to control Microsoft. It appears to almost rely on the good faith of Bill Gates and Microsoft; the same brilliant and cunning CEO that helped his company become the powerhouse in the industry and will do anything to ensure that it stays there.

The government was correct in its intentions, but the language in which the proposal was written does nothing to alleviate Microsoft's grasp of market. In fact, this slap on the wrist by the government and the generous donations by Microsoft to needy education systems only help make its future more promising. The supposedly altruistic donations by Microsoft are in response to consumer class-action lawsuits. But, by donating refurbished equipment to poor school systems, Microsoft will enhance its competitive advantage in schools while doing little to meet their true extensive needs. Apple further argued that this would extend Microsoft's monopoly power, the problem that prompted the lawsuits in the first place.

Because of the nature of the subject, technology, control over the industry has a history of changing hands. Microsoft was an exception. They were able to maintain their power through natural barriers of entry and exclusionary acts. Although they have already been found guilty of this and their future actions will be watched closely, the damage is already done. Software companies prefer to produce programs for an operating system like Windows that is already established. Gate's timing was impeccable and as a result Microsoft will reap the benefits far into the future. As it is commonplace in this industry for any one company to have the majority of control at any given time, why not just let Microsoft enjoy its time at the top? First off and most importantly, the actions by Microsoft made consumers worse off. Secondly, there is a utilitarian way to handle this situation that will make everyone better off. Finally, the

way in which they maintained this power is illegal.

Because of the government's inability to enforce the remedies, harsher remedies are needed in order to restore competition. A mandatory licensing of Microsoft's operating system technology would prove an ideal solution to this problem. More specifically, competitors such as Novel or IBM can bid and obtain a license from Microsoft. Using Microsoft's technology, they could add to and create a completely new system. For example, IBM could market Windows XP under their own trade name by obtaining a license and paying maybe 5% to Microsoft. This license fee needs to be set ahead of time so that there are no allegations of discriminatory actions. By doing this, Microsoft could remain at the top, but it now gives other companies a chance to survive and compete. As companies use Microsoft's technology they will gain support and Microsoft's market share will decrease. Since control over the market is directly related to the ability to control prices or exclude competition, Microsoft will not be able to engage in anticompetitive acts. As Microsoft's power over the market decreases, they will gain the additional license fee for the use of its operating system. The natural barriers of entry will subside as other companies begin to gain popularity and consumers and producers spread out.

This idea has a few very beneficial effects. First, it avoids a potential breakup by Microsoft. There is no need to break up the company's assets and destroy the very thing that makes Microsoft so unique. Although the proposed breakup of Microsoft would allow for more competition, a licensing agreement has the same effects without the disruptions. In other words, it levels the playing field without the costs. Second, Microsoft's software producers and engineers are not restricted from continuing to make new programs. Therefore, as Microsoft continues to develop new systems, other companies will use this to develop their own and both will excel. Overall, everyone is better off and consumers will see an increase in the quality of products available.

So why is this a better idea than the one proposed by the government? First, it addresses and eliminates the main problem, Microsoft's hold on the market for all Intel-compatible PC operating systems. In addition, there is no vague language in which Mr. Gates could cleverly bypass. Finally, there is no need for a committee or donations or any of the other things that make this case more complicated than it needs to be.

The only issue that could be brought against this idea is the possibility that another company could design a more productive operating system. Companies would then compete fiercely for that top spot. This is analogous to the video game industry in which every couple of years Nintendo, Sony, and few other major manufacturers release their respective systems within a couple of weeks of each other. This competition pushes them to produce better products and therefore enhances the well being of the consumers. This is exactly the goal of the licensing agreement with Microsoft.

While Microsoft has already settled this case with the Justice Department, its problems are not over. Or are they? Microsoft is still under investigation by the European Commission for failing to disclose information to its competitors concerning operating systems for personal computers and servers and that it engaged in the discriminatory licensing of its technology. All of these problems would be taken care of if the government would adopt an overall licensing agreement. This would allow all information to be available for a fee and charge the same prices to everyone. As has been shown, the current remedies proposed for Microsoft are not efficient and will not end the long-standing problem. If the government considers the possibility of a licensing agreement they would realize that this is a much better solution.

MTC-0000970

From: George J Jorgenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Comments
Dear US Justice Department,

I do not believe the remedies reported in the news are going to have the slightest impact on Microsoft's predatory marketing practices, and subsequent illegal abuse of monopoly power. Take, for one small example, the case that started it all: internet browsers. Since the time the case freed, Microsoft bundled their browser for free, and essentially drove all other browsers out of the market. They claim they have a right to do this, and that they are only serving consumer needs.

But their most recent versions—including ALL browsers shipped with the new Windows XP—have made a significant change: they no longer support industry-standard third-party browser plug-ins for presenting specialized content, such as movies, sound, animation, and virtual reality. This means that third-party content providers, such as Real Audio, Macromedia Flash, Adobe PDF, and Apple QuickTime—just to name a few of the larger players—no longer function under Microsoft's browsers using the standard installation procedure. Instead, they must provide special installations that go through an additional layer of software—Active X—that Microsoft's own content provisioning software does not go through. This means that ordinary consumers will have to struggle needlessly to install third-party content provisioning software, but perhaps more importantly, if they do actually get through that struggle, the third-party plug-ins will run more slowly and with less capability than will Microsoft's own content provisioning software.

This also means that some 90% of new computers sold cannot properly access my web site, which has Apple QuickTime content, whereas 90% of pre-Windows XP computers could. With this move, done right under your collective noses while you negotiated a cushy "hand slap" settlement, Microsoft not only successfully extended their operating system monopoly into the internet browser market, but now they have extended their browser monopoly into the content provider marketplace! They have

broken the law once, and while being penalized, have broken it again.

Take heed of my prediction: now that Microsoft controls content provisioning, content will come next. Within three years, the average consumer with an "out of the box" computer will be unable to view any content that Microsoft has not provided. With all due respect, the Ashcroft Justice Department is asleep at the wheel on this one. Quit meddling with "states' rights" Oregon and California, and concentrate on appropriately punishing large, multi-national companies who are already convicted of breaking laws.

Sincerely,
George Jorgenson
A Concerned Citizen

MTC-00009071

From: Bob Harkness
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

Please include this in public comment regarding the Microsoft antitrust settlement. I have worked developing software for 30 years so I have seen monopolistic pricing at work in the information technology industry. From a consumer's point of view, Microsoft provides a good value and definitely is not practicing monopolistic pricing. Oracle is a good comparison because they have been one of the loudest complainers about Microsoft, and their database product is directly comparable to Microsoft's SQL Server. The total cost of ownership on a per seat basis is much less for the Microsoft product. Oracle's database caters to the mid to high-end market. Microsoft's SQL Server will work effectively for small to upper mid market applications. Consumers have been well served by the competition.

On the other hand, Microsoft is an overly aggressive competitor. I consider some of their business practices unethical at best and obviously illegal in some cases. I don't want to see Microsoft run everyone else out of the business. But, I don't want the government to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Bottom line: I think the agreement that the federal government and Microsoft has reached is as good as we can expect. The sooner this is resolved the better it will be for the economy.

Bob Harkness
9221 NE 24th St.
Bellevue, WA 98004
425-450-9340

MTC-00009072

From: Eileen J. Palumbo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:04pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

ENOUGH WITH THIS WAR ON MICROSOFT! I FEEL THIS MICROSOFT HAS DONE A GREAT SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY AND DOESN'T DESERVE THE TREATMENT IT IS GETTING FROM OUR JUSTICE DEPARTMENT. OUR COURTS SHOULD NOT BE MANIPULATED BY JEALOUS COMPETITORS.

THIS COUNTRY HAS A LOT MORE TO WORRY ABOUT AT THIS TIME. OUR

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD BE CONCENTRATING ALL THEIR EFFORTS ON CATCHING AND PROSECUTING TERRORISTS INSTEAD OF TEARING APART ONE OF OUR MOST PRESTIGIOUS COMPANYS.

EILEEN AND ARTHUR PALUMBO
159 NORTH GRANT AVENUE
COLONIA, NJ 07067

MTC-00009073

From: Sean OToole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
TO: US Dept of Justice.

As a concerned citizen and tax payer I urge you to put the Microsoft case to rest. It may have been a nice idea for the Federal Government and State Governments to sue Microsoft when the economy was soaring and the states saw dollar signs...those days are gone. I understand that a few high level government officials are looking for private sector jobs and like to make a name for themselves while they have the unlimited budget of the taxpayer. If we continue to allow a few lawyers seek name recognition at the expense of the corporation we will destroy our free economy. The governments job should be to protect the greater public interest and allow Americans to pursue their own happiness. It has been made very clear in this case that Microsoft has not damaged the consumer or the public's interest. I appreciate all our government does. Americans truly are fortunate to live here and I am grateful for the Department of Justice and the people who serve there.

In this matter I think we should let the free market solve the competitive issues.

Thank you.
SEAN OTOOLE

MTC-00009074

From: rushspedden@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not delay the implementation of the Microsoft settlement which is in the best interests of our economy. Also I urge the federal officials to use whatever efforts they can muster to convince the remaining rouge states to accept the settlement.

H. Rush Spedden

MTC-00009075

From: Mary E Jouver
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:39pm
Subject: We have more important issues at hand.

Leave Microsoft the way it is and We have more important issues at hand. Leave Microsoft the way it is and let us get on to rebuild our country. Microsoft has done a tremendous job of helping to built the technological ability of the USA and it continues to do so.

Mary Jouver
17821 90th Ave E.
Puyallup WA 98375

MTC-00009076

From: CHARYL L PEFFER
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/6/02 5:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is fair, lets get on with improving our country and quiet fighting between each other, we all need to work together, all companys, not just Microsoft..
CHARYL PEFFER

MTC-00009077

From: SHED
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 5:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Vs. DOJ
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
From: Shed@accesscomm.ca

I am part of the BeOS community trying to get the BeVOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

- (a) No penalty for OEM's retailing computers with non-Microsoft operating systems
 - (b) Possible incentives provided by Microsoft or government subsidies paid from the Microsoft settlement to software publishers (with proof to claims of damage from the unfair business practices used by Microsoft) developing for small or "Alternative" operating systems or the furthering of small or "Alternative" operating systems hindered by the unfair business tactics used by Microsoft
 - (c) The Microsoft Software development division made to develop for all relevant "Alternative" operating systems. I.E. Games, Productive suits, Internet browsers & other core Microsoft services & software brought to the "Alternative" market
 - (d) Specific awareness campaign for small or "Alternative" operating systems damaged by the unfair business practices used by Microsoft funded from monetary fines from the Microsoft vs. DOJ settlement
- As in points (b) & (d) there must be an awareness raised in the public eye that there are alternatives in this market & a message to software publishers & developers that there are other platforms with viable profit capabilities if they bring their product to market on these small or "Alternative" operating systems I thank you for your time & would greatly appreciate recognition for the damage done by unfair business practices used by Microsoft & in restoring a level playing field for growth & prosperity in the computer operating system & software market.
SHED
(BeOS community member)

MTC-00009078

From: a(u)bfrench
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:16pm
Subject: comment on MS settlement

I think the case has gone on long enough and should be settled. As an ordinary average citizen and novice computer user, I have to wonder if this case was more about using the courts to help Microsoft competitors put Microsoft out of business than of justice. If it weren't for Microsoft products designed the way they are, I would not be able to use a computer. Microsoft is a great American company which contributes to the economic health of the USA.

Arlene French

MTC-00009079

From: arthur anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you today to express my opinion in regards to the Microsoft settlement issue. I feel this settlement is fair and reasonable, and I am pleased to see it resolved. The settlement they came up with was arrived at after extensive negotiations with a court-appointed mediator. It hands out new rights to computer manufacturers to configure systems with access to various Windows features. It also requires Windows to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software, and to disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows. This settlement is a step towards improving our economy. Thank you for making the right decision.

Sincerely,

Arthur W. Anderson
30 NE Sunrise Drive
Waukee, IA 50263
andersaw@msn.com

MTC-00009080

From: Rhonda Christensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:45pm
Subject: U.S. vs Microsoft

As a university educator and researcher I have, over the past few years, been more than annoyed by the persistence of Microsoft to force the use of Internet Explorer. Even files that were not created in a browser suddenly "become" Explorer files when emailed to colleagues and will only open in Explorer. A great deal of my time has been wasted due to their unethical methods of forcing people to use their products.

I ask that you consider the future of the use of the Internet which is becoming ubiquitous. We should be able to choose the browser we prefer to use rather than being forced to use one that Microsoft has selected. I teach on both the Mac and Windows platform. Most of my headaches come from the Windows network. If I have a choice, I always choose Mac. Don't take away our choices.

Rhonda Christensen
Rhonda W. Christensen, Ph.D.
University of North Texas
Email: rhondac@tenet.edu
http://courseweb.tac.unt.edu/rhondac
CC:rhondac@usdoj.gov@inetgw

MTC-00009081

From: Greg Heuer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:49pm
Subject: Fair Consideration of the Microsoft Offer

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Having operated computers since the 1980s, and having experienced the benefits first hand, I urge you to give serious consideration to the self serving remedy proposed by MS, i.e. the wholesale distribution of MS hardware and software to our nation's youth. The national trade association for which I work is a prime example of advantages of an **open shop**

approach to computer and office automation solutions.

We operate BOTH MS and Macintosh platforms side-by-side without difficulty. This empowers our creative team to use the platform best suited to the task, most usually Macintosh. I strongly recommend an even handed and equitable remedy which serves as a REAL penalty to the MS way of doing business while offering the benefits of computer learning to our youth. The Macintosh is the computer of choice for the future.

Greg Heuer, Director
Member Services AWI
Architectural Woodwork Institute
PO Box 291
Nellysford, Virginia 22958
gheuer@awinet.org
http://www.awinet.org

MTC-00009082

From: RFLYGUY@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:54pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Why is it that at social gatherings that don't have employees from MS competitors, one never really hears people talking about how badly MS is screwing us? Why aren't people of computer age rioting in the streets as they've done at WTO meetings complaining of the screwing and overpricing they're suffering from MS? You hear more complaints about what the telephone companies are doing than what MS has done.

Isn't the US a democracy? There are a few companies without the skills of MS who are dictating Govt. Policy towards the Tech Industry as well as 9 AG's from states housing MS competitors who are making mountains out of specs of dust. Without MS's contribution to the computer industry how would the Govt. and private industry and the Armed Forces function? Like perhaps Bolivia? If taken to a vote, how many people would really want govt. aid in fighting such a tyrant? One-tenth of a tenth of 1% the population? Is MS an angel, hell no! Is GE, EXXON, GM, Boeing or the Post Office? Try breaking them up and living without them.

Stop this silliness and also job security for the AG's of the remaining Nine "holdout" States and settle this waste of tax payers dollars right now in MS's favor. Innovation has been put on hold and billions of dollars lost due to this law suit. Stop this law suit now and accept MS's settlement offers and find some other area to fight.....like the medical industry and their competitive pricing policies. Big discounts to the insurance companies and none to the person without insurance. (I'm thankful for the discounts but it doesn't add up). This law suit is about on the same level as the impeachment proceedings against Clinton. They were/are both a joke, and I'm a Republican.

Robin Poole
18998 Marine View Circle
Seattle, Washington
aka rflyguy@aol.com

MTC-00009083

From: E Miller
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/6/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In all honesty I'm sorry this whole situation transpired to begin with. The leaps and bounds that Microsoft has made for the entire computer industry I don't believe would of happened without them. The windows OS changed the world.

I believe the settlement is too severe and I hope they can still operate at just leap and bounds under it.

Ellen Miller

MTC-00009084

From: ANTHONY J DURAN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Prosecute and punish lawbreakers to the fullest extent of the law. How is it giving the Microsoft corporation inroads into the only market they do not totally dominate is to be construed somehow as punishment? Renegotiate this JOKE of a settlement.

It's that simple. Microsoft has, will, and plans to in the future continue crossing the legal limits of acceptable behavior and activity with respect to laws controlling business and commerce. Please add my names to the list of those who feel the USDOJ settlement is completely unsatisfactory and inadequate in relation to the crimes committed by Microsoft.

Feel free to contact me about these matters and or confirm/authenticate this e-mail.

Yours truly,
Anthony J. Duran
214 e dayton
fresno,ca 93704

MTC-00009085

From: Andrew Bachmann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I'm writing in regards to the Microsoft Settlement. I have been watching the case over the years. As a computer consumer it has been sad to watch Microsoft continue to use it's influence to force hardware sellers to bundle their products with new computers. In particular, their use of the bootloader clause to force out other alternatives for me, such as the BeOS operating system.

As you may or may not be aware, recently Be, Inc., has been in process of dissolving after selling their intellectual property to Palm, Inc. The constraints that Microsoft has placed on the hardware sellers such as Dell, Compaq, etc. made it so that I couldn't buy a new computer with BeOS installed. Instead I could only buy a machine with Windows on it.

Now that Palm owns the BeOS there are many of us trying to encourage them to keep providing it and developing it. However, as Be, Inc., was effectively shutdown by Microsoft's tactics, it is not very appealing for Palm to try to continue with the BeOS under the present conditions. So, when I get my new machine I will not be able to get a new version of BeOS for it. Also because of this the software makers who have made software for BeOS in the past are no longer continuing. So I have no software choice for my operating system.

I have heard that Microsoft is trying to make a settlement where they provide computers to schools. All these computers are to be installed with Microsoft software. It seems to me that this is not a penalty at all, but rather a way for Microsoft to insinuate usage of Microsoft into the youth. Because the students would only be exposed to Microsoft software they would not have knowledge of alternatives that might exist, and those alternatives would die away.

I think a more appropriate remedy would be for Microsoft to pay reparations to Be, Inc., and Be, Inc., shareholders. Also if they provide computers to schools, these computers should not be installed with Microsoft software. They should be provided with BeOS or some other operating system installed. And of course they have to allow for computer manufacturers to provide these options to consumers like myself. Then when I buy a computer I can have the choice of another operating system, which can be more stable and faster than Windows. Since the beginning of this case I have been glad to see the Justice Department acting in the interests of the computing consumers. Please continue to press for a just remedy to Microsoft's crimes against the consumer.

Thanks for your time.

Andrew Bachmann

MTC-00009086

From: DAVCARL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:11pm
Subject: MS Settlement

Let get on with our lives. I would encourage all states to settle their cases with Microsoft and quit spending taxpayer money on their own "t more for the consumer." The consumer will not see any of the money directly anyway, so who cares. If they don't want to settle, take their current Microsoft OS away from them and let them find some other operating system instead. I don not understand their thinking, whom do they think they are helping? The public or themselves?

Thanks for listening.

Carld

MTC-00009087

From: MrrAloha@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I feel the decision regarding this settlement is fair and just. It is about time we move on and stop wasting taxpayers monies.

Iliia Patlidzanov

MTC-00009088

From: Jim (038) Wanda Dahl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Dear Sirs:

We are writing in support of the proposed settlement of the Microsoft legal case. We are aware that the appellate court has deemed Microsoft to be a monopoly. It seems to us that if this is true, it is because their competitors were unable to compete in the marketplace as the Microsoft products were superior, so that they dropped out of the

competition, leaving Microsoft "only man left standing", ergo, a "monopoly".

It is also our understanding that a monopolist should be punished if it has harmed consumers. We have purchased many of Microsoft's software products, and have been delighted and amazed by the features they contain, and certainly do not feel we have been overcharged for any of them. We recently purchased a new computer, in part because we wanted to upgrade to the new Windows XP product, which has indeed been a major improvement over our previous Windows 98 software.

Rather than being prosecuted in the courts, to some considerable extent on the behest of their bested competitors, we feel Microsoft should be acclaimed for its contribution to the facilitation of the development of the worldwide net by developing products which by their wide acceptance have provided a common "language" for use between computer users, rather than a "babel-like" situation which could have evolved if many competing "languages" were equally prevalent. Perhaps Microsoft should receive a Nobel prize in some category. In any event, we feel Microsoft should be punished as little as possible.

Sincerely,

James R. Dahl

Wanda K. Dahl

MTC-00009089

From: Joseph Pellitteri
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:19pm
Subject: Resolve this settlement

Resolve the Microsoft situation NOW. Four years is to long even for the Federal Gov. Lets get on with life. The economy needs a jump start.

Talk to you later.

Joe

MTC-00009091

From: Manfred Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:25pm
Subject: Hands Off

I respectfully submit that the real injustice is the persecution of business under the Anti-trust "laws" that are so convoluted that no business man is safe from their use by any petty government official that has a political agenda or statist ideology.

Hands off Microsoft! Hands off Business!

Manfred Smith

The Learning Community ? TLCN.org

Maryland Home Education Assn. ?

MHEA.com

Columbia, MD 21045

410-730-0073

"There is no safety for honest men except by believing all possible evil of evil men."

Edmund Burke

Remember September 11 !

MTC-00009092

From: PenDensham@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I work in the entertainment industry as both an employer and a creator. I and my partners have been responsible for producing

the Television Anthology Science Fiction series, "The Outer Limits" for seven seasons. Therefore, I have lived full time as a "Futurist", creating and delivering morality tales frequently using technology and human nature. On both sides of the camera.

It is quite clear to me that mankind is involved in the most extraordinary tsunami of change. Technology, in almost every field of life and commerce, is evolving faster than any individual can knowledgeably fathom... It is rather unnerving to consider that none of us can know where man is going. We can clone, compute, bio-change, write with atoms... slow down the speed of light and soon assemble the very building blocks of matter to make new atomic forms. What does this have to do with Microsoft?

The one unswerving guide to our survival as a specie has to be morality. A human compass in a vast storm of change. Only morality... justice, the balance of ethics above greed and power will navigate us through the unknown in years to come. Simply put... when we allow one law breaker who has assembled a massive technological power grip on the global market through illegal and immoral means to get away with a less than equal punishment. (Which, as a follower of computer technology, I feel the DOJ settlement does.) You may open Pandora's box.

We say to those that follow in new technologies... prey on us. We don't have the will to stand up to you. Microsoft has transgressed. Make them pay the price... do not send a signal that mankind no longer values itself, and is fair game to any who amass power through technology. As they surely will in the future and the consequences may be far more awful.

Very sincerely, very concerned.

Pen Densham

Father, Husband... Human.

CC:wklein.atmain@atg.state.ut.us@inetgw

MTC-00009093

From: Peggy Fitzgerald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:33pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Hello—I think the Microsoft judgement was fair, and I do not believe it is in the best interests of the American public to spend more time trying this case. The landscape of the computing industry moves too quickly and the issues surrounding the original case are no longer valid.

MTC-00009094

From: Bobby Sadin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

An open letter to the Department of Justice regarding the ongoing Microsoft anti-trust case:

To Whom It May Concern,

I have followed the Microsoft vs. the US Government anti-trust case since it's inception, and hope you will do everything in your power to bring it to a swift conclusion. The value of Microsoft to this country cannot simply be viewed as one did the steel or telephony industries in the past. They were local engines for growth in the US

economy. Today Microsoft, along with IBM, Intel, and a small handful of other technology companies, have become the centers for a uniquely global intellectual economy which leads the world in everything from personal computing, to satellite communications. They are the global engines of the information economy. And they are the envy of the world.

Crippling any of these companies, as the DOJ, and several State's Attorneys Generals have tried to do on behalf of Microsoft's most vocal competitors, is the moral equivalent of shutting down the most successful US steel producer at the height of WWII. With the events of September 11th, a faltering economy (yes, we're in a recession!), and soaring unemployment in this country, the US Government needs to ensure the best and brightest companies are able to grow and flourish, not attack them.

In the face of an uncertain future for all of us due to international terrorism, we need to encourage growth in our technology infrastructure, and our economy—which means ending the prosecution of what is arguably the most successful technology provider in the world, Microsoft.

In a rapidly changing world where the US economy is increasingly challenged by Europe's and Asia's in areas like airline building, telephony, steel, and in growing measure, compute software, I ask you, members of our government—my government—to resolve the Microsoft case so they can back to what they do best, creating great software that people love to use.

Thank you for your attention, and God Bless America!

Sincerely,
Robert G. Sadin
15923 Manion Way NE
Duvall, WA 98019

MTC-00009095

From: Aubrey Brewster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:48pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think the microsoft settlement is Fair let it stand.

Thanks Aubrey Brewster

MTC-00009096

From: Satchmoz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 7:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success as long as microsoft continues its monopoly. Microsoft contually only supports their standards opting not to use any existing standards within the PC industry, instead they push their own formats as the only option on the Windows OS. They literally sell and inferior product compard to many other OS, but can destroy there competetion through sheer business power, due to the size of their monopoly. BeOS is just one of many casulties. IBM was hurt many years ago when they tried to create an operating system to compete with windows known as OS/2. All of their business practices are designed to elliminate

competition. The proposed "penalty" on microsoft is nowhere near strong enough. Nor will breaking up the company help. Most people in the technical world i have spoken to agree that many things need to be done to stop the damage microsoft is causing to free enterprise. This includes but is not limited to:

- open Office file formats
- open Win32 APIs
- make dual-booting other OS's (such as BeOS) mandatory on OEM licenses.

MTC-00009097

From: Joe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hi,

I am an avid Be OS* user. I have also used every version of Microsoft Windows starting with version 3.0. I would like to offer some suggestions as to what should be done with Microsoft.

First, it is important that Microsoft be forced to release all of their APIs, such as DirectX, so that compatible system can be made that will allow Windows-based games and programs to run on other platforms.

Second, I believe it would be in the best interest of everyone if restrictions were extended for more than 5 measly years. Five years will not be long enough to allow comparable competing operating systems to develop and reach market.

Third, disallowing Microsoft to enter any mergers for the next 5 to 10 years would prevent them from hiding their monopolistic nature behind seemingly innocent agreements.

Finally, Microsoft must not be allowed to integrate ANY application with any of their operating system products. It is denying the consumer freedom of choice while using their computers, because they are unable to easily remove the integrated software. Also,, a point that must be made is that integrated software just adds more code that will add more bugs and degrade the value of the product, regardless of how helpfull Microsoft will put it off to be.

In conclusion, I hope that y'all will find my suggestions helpfull. Being a computer technician and avid alt-OS (non MS operating systems) user, I feel that I should do all that I can to aid the legal actions against Microsoft.

* Be OS was created by the soon-to-be defunct Be, INC. Their destruction is obviously at the hands of Microsoft. Be, INC had deals in the works with various computer makers to ship Be OS in a dual-boot setup with all/most/some of their machines. Microsoft's previous agreements with these companies forbade them from allowing anything other than Windows to boot the machine, meaning that not even a boot-menu would be allowed. *

-Joseph D. Groover, JR
looncraz@hotmail.com

MTC-00009098

From: DonnaY1069@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:04pm
Subject: Microsoft punishment?

Dear Sirs:

I am a retired educator and do not feel that having Microsoft give copies of its software to schools is a punishment. Since they have been found guilty, they should suffer not profit from their wrongdoing. Please listen to the public before making a final ruling.

Donna Yarborough
340 N. Suber Rd.
Greer, SC 29651
864-877-9362

MTC-00009099

From: michael(u)14110
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:06pm
Subject: partasan mess

A herd of lawers making a bundle of money at the expense of our countrys future. The Clinton era is over, lets get real folks. Back off, and let our businesses be successful. We don't have many left in this country.

I am beyond disgust.
Michael F Clark
Washington State

MTC-00009100

From: Brian McDevitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
I was unable to find information on the penalties, so I am relying on newspaper articles that I have written in the past.

I am happy that the DOJ and Microsoft are settling the case and moving on. As a user, I expect easy to use and reliable software; software that works together. Breaking up Microsoft or imposing other draconian measures would just help competitors, not users.

As part of the penalty phase, do not allow Microsoft to give out free or reduced cost software to the education market or any other market that another OS has a strong market share. I can't think of a penalty that would benefit Microsoft greater. Require Microsoft to discount upgrade products to "current" users, not a market that Apple or another company competes in nicely.

I use a MS OS, MS applications, and am a small Microsoft stockholder.

Sincerely,
Brian T. McDevitt
brian.mcdevitt@mindspring.com
1846 Bangor Lane
Elk Grove Village, IL 60007

MTC-00009101

From: Robert Ardill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:29pm
Subject: Microsoft maintaining monopoly position

I would like to add comment to the Microsoft case . Microsoft's settlement proposal of free distribution of computers and software to schools etc, is an obvious situation of further maintaining the monopoly, which is the direct opposite effect to the original decision.

I understand that Microsoft Corporation was found guilty at trial of having maintained an illegal operating system monopoly and of having illegally tied its

Internet Explorer to its monopoly operating system. When Microsoft appealed, the appellate court threw out the guilty verdict as pertains to the browser but said yes, Microsoft did in fact illegally maintain an operating system monopoly. (The word "maintain" is critical here. It is not illegal to have an operating system monopoly, but it is illegal to do anything to keep that monopoly—to maintain it.)

This proposed settlement, would grant Microsoft its operating system monopoly—indeed, contains wording such that it would no longer be illegal for Microsoft to maintain that monopoly—while saying that if Microsoft wants to, it can make it easier for people to write Windows applications, but it's by no means required to do so. In short, the settlement is ill-advised and does not maintain the law at all. To truly enhance competition in the US and in the world markets, (that other computer operating systems marketers including Microsoft export to), the comments following are helpful.

"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, and 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 addition, I believe that maintaining the monopoly of one main operating system, like Microsoft, (US and worldwide) will make it easier for terrorist activity, rather than a diversified market of operating systems worldwide.

Cheers
Robert
Robert Ardill

MTC-00009102

From: Tim O'Hare
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 8:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

Even though I reside in Australia I am deeply concerned about the effects of the Microsoft settlement currently taking place.

I am concerned that our choice is been severely limited by Microsoft and it's anti-competitive behaviour. Two examples of this are the current X-Box product being sold by Microsoft and the current .Net proposition being put forward by Microsoft. They have the ability to throw massive resources at whatever stands in their way, as shown by when they were threatened by Netscape and the Navigator Browser. It is becoming clear that they will have a major impact in the gaming console market and if their dream comes true, all online commerce will be effected by .Net. I can only see this path developing and evolving—will we all be driving cars made by Microsoft in the future?

I am not an anti-Microsoft zealot, the company has unified the computer industry over the last two decades and provided a means for many people to access a computer who could not have done so otherwise. I use their products everyday.

I just wish for some regulation to provide efficient and stimulating competition.

Instead of braking the company up (I think this isn't going to happen now?) or some other method of paring Microsoft down, my suggestions would be to make the external interfaces of their software open and allow anyone to write software which can connect to Microsoft software. This is analogous to a third party muffler manufacturer having the dimensions so that they can connect their muffler to a Ford engine. This way Microsoft can still make the Office suite and if it is still the best product available, they will make profits from it but if another product is better then this means Microsoft cannot cut them out of the market by changing the format of the files.

Some of the things I would like to see be made open and documented are their file system, the Office suite file layout and API and the Win32 API.

The other thing I see necessary is to make sure OEM's can pre-configure computers to have a dual boot option or to load any operating system without significant penalty. This makes sure that Microsoft allows OEM's to put other operating systems on computers besides Windows.

If Microsoft continues to make the best product and the one most closely aligned to what the user wants, then they should have nothing to fear.

Regards,
Tim O'Hare
Software Engineer
timo@platypus.net
Platypus Technology Australia Pty Ltd
Level 4, 1 Atchison Street
St Leonards NSW 2065
Ph: +61 2 8436 8500
Direct: +61 2 8436 8517
Fax: +61 2 8436 8501
www.platypus.net

MTC-00009103

From: jim kuska
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:19pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe the settlement that has been agreed to by a number of the states is what should be followed by all the states still trying to modify the settlement. It is time to put a stop to more litigation. To continue to litigate just wastes time and money for all concerned parties.

Lets put this case behind us and let us move forward.

James J. Kuska
1096 Randall Flat Road
Moscow, Idaho 83843

MTC-00009104

From: FalcD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:20pm
Subject: Leave Microsoft alone already!

Hello,

I think its time the Government moves onto other issues of much greater importance. Leave Microsoft alone. Its a great company. They run a great business and the cost of software has never been so inexpensive not to mention as powerful.

History has shown that every time the government breaks up a great company it

falls apart. The railroads in this country are mess. Try to get a proposal to move freight it takes weeks and even longer once the freight moves. Breaking up AT&T. What a mess.

I now get multiple phone bills and the cost has never been higher and in the near future, its a shame to say that there probably won't be an AT&T. Please don't do us anymore favors. Let Microsoft continue as the Microsoft it is.

If our Justice Department needs work maybe they should be looking into Enron and what effect they had on manipulating the market and driving up prices a year ago. Also, investigate why the management of the company was selling their stock while being on TV contending the stock was undervalued.

Microsoft is only helping and protecting the consumers and all their shareholder.

Sincerely,
D.J.F.

MTC-00009105

From: C Eguia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:18pm
Subject: Continued Microsoft violations?

It appears that Microsoft is continuing to ignore the spirit of the ruling by the judicial branch.

Isn't the Microsoft XP operating system just another rush to get business & private customers more dependant on MS with their Passport & .Net technology that is already making private information available to local crackers and those abroad due to the numerous bugs in the MS software*. Users would also be required to checkin with MS systematically when hardware devices are added or changed on a computer? (It is expected that it would also be needed whenever a person had to reformat their harddrive.) This continual interaction with the monopoly would also provide the company with hardware (and software) data without the user's knowledge and this information could be made available to advertisers for a price as well.

It appears that the DOJ is providing Microsoft with the capability to extend it monopoly by not adding their recent inroads into the audio, video & photography player software market by including their own software in their operating system and making them the default players. Also, by not providing the code to competitors, Microsoft makes it more difficult for them to provide more compatible and secure software. Even with this handicap, competing software is typically better and more bug-proof than Microsoft's.

Is Microsoft still being allowed to change the various standards on the internet with Internet Explorer (XML) functions so they can further extend their monopoly? Is MS being allowed to make their internet portal the default in Internet Explorer thus allowing them to make more money on advertising?

I have read that the proposed ruling, as a *punishment*, allows Microsoft to provide their software (and their OLD hardware) to the schools and facilitates them to extend their monopoly in the educational market. Is this true? If so, doesn't that make our

government a party to the monopolistic practices that MS continues to practice? Would requiring them to provide the money for software (and new hardware without an operating system) to the schools be a better solution and punishment?

The next thing to review is the contracts Microsoft has with PC vendors. I've tried to buy a computer with various companies without a MS operating system (OS) and they refuse to reduce the cost of the software from the price of the PC or to even send the PC without an OS. It has been rumored that MS would refund the money if the OS software was returned with the shrinkwrap intact but that refunds seldom occurred.

Thank you, Candelario Eguia
Palmdale, CA 93551

Reference: "*Microsoft's direct connection to the customer"

Once, the software group's MSN was a news and information website. Now it is much more than that, writes Fiona Harvey

Published: December 30 2001 17:54 ✓ Last Updated: December 30 2001 22:03

MTC-00009106

From: DrShelleyG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please allow Microsoft the maximum opportunity to innovate new products without hindrance. Don't kill the goose that laid the golden egg for the US economy in the 1990s. Do you think we need two Enron's? The US government could use Microsoft's help on many fronts. Work together as a team. Do us (US) proud.

MTC-00009107

From: Jerry Martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:29pm
Subject: i have faxed this letter to ashcroft and thurmond and to msft

21 Edgewater Alley
Isle of Palms, South Carolina 29451
January 5, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to voice my opinion concerning the Microsoft antitrust case that was recently settled with a strong and binding settlement. I urge you to please stop any further Federal government intervention beyond this settlement. There have already been settlements reached between various states and Microsoft, all of which involved mediators and a great deal of negotiation. The settlement forces Microsoft to document and disclose for use by its competitors various interfaces that are internal to Windows' operating system products—a first in an antitrust settlement. Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against software or hardware developers who develop or promote software that competes with Windows or that runs on software that competes with Windows.

I am retired, but have previously been involved in "big business." I see the hardships Microsoft is facing on the side of a businessman and an everyday computer

user. It seems to me that this drawn-out lawsuit has become a victim of politics and money lust. Microsoft has contributed much to this country, creating jobs, bringing technology and donating a great deal of products to schools and other charities.

Don't allow our economy to drift further into recession. Please allow Microsoft to get back on their feet again.

Sincerely,
Jerry Martin
cc: Senator Strom Thurmond

MTC-00009108

From: RGrub@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:36pm
Subject: settlement

as a user of microsoft products I am in agreement that the settlement should be approved so that we can put this episode behind us and go forward with normal business.

RGrub@aol.com (R.Grubin)

MTC-00009109

From: Mahlon Tate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 9:51pm
Subject: Comment on Microsoft settlement

As a person who works in a school district, i resent the implication that Microsoft's "volunteering" to donate equipment and software to needy schools is a step toward resolving the suit against Microsoft. Schools are so desperate for any kind of technology in many cases that they would be happy to have the workstations and software; however, the point is slowing down a monster of a company's monopoly, not helping schools. The very act of donating the equipment and software further entrenches Microsoft technology in schools, as well as helping to build a future consumer base. It isn't too big a reach to liken this to the tobacco industry's shameless attempts to addict as many young people to cigarettes as possible.

Not that it matters, but as a Mac user, this has gone on so long that I am sick of it. Big money wins every time. To say otherwise, unless you break this company up and force it to open source it's code, as the Mac has done with system X, is to ask for a monopoly to grow rather than to reduce it. People want a choice, rather than being forced to use a product that is bug prone, security weak, and over priced.

Mahlon Tate
Instructional Technology Specialist
3150 McCart, Suite 16
Fort Worth, TX 76110
Office phone: 817-207-6796
Fax: 817-922-6967
Email: mtate@ftworth.isd.tenet.edu

MTC-00009110

From: Sylvia J Trepp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement for Microsoft is in the public interest. Please consider this in your decision. Special interests should not be allowed to derail the settlement and prolong the litigation.

Sincerely, Sylvia Trepp
515 Lake St. S., # 301

Kirkland, WA 98033

MTC-00009111

From: Tony
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Request that the lawsuit against Microsoft be ended without delay. In view of the facts that anti-trust law is non-objective and is used against business men and women in a gangster type environment, we request that this activity end now. We do not want government dictating what we can not include in our software. We want the free economy to decide.

Anthony A. Nelson
25862 Jasper Rd. Suite 43
Barstow, CA 92311-7204
PayPal: avidavenue@earthlink.net

MTC-00009112

From: Paul J Denuel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:37pm
Subject: misomes

We need to continue the direction mandated by the courts to save free enterprise. pj

MTC-00009113

From: Jenny (038) Andy Firth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the proposed Microsoft settlement is good for me & the industry.

Regards,
Jenny Firth

MTC-00009114

From: CHERYLBUR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think that it should be put to rest. This should be settled once and for all. I also don't think that Microsoft should be broken up. I am a stockholder and wish the company to remain successful in the years to come and I think we should be focusing on more important things right now; like national security.

MTC-00009115

From: RICHARD BEDOLLA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 10:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the subject matter. Let's support the general public by showing the true colors of our leadership. God Bless America.

Richard Bedolla

MTC-00009117

From: D. Sauntry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello.

I'm writing to express my approval for the Microsoft Settlement. I understand that I am within the public comment period, and I would like to register my view that the settlement is within the public interest. Microsoft has worked hard to reduce the

price of software. Years ago, single applications would cost hundreds of dollars. Windows now includes some of that functionality for free in the Operating System, in a way that makes it much easier to use. The competition, such as Oracle, Sun, and Apple, continue to sell competing solutions at much higher prices. They would very much like to see Microsoft artificially held back in order to benefit their ill-conceived marketing strategies.

The settlement provides significant relief for the behavior that Microsoft has been found guilty. It should be approved. Any further action would go beyond the findings and work to significantly disadvantage Microsoft in the future market—and obviously advantage the above competitors. I fear that the end result of any further action will be higher prices paid by consumers.

In short, the settlement is in the public interest.

Thank you,
David Sauntry

MTC-00009118

From: CTHMAH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a taxpayer and citizen, I strongly urge you to bring the Microsoft case to closure and implement the proposed settlement as quickly as possible. All parties have looked at the facts in excruciating detail, and fair minds agree that the settlement is reasonable. Further expenditure of time and money is pointless, and can only result in jockeying for position, not in better understanding and decision making.

Sincerely, Curtis T. Hill

MTC-00009119

From: Jim Burke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To the DOJ

Please stop rewarding the few special interests in the category of Apple Computer, Sun, Time Warner, Oracle, (Netscape and AOL). I am not a fan of Microsoft but they do provide a system that can benefit us all and keep prices low. There are too many financial reasons against the issue continuing the lawsuit against Microsoft. I realize that many Americans have jobs with MSFT and they cannot be laid off in this economic time. Also may I mention THE HUGE INTERNATIONAL TRADE that MSFT does in other countries—that would be lost and therefore the balance of trade would further go away from OUR favor.

Stop helping our enemies. No NAPHTHA (that benefits Cuba) No DOJ suit (that helps lose jobs that are needed now. STOP special interest—if they have a BETTER PRODUCT line than MSFT let them show it and sell it—the market always drifts to the best product.

MTC-00009120

From: Julie Casso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:41pm
Subject: DOJ/Microsoft Settlement

As taxpayer in Great Falls, Virginia, I would like to forward some comments about

the Microsoft settlement that your Department is now working on. My view is the case needs to be promptly settled. The U.S. government taking on a major successful company and an economic engine of the past decade did little but send technology stocks into a fearful spiral downward. Laissez Faire is the approach the government should take, unless their is a true monopoly (i.e. no other companies providing the product or service), which does not exist in this case. My opinion: settle the case and spend the time on issues with more merit.

Sincerely submitted,
Julie Casso

MTC-00009121

From: mtman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:53pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is this families opinion that this entire fiasco is out of line. It is to the great detriment to even remotely consider any further action other than the basic settlement. MS is the industry standard and those companies like AOL are a pack of cry babies that can not or do not wish to compete. We feel that Microsoft has given us the very best product that our money can buy. We implore the department to settle right now and end this nonsense!

Mr. & Mrs. Richard F. Hill

MTC-00009122

From: Jeffery Budzynski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs,

I am a member of the BeOS Operating System community. This Operating System can very well survive in the computer market place, if we, as users of a global computer network enviroment, can have a mandatory dual-boot option, along with open file formats that Microsoft has been controlling.

Thank you,
Jeff Budzynski

MTC-00009123

From: Joseph Roni
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:

We understand that a few special interest groups are attempting to use this review period to derail the settlement of the Microsoft case and to prolong the litigation even in the midst of these uncertain economic times. As a private citizen my wife and I object to continuing this litigation. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation which benefits only a few wealthy competitors who cannot compete with their own innovation.

Please don't let these special interest groups defeat the public interest.

My wife and I are retired and our invested retirement worth has declined significantly since this litigation was initiated and it seemed to us that it was one of the leading causes for the rapid decline of the NASDAQ stocks and the stock market in general.

Let's settle this thing now for the good of the consumer, the industry and the American economy.

Regards,
Joseph and Virginia Roni
Federal Way, Washington

MTC-00009124

From: george kajda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please settle with Microsoft. It's in the public best interest.
george kajda
707 westwood north dr.
magnolia, tx 77354

MTC-00009125

From: Scott Barton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone! The whole antitrust trial is nothing more than the "losers" in the market using legal tactics instead of innovation, and does NOTHING to help consumers. How can the inclusion of a free Web browser be harmful to consumers? After all, they're free to replace it should they decide to.

I see all of this as a waste of my taxes, and I strongly resent it. There should be no settlement at all, but if there has to be one then let it be the current one proposed to by the DOJ and agreed to by Microsoft. Let's get on with it... I haven't been harmed at all. If not for Microsoft, I doubt that personal computing would be nearly affordable as it is today.

Scott Barton
Redmond, Washington.

MTC-00009126

From: Mike McCune
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/6/02 11:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I've waited until late so that I can fully digest and understand the settlement. I work in the computer field, so getting a settlement that allows competition without harming the computer industry is very important to me. I won't rehash the current settlement proposal since that has been done endlessly by now. I will only say that it has so many exceptions and exclusions that it would be unenforceable. We must not make the same mistake we made with the 1995 consent decree. The final settlement must be both simple and enforceable.

There only needs to be two simple conditions that need to be enforced:

1) Microsoft must give everyone full and timely access to all interfaces, data formats, protocols and APIs. Full and timely is defined by the oversite committee, not Microsoft.

2) Microsoft must give the exact same licensing terms to all customers. It must also disclose the terms publicly. This will prevent Microsoft from using its monopoly to reward or punish customers and vendors. There must be real and enforceable punishment if Microsoft breaks these terms. If they break the first condition, let everyone have access the the offending programs

source code. That would allow others to figure out the interfaces, data formats, protocols and APIs for themselves. Breaking the second condition would result in a fine. The fine would need to be big enough to be a deterrent. Microsoft has a large cash reserve and if the fine is too small, they may decide to pay rather than obey.

Please let me know how I can view all the public comments and how I can find out the final terms of the settlement.

Sincerely,
Mike McCune
Chicago, Illinois

MTC-00009128

From: Michael S. Scherotter
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 12:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to voice my concern with proposed remedies to the Microsoft antitrust decision. One of the ways in which Microsoft has prevented other OS companies from establishing any marketshare is by prohibiting multi-boot configurations on OEM machines. Companies like HP, Compaq, Sony, Micron, or any other manufacturer cannot install a Microsoft OS along with a non-Microsoft OS because it will void their contract with Microsoft. A user must install a boot loader which will allow other operating systems to boot instead of their Microsoft OS. BeOS and Linux are operating systems that require a user-installed boot loader. One of the reasons that they cannot compete successfully with Microsoft is that the hardware manufacturer cannot install the boot loader and the alternative operating systems even if the user is willing to pay for it.

These alternative operating systems provide a market that is not being addressed by Microsoft:

BeOS is a robust multimedia platform
Linux is an open-source platform

As a remedy for Microsoft's antitrust behavior, I suggest that Microsoft should not be allowed to make any contracts prohibiting alternative boot loaders and operating systems installed by OEMs. In addition I suggest that the settlement prohibit Microsoft to make agreements with hardware manufacturers that insure that hardware will only work on Microsoft Operating Systems.

Michael S. Scherotter
mss@tartus.com
407 Scenic Avenue
San Anselmo, CA 94960

MTC-00009129

From: Mike Zadar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madams and Sirs,

I have used the Be Operating System (BeOS) for several years now and am abhorred by my government. BeOS users and the general public have struggled for years and every step of the way for an alternative to Microsoft.

Their monopoly has been unhealthy to computer industry and to technology in

general. BeOS is an innovative robust operating system squelched by Microsoft through their exclusive boot loader agreements with all the large computer manufacturers. Why my government has allowed this monopolist tactic to continue is a disgrace.

Microsoft record speaks volumes, and now BeOS was forced to sell all its assets to Palm to pay its creditors. Is this truly in the best interest of the American Public. Should our government allow another JP Morgan or is Mr. Gates made another back room deal with the Department of Justice?

Be Inc. and all the user of BeOS deserve justice. I have read the Settlement agreement from beginning to end, it an insult and a travesty. I don't want my children to learn about computers through the eyes of Mr. Gates and his twisted Windows. It make me sick to think our government agreed to that nonsense. Please reconsider the best interest of the American Public, Microsoft is clearly not in the picture. The computer industry needs access to or open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, and make dual-boot options mandatory.

If not for this generation think of our kids, please.

Respectfully,

MTC-00009130

From: Ethan P. Wieting
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:38am
Subject: Microsoft

I believe that what has been accomplished is fair and equitable. The only people standing for further litigation are Microsoft's competitors.

Ethan P Wieting

MTC-00009131

From: Jim Sexton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

It is time to move on!!! It is a very good thing to have this settlement behind us, well almost. Let us not lose sight of the fact that if there had not been a Microsoft to set the technology standards in this country, we would not be the leader in technology for the world. Technology people always think their mousetrap is better than the other guy's. Well, so what, if Microsoft had not forced the standards that exist today, we wouldn't be able to buy a computer for \$900 that is more powerful than Big Blue's mainframes in the 80's. Think about it, would be able to do the things we take for granted today, without the PC. We should just standup and thank Microsoft for being a company in the United States of America and not somewhere overseas.

A very pleased consumer. Let's tell all the whiners to shut up and get to work. If they don't like what Microsoft has done for the consumer, why don't they invent a better mousetrap that I will buy, instead of Microsoft's. So far, they haven't done anything but whine and cry.

Jim Sexton

MTC-00009132

From: Dan D.

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets get on with this settlement, any more legal action is going to benefit very few people, and certainly not the majority of the American people.

Thanks for listening to me.

Sincerely,
Dan Darling

MTC-00009133

From: Mike Inman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly support settling this case.

Microsoft has been on its heels for too long. It is hurting the whole tech sector of our economy.

MTC-00009134

From: RKLiechner@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I seldom become involved in matters that do not directly affect me, but believe this antitrust case deserves me to do so. Let's settle and get this issue put to bed. The case should never have reached this point, so now that a settlement has been agreed upon, let's get it done. Don't let a few states or competitors located within those states drag this case before more courts.

Thanks.

Richard K. Leichner
1377 Loch Haven Drive
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835

MTC-00009135

From: Jane BrightPreferred Customer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:44am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
GET OFF OF MICROSOFTS BACK
KEITH & JANE BRIGHT

MTC-00009136

From: darenw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am aware that the DOJ is seeking input from the public regarding the Microsoft Settlement. About two months ago I bought a new notebook computer. It came with Windows XP. I asked the salesman if it could run BeOS or Linux, which I strongly prefer. Especially, I asked him if the manufacturer's or retailer's warranties and service plans would remain in full force, or if changing operating systems would void part or all of these warranties. I had the impression that the salesman didn't know anything about these "alternative" operating systems, or what effect they'd have on the warranties offered.

I bought the machine anyway, because I did my homework already, and knew it could run Linux. Luckily, it also runs BeOS just fine as long as one special setting is made upon bootup. It runs faster than similar computers that have Windows XP loaded, and is very close in speed to Linux, given the same hardware.

Everywhere I go, everyone know about windows, and everyone complains about windows. The few people who are not technical experts and have seen BeOS like it, and wonder why it isn't better known. The fact the Be Inc. has closed does not reduce my preference for it, or slow down the production of software from those who also prefer it.

What I'd like to see as a result of the Microsoft Settlement is that I can walk into a retailer that carries computers, and see BeOS running demo software, or to walk into a cyber-cafe and see that their computers are running Linux or FreeBSD to offer web surfing and other services. People should no longer think Computer = Windows = unreliable, but know that there are choices and be free from the effects of FUD (Fear Uncertainty and Doubt) planted in the public forum by Microsoft and its allies. Also, no manufacturer, VAR or retailer should feel any pressure to offer only Windows, or have any constraints however indirect from Microsoft, as to what operating system may be pre-installed or user-installed.

Thank you for your attention.

Daren Scot Wilson
darenw@pipeline.com
(970) 226-2276

MTC-00009137

From: Joy muzhuthettu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:52am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Justice Dept. must take initiative to resolve the Case immediately. The Dept. must go with the majority of the States decision. Not with the 9 states vested interests.

The majority of the American consumers want to settle the problem. This is good for the economy. It is more effective than further interest rates cuts.

Joy
A U.S. citizen.

MTC-00009138

From: Steve Barnes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:50am
Subject: Public Comment

I have watched Microsoft for years and they are anticompetitive and monopolistic. Unregulated capitalism is not always in the public interest. The proposed remedy is insufficient.

Steve Barnes
75682 Wicks Road
Dorena, OR 97434

MTC-00009139

From: SlateInc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

I believe that it's in the best interest of American consumers (and indeed of the US economy) for the DOJ to quickly resolve it's issues with Microsoft. I think that there never really was a case against Microsoft that warranted any kind of major penalties.

Thank you.
Larry Delaney
Consumer and small business owner

MTC-00009140

From: Matamata22@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer, I urge you to speedily conclude this case so Microsoft can move forward and apply their resources to technology. I would rather see my taxpayer \$ spent on more productive pursuits.

Amy Liu

MTC-00009141

From: Krishna Murty M S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Respected Sir/Madam,

I sincerely feel that the row between DOJ and Microsoft has taken a long time. In this mean time, MS (Microsoft) has undergone enormous strain both from the industry and internally. They have applied themselves for what ever they have promised for. They will do the same with the sanctions or settlement terms mentioned by the DOJ and 9 states. I wish the court respects the settlement and puts an end to this rather long and tiresome battle of MS and DOJ. I would also request the concerned to take initiative into persuading/obliging the 9 other states into respecting the settlement.

This legal battle against the so-called monopoly has long taken the shape of grudge and vengeance. With due respect to the concerns of everyone involved, I firmly believe that MS is in its grounds when it does not give its source code to public. I wish to state an analogy. Though you respect your neighbours and are very friendly with them, you do not end up giving lock and keys of your house to them. Unless of course you are absolutely confident of their friendship. Now, applying the same analogy, any of the self proclaimed sufferers of the monopolistic behaviour of MS are far from being friendly. I wouldnt give my keys to any of them. Microsoft respects the legal verdict and the jurisdiction and has taken/started to take steps in doing so. I only wish the legal battle ends here. Its good for the concerned parties and good for American and world economy.

Regards,
Krishna Murty M S
India.

MTC-00009142

From: Schurbert@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department Representative:

I am writing to voice my support to the settlement of the litigation against Microsoft. The software industry (despite the allegations against Microsoft) is amongst the most fluid and competitive in the world. The application of dated antitrust law to this competitive marketplace is a dangerous government intervention into a functioning market.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Steve Albert
Partner, Grant Thornton, LLP
Cincinnati, Ohio

MTC-00009143

From: Victor Lengquist
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues as these aren't addressed: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, make dual-boot options mandatory, etc..."

MTC-00009144

From: Joseph Boykin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing as a citizen of Massachusetts and the United States of America in regards to the proposed settlement with Microsoft. A number of states have already decided not to join the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. I believe theirs is a wise move as the proposed settlement is grossly unfair to the American public.

As a "computer professional" I am very familiar with the industry and Microsoft and firmly believe that the proposed settlement is unfair to numerous corporations that have attempted to develop competing products, consumers who have used or even those that have *not* used Microsoft products. The settlement does nothing to stop these actions and worse, give Microsoft a wedge to drive itself into the one market, education, that it has been unsuccessful at winning against Apple Computer.

I hope that a more fair and equitable agreement can be reached in regards to this matter. I urge you to reconsider this settlement proposal.

Yours truly,
Joseph Boykin
7 Hampton Road
Natick, MA 01760

MTC-00009145

From: Chuck Donovan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs:

As a longtime computer user and as a consumer of Microsoft and other computer software products I ask that you stop all action against Microsoft and allow them to get back to work unimpeded by the government.

Charles E. Donovan

MTC-00009146

From: Bill Fisk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:25am
Subject: microsoft settlement

An example of the current 'problem' of Microsoft's monopoly in the OS and office productivity software markets is 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 academic and business communities 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 3rd party applications are many; however, having personally tried a number of such programs, I can 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.

Bill Fisk, Ph.D., Professor
Educational Foundations Coordinator
Co-Director of PT3 Project Jericho
<http://itcenter2.clemson.edu/jericho>
404-B Tillman Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-0715
864-656-5119 (fax 864-656-1322)

MTC-00009147

From: EddieELR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:35am
Subject: (no subject)

I feel that a fair settlement should be reached within a justifiable period and avoid the prolongation by further litigation which hampers an active productive pace.

MTC-00009148

From: Fortdale@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:37am
Subject: (no subject)

To whom it may concern, re: Microsoft Settlement Please accept Microsoft's terms and conclude this case. We should have used our resources to pursue the foreign countries that pirate our software, games, music, movies and technology in general. We are fortunate that MS has not relocated his business to another country as I would have done if I were

Mr. Gates.

We have lost our manufacturing sector. Protect the "information society" assets we have left. We should have allocated our E Business and personal computer technologies worldwide as OPEC does oil. Dale Flanigan
440-975-1111

MTC-00009149

From: Raymond Deschenes
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 8:46am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

This whole thing has dragged on long enough. I am sure it had substantial impact on the whole stock market last year. The proposed settlement seems more than fair to me. I think Microsoft has bent over backward on this. Let them get back to business, PLEASE!

Ray Deschenes
Marvin & Palmer Associates, Inc.
1201 N. Market Street—Suite 2300
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 573-3570

MTC-00009150

From: howardnancy Adelman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:53am
Subject: Microsoft "Offenses"

Microsoft may have a "monopoly" on their DOS, but I do not at all feel that they have exerted this "monopoly" to the detriment of consumers by high prices and other "crimes" they are accused of. Rather, they have brought standardization and fair prices for excellent software. I feel that the lawsuit against them is bogus and brought on by their competitors (some monopoly!) who cannot compete against them in the marketplace.

Howard Adelman, M.D.

MTC-00009151

From: Kurt Grimm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Make a settlement now. Put this to rest. Get on with life.

/*Kurt Hermann Grimm
/*Systems Analyst II
/*Yale University, School of Medicine
/*Pathology—BB50
/*T:203.785.5154
/*P:203.766.9687
/*F:203.785.2403
/*e:Kurt.Grimm@Yale.Edu

MTC-00009152

From: Bill Robinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement!

Greetings Judge Kollar-Kotally,

There comes a time at least once in everyone's life when a monumental decision is thrust upon them. A "moment of truth," if you will. A decision between right and wrong ... truth and justice or dishonesty and injustice. You, Judge, have the burden of such a decision right now. I can only imagine what it must be like to have your "moment of truth" involve so many economic, political, technological and human implications. I pray that you make the wise and honorable decision that all ethical business people hope you will make: That is, to reject the Proposed Final Judgment (PFJ) that Microsoft is so eagerly and greedily seeking and do what you can to force the right remedies to be exacted upon Microsoft, so as to level the playing field.

Having written columns for major technology, business and investment magazines for the last two years, while appearing on CNN, SKY News, PBS and Bloomberg TV, I speak with a tad more authority than most casual observers. Microsoft violated, and continues to violate, every reasonable and ethical business value and concept ... there is literally nothing to which they will not stoop. A few examples:

**It is pretty well known that Microsoft's internal strategy has always been the "Three E's." One might hope that this scheme is some warm and fuzzy, people-oriented plan for business success, perhaps Ethics, Empathy and Employees ... and one would be dead wrong! The three E's stand for: Embrace, Extend and Extinguish. The way Microsoft has employed this devious strategy

time and time again is: First, Microsoft embraces a much smaller competitor in whose technology they see some potential, or threat to one of their myriad of businesses; second, Microsoft extends the competing technology to work best with their Window proprietary platform; and, finally, Microsoft extinguishes the competitor. This is precisely the sequence of events Microsoft used against Netscape a few years ago. Just ask Jim Barksdale. In my estimation, there is absolutely no place in business for this kind of evil intention or dastardly operational scheming.

**I personally know tech CEOs who have received the now infamous phone nastigrams from Microsoft CEO Steve Ballmer. During these calls, Ballmer threatens the CEO's business, employees, income and subsequently, families, if they won't do whatever it is in particular that he wants them to do. The only parallel I can draw between this kind of behavior is one of how organized crime operates when they try to enter an industry through threats, extortion and protection rackets. I hope Rudy Guliani becomes the US Attorney General someday, as he knows how to prosecute these types of criminals very effectively and he would find it amazingly easy, I believe, to bring Ballmer, et. al. up on serious RICO charges.

**The ways that Microsoft deals with its partners is nefarious. Only interested in the benefit any particular relationship brings to themselves, they have made a consistent habit of pressuring smaller partners, who of course want to work closely with Microsoft, into unreasonable concessions, ill advised contributions and poor decisions with regard to affording Microsoft an unfair competitive advantage. If you dig a bit, you will find that even Microsoft's closest henchmen such as Compaq, Dell and others, internally despise Microsoft and wish for it to get its comeuppance.

**Microsoft has gotten a lot of mileage out of the fallacious claim that they are innovators of technology, or that in some silly way they stimulate innovation and competition in the marketplace. This could not be further from the truth. From the very inception of Microsoft, where Bill Gates paid \$80,000 to a small Washington state software company to obtain what would eventually become the MS-DOS, or Windows operating system and allow Microsoft to completely and unfairly dominate the software business, Microsoft has not innovated much of anything. Let's see, they bought their monopoly from the company who innovated the operating system, stole the "look and feel" from Apple Computer and forced it down the throats of IBM and virtually every other computer OEM (Original Equipment Manufacturer) and that of business, consumer and personal users worldwide. Nice. Nice way to build a business. Then, they either stole or bought virtually every application they then used to bludgeon other software and application developers into oblivion. Ask any non-Microsoft software or application developer (this should be easy, as the vast majority of these technology people are not employed by Microsoft, and hence are anti-Microsoft), whether their innovative work has been slowed, hampered or stymied

by Microsoft in one way or another, and the answer will always be "yes."

The sheer temerity that it takes for Microsoft to claim that somehow innovation in technology will suffer if they are held accountable for their crimes is absurd and astonishing. Fact is, I cannot think of, and Microsoft cannot with a straight face proffer anything of real substance that it has directly and completely invented. Innovation, would not as Microsoft says, suffer, but explode with unleashed energy which until then was suppressed by Microsoft's total domination of the software industry along with their unfair and anti-competitive business practices.

In summation, as I aggressively stated in a CNN interview some five years ago, "Microsoft undeniably violates every anti-trust law every written. There can be no argument made that Microsoft should be left intact and allowed to bully, harass and control other software and technology companies, given the US Supreme Court's decisions to break up Standard Oil in 1911, severely limit IBM in 1954 and break up AT&T in 1973. It is just not possible. Microsoft dominates their business sector to a greater extent than John D. Rockefeller or AT&T ever did. If the US government saw fit to split these businesses, then Microsoft should receive this treatment and more. More aggressive penalties will have to be created so that the damaged parties can be recompensed, so that future competition and innovation will be secured and so that Gates and Ballmer will never again resort to these kinds of business operations which even Machievelli would have found distasteful." Please make the right decision, Judge ... during this, your "moment of truth." God Bless America!

All the Best, Bill
William R. Robinson
Chief Marketing Strategist
Relentless Marketing
"Relentlessly Getting Results"
UK Tel.: +44 (0) 1608 664-200 Fax: 664-400
UK cell phone: +44 (0) 7970 479-130
Toll-free U.S. voice-mail: +1 877 763-1200
E-Mail: bill@relentlessmarketing.com
On the Web: www.relentlessmarketing.com
*Columnist for Upside Magazine
(www.upside.com), Marketing Magazine
(www.marketing.haymarket.com), Business 2.0 (www.business2.com),
Fortune Small Business (www.fsb.com),
Cisco System's iQ Magazine
(www.cisco.com), Tornado-Insider
(www.tornado-insider.com) and
United Airline's Hemispheres Magazine
(www.hemispheresmagazine.com)

MTC-00009153

From: Richard M. Salsman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:12am
Subject: Drop the case
My "public comment:"

The case against Microsoft should be dropped, because it's an assault on the firm's property rights. Indeed, the antitrust laws themselves should be abolished, as an unjust taking under the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

For more, see attached.
Richard M. Salsman, CFA
President & Chief Market Strategist
InterMarket Forecasting, Inc.
162 Sidney Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: 617-252-3483
Fax: 617-252-7461
Web site: www.intermarketforecasting.com
InterMarket Forecasting, Inc. is an

investment research and forecasting firm that quantifies market price indicators to guide the asset allocation decisions and trading strategies of pension plans, asset managers, financial institutions and hedge funds.

MTC-00009154

From: Josh Sparks
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 9:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern,

I would like to briefly express my opinion in favoring an end to the litigation against Microsoft and in having a settlement finally reached. Doing this will help ensure a quick end to the devastating blow this lawsuit has inflicted upon our economy and the citizens of the United States.

Respectfully,
Josh Sparks, MSS
NewData Strategies www.newdata.com
Consulting* Hosting* Education*
Ph# (972)735-0001x149
Ph# 1-800-258-6628
Fax (972)735-8008
Email jsparks@newdata.com

MTC-00009155

From: swiftyprinting@mac.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not think this settlement is fair. Forcing Microsoft to "give away" its software as punishment is not punishment at all. The actual cost to Microsoft is minimal. However the benefits are fantastic, they get a leg up on the competition by getting their product in front of the public and children. Children are then taught to use Microsoft products and they are now their customer. A great deal for Microsoft. The punishment should be for a cash settlement or force Microsoft to purchase competitors products for the schools.

Charles Pappas
20 grand View Road
Arlington, MA 02476
781-643-3253

MTC-00009156

From: James W. Bushee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

I was pleased by the announcement of the proposed Microsoft settlement. I credit that to the wisdom of the leadership at the Department of Justice and know that it took a lot of thought and extensive work. Although the proposed settlement wasn't as permissive as Microsoft would have liked, it wasn't as onerous as sought by Microsoft's competitors. I congratulate you and truly

believe it was in the best interest of the public.

I want to go on record in support of the settlement. I just hope we, as a Nation/our government, can move on now to address real-time problems. It is unfortunate Microsoft's competitors are so intent on making lawyers rich by seeking to continue litigating.

J. W. Bushee

MTC-00009157

From: Stan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:52am
Subject: Microsoft
Stanley Kneppar
8109 Hibiscus Circle
Tamarac, FL 33321
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

This letter is to express my support for the settlement in the Microsoft case. This is a balanced agreement, painstakingly negotiated with a court appointed mediator. Microsoft will have to make some critical concessions, while being allowed to use the technology that has made it the gold standard for computer innovation.

I am convinced that Microsoft's success comes from the simplicity and superiority of its product. I briefly used the Netscape Navigator before switching to the Microsoft Internet Explorer, and I found the latter to be very preferable. The company does not deserve to be punished with litigation just for being a success. I anticipate that as Microsoft is forced to open up its codes for Windows to improve interoperability, we will see the competition and Microsoft improve such software as browsers and media players. In turn, that is good for consumers.

I sincerely hope the District Court Judge deems the settlement to be in the public's best interest.

Sincerely,
Stanley Kneppar
cc: Representative Robert Wexler

MTC-00009158

From: Connie and Tom Forster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern: January 7, 2002

The Microsoft litigation has gone on long enough. The people at Microsoft are not saints, but neither are their competitors.

*Most of the states that are still pursuing the litigation have budget problems of their own, so their motives are mixed to say the least.

*Many of the class action trial lawyers feel that getting money and software products to some schools is a better idea than spending it covering legal fees. I've bought Microsoft products for years. How large a check am I likely to get in the mail if a class action lawsuit were to prevail?

*Finally a word about Microsoft's theme about being free to innovate. I recently upgraded to Windows XP, and have been

quite pleased at the number of new and improved features that this operating system contains, everything from a good web browser, to an improved backup and a firewall that really works. Plus literally dozens of additional features. Certainly most consumers don't want to have to buy each of these features separately, and then keep them updated. Microsoft does ensure that its office products work well with its operating system. But the settlement which it reached with the Justice Department will make it very difficult to Microsoft to interfere with the development and marketing of good competitive products.

I hope that in when the District Court decides this issue, it will accept the proposed settlement. What I fear most is not Microsoft, but rather excessive regulation of the software and technology industries.

Sincerely,
Tom Forster

MTC-00009159

From: Dallas Lawrence
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 9:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotally,

I write to respectfully file my personal objections to the proposed settlement now laid before the Court in Microsoft v. US. As a native of California's "Silicon Valley" I have had the opportunity to witness the many negative results of Microsoft's monopolistic and predatory practices first hand and am greatly concerned with what now appears to be a complete abandonment of the previous Court findings in this case. After years of legal wrangling, millions of tax dollars spent and unanimous findings of the U.S. Court of Appeals, it would no doubt now be a travesty of justice for the Court to mete out anything but a balanced judgment against Microsoft, seeking full redress for the findings of the Court of Appeals.

I am quite confident that Your Honor will receive thousands of letters expressing the many technical flaws of the proposed settlement, in far better language than I could possibly hope to offer in this brief appeal. Therefore, I will focus this letter on one overriding concern not adequately addressed in the proposed settlement:

The proposed final judgment does not appear to provide for an effective enforcement mechanism for the minimal restrictions it does provide for. If there is one thing we have learned from dozens of previously failed "watchdog" programs, both home and abroad, it is that, if there is no adequate and independent enforcement mechanism in place to enforce the agreement, there is no incentive for the penalized party to abide by the findings. Providing for an inspection panel with a 2/3rds majority, either directly appointed or approved of by the party under inspection, opens the entire process to severe criticism at the least and complete ineffectiveness at the worst.

If the Court is to agree with the unanimous findings of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Microsoft's guilt is no longer a matter for debate. The Court must now decide that the United States Government is both serious in

meting out punishment for past illegal practices and equally dedicated to curbing future abuses under the law.

I respectfully submit to the Court that the proposed final judgment does neither.

Respectfully,
Dallas B. Lawrence
1601 Argonne Place, NW #517
Washington, DC 20009

MTC-00009160

From: James Doc Greene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:03am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please accept the microsoft settlement. This lawsuit has already destroyed the retirement income of thousands of people. It should have never been brought in the first place. Please do not continue to harm the american public with this lawsuit.
Doc

MTC-00009161

From: steve skinner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The companies that should be facing criticism are Sun and Oracle. Oracle has done everything they can to become a monopoly and since Informix has been bought they no longer face competing with superior technology. Sun is much worst. They are the ultimate hypocrites. They claim JAVA as the open standard and don't give it to standards. Sun also is the group that stopped the OSF initiative for a Unix standard.

Why hasn't Oracle been sued as a monopolistic company? Why is Sun allowed to castigate Microsoft for practices that it strives to achieve?

MTC-00009162

From: Jonathan Tarbox
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 10:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs;

I was deeply involved with the BeOS operating system at one time and would greatly love to get back into the swing of things with it. However, since Be, Inc. is no more and Palm is hesitant about licensing out the BeOS source code to the BeUnited project (www.beunited.org), I thought I'd voice my opinion.

The main thing that prevented BeOS, or any non-Microsoft operating system, from being shipped on any mainstream OEM computers was the MS licensing preventing OEM companies from being able to install other operating system. There should be no bonus or penalty to an OEM for not installing or installing another operating system on a shipping PC. From what I knew of the deal, an OEM company would loose out on bonuses that Microsoft would award thier OEM purchasers if they installed other operating systems on thier shipping PCs.

And because of the lack of OEM support, hardware manufacturers would often not write drivers for thier hardware for the BeOS. This greatly hurt the momentum of the BeOS to a point that the owners of Be, Inc. had to shift focus to Internet Appliance devices

instead of PCs. This also didn't pan out and the IP of Be, Inc. was sold to Palm recently. Personally, I believe the settlement should prevent MS from using licensing or monetary bonuses to sway OEMs into using only MS products on thier PCs. It should also remove limitation of not allowing any other operating system to dual boot with any MS operating system.

Thanks,
Jonathan Tarbox

MTC-00009163

From: Larryhlcl@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

When this Midrosoft mess began, I could not believe our Government was prosecuting an American Company which has done so much to advance our society (both personal and business). Now that the initial phase of the Salem process (prosecution) has been completed and we no longer have an administration which requires constant diversions, I believe it is time to stop this procecutation and address other issues in which the DOJ is so effective. e.g. crime (dirty and white), Enron insider trading which is affecting literally millions, illegal drug trafficking, etc.

The Microsoft case has, no doubt, financially enhanced the "legal" segment economy and the economies of some states which are desperate for revenues. I only hope that the revenues (benefits) generated for these entities is as beneficial and far reaching as those which would have affected the shareholders of Microsoft and the business community as a whole. I believe this entire process of prosecuting Microsoft is unfair to the general public and business alike. However, if Microsoft is willing to accept a settlement as negotiated with the DOJ, I believe it is in the best interest of all to close this matter and get on with more significant national interest. I like our most recent governmental attitude. Lets Roll.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Larry Clark
15903 Redwood Pl
Houston, TX 77079

MTC-00009164

From: Comly, Jr, A. R.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 10:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen;

It is time to close this litigation and move on. I respectfully encourage that all parties accept the settlement proposed by the Tunney Act.

Sincerely,
Albert R. Comly

MTC-00009165

From: John Limmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:33am
Subject: Antitrust settlement
Dept. of Justice;

As a computer technology person in an independent school, I cannot accept the wisdom of allowing Microsoft to provide free

software as compensation for their antitrust transgressions. This would simply allow Microsoft to invade an area they do not currently dominate. Once started down the Microsoft road, schools will not be able to change course, it would simply be more and more Microsoft products. Assess a financial penalty, then if you wish to help schools, give them money, not Microsoft products.

John Limmer
Newark Academy
91 South Orange Ave.
Livingston, New Jersey 07039

MTC-00009166

From: DTSORR@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:36am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am writing to you as a consumer interested in computers and software and the innovation that provides better products for us. My husband and I are both in favor of the settlement the government has made with Microsoft. Please put an end to this litigation.

MTC-00009167

From: FISHERLT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let this settlement be done and over with. The US Government has spent so much of our taxpayers dollars to go after a company who is being penalized for being successful and it's competitors are crying the blues because they are behind the 8-ball. They are putting money into the pockets of Liberals to battle Microsoft in the courtroom and not on the consumer product field and it hasn't worked. Microsoft has continued to bring out new products and prosper financially despite the Antitrust lawsuit against them showing their resilience. If the Department of Justice wants a true monopoly to go after, look back to proposed legislation from the fall of 1999 from Senator Tim Johnson from South Dakota, I think, about companies in the meat processing business owning livestock. Some states have adopted laws to try to slow down companies like Smithfield Foods. They continue to destroy a segment of the food chain and this Government does nothing about it. They are the largest pork processor in the US and the largest pork producer in the US. They continue to grow by buying up the competition in their market and totally control the market price of pork in this nation. They also continue to grow by acquiring producer farms through a practice they used during the market lows of the late 1990s of ledger buying. They took over Murphy Farms that way, and they were the single largest pork producer in this country.

Microsoft having market superiority does not hurt consumers, ask consumers of their products what they think about them bringing new products to the market, and if their bring competitive products, who benefits? The consumer! If Smithfield Foods continues to roll like an avalanche over the pork production business without any regard period, who loses? The consumer just for starters! Pork producers as well, the meat processing business, and the government. Please take a look at this Goliath company

and it's business practices. I live in North Carolina and in the last 10 years have seen this company single-handedly destroy the pork production business in the states of North and South Carolina and Georgia. There are NO competitive packers in the areas and every time there has been any rumors of some other company coming to the Southeast, Smithfield Foods immediately jumps on the situation with both feet and squelches any possibility of competition in this area. They bought every competitor in the area as well as some in the Midwest and have shut them down. This situation is worthy of a look if any person within the Department of Justice is truly concerned for the well being of the citizens of the United States of America. Thank you! Robert A. Fisher

MTC-00009168

From: Kirk Nason
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to move on, please don't waste my tax dollars by tying up technology in the legal system. Let the software companies compete on their capabilities, not through lawyers. Microsoft has done more for computing than any another software company. When my 6 year old can be productive for homework on Windows and Office, this is a testament to the abilities MS brings to society.

My family has not been "harmed" by pricing by Microsoft. I continue to derive greater and great value from the integration MS has achieved in their software products. There are more important things for you to be concentrating on, like terrorism, security, education and how bad our immigration and power problems are. This is where we are getting ripped off. Even though I achieved the 20% discount for power all summer (do to conservation, buying florescent lighting, etc), my bill is radically higher than a year ago.

Fix the real problems

Regards,
Kirk J. Nason
714/842-8051
kirk.nason@hotmail.com

MTC-0009169

From: Pete Kline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very much in favor of the Microsoft Settlement. This case has been a witch hunt, pursuing a company that has done more to drive consumer pricing down than any government agency ever thought of.

Lets get it over with and behind us.
J. Peter Kline
214-378-4823

MTC-0009170

From: Sid Sidner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:12am
7 December 2002
Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I wish to comment on the proposed penalties in the Microsoft vs. Department of Justice case. I have been a computer software engineer for over 30 years. I use all of Microsofts products and have developed sophisticated banking and electronic payment applications that are sold worldwide, designed to using Microsoft Windows server operating system and associated database and Web software. I also have extensive experience with Unix and IBM mainframes. I lived through the era of the IBM monopoly on computer systems, when I watched innovation in hardware, software, and systems grind to nearly a standstill. I have watched with dismay the same process starting to occur again, courtesy of Microsoft. Microsoft has been found to maintain monopolistic practices. What is at issue is what remediation can be obtained for this past practice and what can be done to prevent damage in the future.

The very future of computer technology is at stake here. The United States is the world leader in computer technology and much of our prosperity of the last ten years is based on this. Even in the area of biology and medical research, computers are becoming critical to further advances in genomics and diagnostic equipment. Based on my technology and business experience, the following three remedies seem simple, practical and effective:

The bundling of Microsoft software with personal computers should be terminated, and replaced with realistic pricing of this software as an extra-cost option, allowing third-party operating systems (like Linux) and applications (like Lotus SmartSuite) to compete; Microsoft must publish the file formats used by its software with each release of the software, similar to the way they publish application programming interfaces (APIs), allowing third-party applications the ability to interoperate with Microsoft applications; Likewise, computer-to-computer networking protocols must be published when software is released, again to allow non-Microsoft systems to interact with Microsoft systems.

None of these remedies are burdensome or expensive to Microsoft.

Please reconsider the proposed settlement to include these remedies.

Thank you,
Sid Sidner
PO Box 335, Fort Calhoun, NE 68023-0335
ssidner@yahoo.com (402) 850-7092

MTC-0009171

From: HerbGraves@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please add my voice to those strongly supporting the final settlement of the Microsoft case. The world is better off today, by far, as a result of the genius and freedom to innovate of Microsoft employees and management.

H.C. Graves

MTC-0009172

From: Walter Brown
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:05am

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The attached letter expresses my concerns regarding further action against Microsoft. Thank you for your consideration.

John W. Brown
3082 Greenwood Road
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
January 5, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The purpose of this letter is to implore you to agree to the terms of the settlement that was reached between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. The settlement was reached after three years of extensive litigation and negotiations. To press this issue any further would be a complete waste of time and money. The agreement calls for Microsoft to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure its operating system. They will then be able to promote non-Microsoft software programs that compete with the Microsoft programs included within Windows. Computer makers will now be free to remove the means by which consumers access various features of Windows, and can replace access to those features with access to non-Microsoft software.

I have worked in the communications industry all my life, and have seen first-hand how innovative products have a positive effect on everyone. It is the same in the Information Technology industry, and I feel that if there is someone smart enough to provide a product that is far better than any other product, there is absolutely no reason why we should make them share the intricate design information with competitors. The government needs to keep their hands off private businesses, thereby allowing businesses to prosper and create more jobs. This will help our economy get out of its recession

Please agree to the terms of the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice, and do not take any further action against Microsoft at the federal level.

Sincerely,
John Brown
cc: Senator Strom Thurmond

MTC-0009173

From: Richard McIntosh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:25am
Subject: SETTLEMENT

DEAR DOJ,
PLEASE JUST LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. THEY ARE THE INVENTORS AND CREATORS THAT GOT US THIS FAR IN TECHNOLOGY. I USED TO BE A "MAC" FAN, ADVOCATE UNTIL I LEARNED WHAT A PC WAS, I WOULD NEVER GO BACK TO A MAC. STIFLING THEIR R AND D WILL ONLY HOLD BACK TECHNOLOGY. YOU SHOULD BE ENCOURAGING THEM NOT ALLOWING OTHERS, (COMPANY'S) TO BENEFIT FROM THEIR TIME, ENERGY, AND CREATIVITY.

IF OTHER COMPANIES WANT CERTAIN TYPES OF DESKTOPS OR SOFTWARE, LET

MICROSOFT LOAD IT AT THE FACTORY SO THAT PURCHASER FEELS IMPORTANT. MICROSOFT DIDN'T START OUT AS A MONOPOLY, NEITHER DID FORD, CHEVROLET, CHRYSLER ETC. THEY ALL HAVE CERTAIN RADIOS, AND ENGINES AND WHEELS (FIRESTONE). ANYBODY HEARD OF THEM? IF ANYONE DOES NOT LIKE MICROSOFT WARE, BUY A MAC. A CRASH (COMPUTER CRASH) A WEEK WILL KEEP THEM BUSY.

THANKS FOR READING,
MAC
TEACHER, CREEKSIDE H.S.

MTC-0009174

From: Eric Candell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to submit my approval of your recent action to settle with Microsoft on their anti-trust case. In reading through the settlement, it appears that you have gotten some significant concessions that ought to help to ensure that you can continue to protect consumers. At the same time, you have come to a conclusion that will finally cease the costly litigation that makes no sense to me and other taxpayers.

I have never felt that Microsoft has tried to profit from me without providing me an excellent set of products in which they continue to innovate (Windows XP shows this quite clearly). They produce the most reliable products of any I install on my computer. And, they stand behind their products in a way that makes the user feel like an important part of their equation for the decisions they make.

With your proposed settlement, I have confidence that they will not get out of control but can still continue to do the things that I'm so grateful they can do.

Thanks for looking out for us-both in questioning Microsoft and in seeking closure in this case.

Eric Candell

MTC-0009175

From: Coqui2468@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

2743 Moorsfield Lane
Jacksonville, FL 32225
January 7, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
USDOJ, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing this letter today to make you aware of my feelings about the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. After three protracted years of trials, both sides came to an agreement on the antitrust suit, and I fully support the settlement.

The time has come for the United States to put that mess behind us, and turn our attention to more pressing issues. Microsoft had more restrictions than they deserved, such as disclosure of intellectual property concerning the Windows operating system, but the settlement is fair enough to both sides, and the government will create an

independent review committee to make sure that Microsoft is holding up its end of the bargain. Microsoft has done so many good things for the technology industry, has provided jobs to thousands of individuals, and donated millions of dollars to charities and schools. Why punish a company that has been so beneficial to America?

I appreciate your time in accepting my opinion, and wish you the best.

Sincerely,
Patricia Cappiello

MTC-0009176

From: Randy Black
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 11:26am
Subject: Get off Microsoft's case

Please stop this unnecessary litigation against Microsoft. You are wasting taxpayer dollars, your time and are attempting to bankrupt a great company.

Sincerely,
Randy Black

MTC-0009177

From: Emesser1@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government needs to settle this suit against Microsoft and allow Bill Gates to concentrate on his business instead of fighting off the government. It is a disgrace when a man builds his business and then is penalized and persecuted by his government for doing a good job and this is what has been done to Bill Gates. He should just be left alone to handle his company.

MTC-0009178

From: TShreve333@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the settlement and move on. Why help Microsoft competitors. The country needs a settlement. Don't make a few lawyers rich.

Ted Shreve

MTC-0009179

From: Curtis, Iva, 127WG, 6180
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft

In regards to Microsoft's suit. I honestly feel that Microsoft did nothing wrong, nor did they try to Monopolize PC's by placing their Browser on Desktop's. I just think that if someone comes up with an idea first, that they should be allowed to go with it. If Microsoft is smart and quick enough to beat others at doing this, why should they be punished.

Well, this has been going on for such a long time and now comes the time to deal out the punishment and Microsoft has to pay up. The current settlement given is, I think, fair and Microsoft should be left alone to go forward in the name of technology.

This is my opinion.
Curtis

MTC-0009180

From: reulrich@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:36am
Subject: upcoming court action
Hello,

As a technology professional retired...I think we should get off Microsoft and be thankful we have them in the USA. I have been in the computer business since before Microsoft had the operating system of choice. They can get a bit heavy at times and we should keep a watch on them to police the industry but a vendetta on behalf of their competition should not be an option.

Bob Ulrich . . . retired University of California, Davis

MTC-00009181

From: Mitch Malouf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:34am
Subject: Law suit

It seems that Microsoft is trying to be fair in this case but the government, federal and state, want to punish Microsoft for innovation. I some of the anti trust arguments, but government should stay out of business. Allow the free market to work, otherwise it will get political and destroy any business climate we now have in place.

The lawyers are the only people benefitting from this case. The consumer will pay eventually.

MTC-00009182

From: John Giovannini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
ENOUGH ALREADY!!!!

Focus you attention on terrorists, both the kind that do physical harm and the kind that do cyber harm with their e-mailed viruses that disrupt work just because they can.

John Giovannini

MTC-00009183

From: SK8MANDAN@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

As a software developer and consultant who has worked for an anti-Microsoft company, I seriously believe that Microsoft's competitors will stop at nothing to defeat the company. The proposed settlement is a step in the right direction and the only thing holding back the last nine states is a powerful lobby that has been unable to defeat Microsoft in the marketplace. If Microsoft products were really that bad, no one would buy them. There are several documented pieces of software where Microsoft has filed (MS Bob for example) and no level of marketing or dominance will let a bad product win the marketplace. The question that must be applied is—"Is this good for consumers?" and I have to tell you to open your eyes and see that consumers like convenience features like having a calculator or simple word processor bundled with an operating system. I don't think Microsoft is without flaws, but don't tie there hands at the expense of my benefit.

Please urge the nine states to settle, for consumers, for developers, for the industry and for our country.

Thank you

Daniel Fernandez
sk8mandan@aol.com

MTC-00009184

From: Dolan, Aline
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 11:54am
Subject: It's the Law! Under DoD you can ONLY buy Microsoft. We've mandated their monopoly!

I'm scared of Microsoft as a company. I'm not scared of many things in life, but they scare me. Maybe it's irrational, but I don't think so. I have watched over the years as they've misrepresented one thing and another. I told a friend, who is a Microsoft Certified Engineer, that I used Linux for my home desktop system, not being able to afford Microsoft, and he was amazed that I could use a 'command line interface' as "You're not a programmer!" It turns out he was told in his MS certification class that Linux was a command line OS understandable only by programmers. FOAD, which equates to Fear, Uncertainty, and Doubt is the program that Microsoft has launched against any competitor, without an iota of truth, but what can a little guy do against them?

Now they have .Net, and I see a future where no one but Microsoft customers will be able to access the Internet in the US. Right now, I often have to come to work to view a web site as it's been written in MS FrontPage. Many web sites written with FrontPage 4.0 are unviewable to any browser not running on a Microsoft Platform, as FrontPage does not follow the W3C standards when creating a web site. Why should they bother to write a web page composer program which runs in any other browser? That defeats their purpose.

MS was bundling FrontPage with their office suites, which means their customers won't look for another web composer. Since these people are not web designers, they don't understand the reason FrontPage is a damaged product. It looks fine in their Internet Explorer, so it must be a great page right? I try to do research for a paper for my class, and I can't read 25% of the web sites I hit. When .Net becomes the norm, I'll have to learn French or German in order to surf the web anymore. For an example of what Microsoft has done to the world as a whole, just look around your offices. The Department of Defense will allow no other operating system to be used, because they're stuck in the proprietary upgrade loop. Many other Government offices have the same mandate. The US Government puts millions of dollars per year into MS's pocket, because they were conned early on and now they *think* they're stuck. The decision makers are getting advice from NT engineers who are desperate to save their jobs, and tell lies like 'Linux is a command line interface users won't be able to understand.' Or maybe, like my friend, they just don't know they're lying.

I work as an NT admin for the Navy. In just the last six months, my command has spent over \$20,000 for products which are available without additional cost under Red Hat's Linux distribution. To date, the software on servers and machines at this tiny dental command has cost close to \$65,000. Under

RedHat Linux, it would have been under \$10,000 for everything (or you could just by pass RedHat and download it all for free). It's nuts that we're forced to do this.

I wish I had time to make this more compelling, but I'm on my lunch break at work now. Ironically, the web site where I found your address is a mess in my browser at home, as it was written in FrontPage. I'm sure it's out there on a page I could read, but I'm too busy to go looking. As a side note, I can read less than one half of the Government web sites on the web, as most of them were created in Frontpage, or deliberately written to work only in Internet Explorer. I work for the Naval Dental Center, but at home I can't access my eMail or get updates or notices, because I don't use Microsoft at home, and I don't think it's right that I should have to pay over \$5,000 to replace all of my current software with Microsoft software. I'm a taxpayer too. Don't I have the right to view pages made with tax dollars? Oh well, that's another rant altogether.

Aline (Ali) Dolan
Naval Dental Center Southeast
Box 74
Jacksonville, FL 32212-0074
(904) 542-3546 ext 176
DSN Prefix 942
<http://ndcse.med.navy.mil>

MTC-00009186

From: chester c fong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Department. of Justice
Re: Microsoft Settlement

As a private citizen, this case should be closed and left as is. It has cost quite a bit of money to work on this case both from the government (representing the people), the taxpayers who pay the government to perform, and the Microsoft Co. who are the defendants of this case.

The settlement brought forth by the lower courts is a fair one. It costs Microsoft Company to pay for its transgressions of the law and the Plaintiffs should be happy. The public (taxpayers) are sick and tired of this case dragging over the past two years.

This case has been deemed fair by the courts, let it be. In the interests of justice for everyone concerned it is closed.

Private Citizen, Chester fong
801 Franklin St.
Oakland, Ca 94607

MTC-00009187

From: RICHARD AMBROW
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:09pm
Subject: Microsoft should be given the freedom to innovate.

Dear DOJ,

I support Microsoft and their freedom to innovate. I believe the Microsoft case should be settled. The settlement will be good for the American people and the American economy.

thanks. . . .
Richard Ambrow

MTC-00009189

From: Robert I. Parker

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:15pm
 Subject: SETTLEMENT
 please add my voice & vote for the
 finalization of the agreed to settlement.
 Robert I Parker

MTC-00009190

From: david owens
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:15pm
 Subject: trial
 we have wasted enough resources of the
 taxpayers on this farce of a trial. There has
 not been any proof that I have been harmed
 by Microsoft. This is a scam by the liberal
 dicksuckers from the clinton administration-
 Janet Reno (gag)- to placate
 Sun and Oracle, big donators to clinton
 and other appeasers. Enough already. Get a
 life and rip Enron a new asshole.

MTC-00009191

From: Jack Frew
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:19pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 I believe the settlement under
 consideration is in the public interest

MTC-00009192

From: Washburn, Nelson (GEAE)
 To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/7/02 12:28pm
 Subject: microsoft case
 SOUNDS LIKE SOUR GRAPES FROM THE
 COMPETITION. LEAD, FOLLOW OR GET
 OUT OF THE WAY.
 NELSON

MTC-00009193

From: bweidler
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:33pm
 Subject: anti trust action
 end federal suit. it should never have been
 filed!!!!!

MTC-00009194

From: DLYNNGOSNELL@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:40pm
 Subject: MS SETTLEMENT
 RE: THE MS / DOJ SUIT SHOULD BE
 ENDED ASAP. THIS , I BELIEVE WAS THE
 MAJOR CAUSE OF THE DOWN TURN IN
 THE STOCK MKTS AND ILL CONCIIEVED
 BY THE CLINTON ADM. THE SOONER
 THIS DARK CLOUD IS REMOVED FROM
 OVER THE THE TECH INDUSTRIES THE
 SOONER THE MKTS WILL RETURN TO A
 STABLE AND PROFITABLE BASES. COME
 ON LETS END THIS WITCH HUNT AND
 MOVE FWD. TRYING TO SAVE FACE IS
 COSTING THIS COUNTRY TRILLIONS IN
 REV AND HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF
 JOBS. REGARDS: D GOSNELL PRESIDENT
 DLG FIANCIAL INC.

MTC-00009195

From: Wayne (038) Mabel Rives
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 In December 1996, I purchased my first
 computer, monitor and printer at a cost of
 \$1350. In November 2001, I purchase a new

computer, monitor, printer and premium
 speaker system for \$750. I realize we are in
 a recession, however, prices have been
 steadily going down during this period. I fail
 to see how anyone can say that Microsoft has
 hurt the consumer. Next, the Justice
 Department and 45 states have accepted the
 Microsoft settlement as fair and reasonable.
 I do not understand how the seven states
 could possibly think that the consumer or the
 states have been hurt and therefore should be
 rewarded in a suit against Microsoft. I believe
 the suit against Microsoft should be
 dismissed. Business needs to get on without
 this cloud of uncertainty. Wayne W. Rives

MTC-00009196

From: JEAN NEAL
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:41pm
 Subject: To Whom It May Concern:
 To Whom It May Concern:
 I want to stress how important this
 settlement with Microsoft means to me as a
 consumer and as a Tax Payer. I want to
 continue to benefit from Microsoft's
 innnovations. I do not want any more of my
 tax dollars spent to fight the competitors
 inability to be as creative. Microsoft has agreed
 to modify future business practices. Do not
 penalize a company who has the comsumers
 best interests at heart. Do not reward
 competitors who have grown bigger and
 better because of the competition. Do not
 force us to keep spending our hard earned
 money litigating.

Sincerely yours
 Jean Y. Neal

MTC-00009197

From: Lois
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:47pm
 Subject: Answer to Request
 Yes, Yes—The Government should have
 thrown that stuff away and quit torching
 Microsoft .

MTC-00009198

From: J.C. Bowman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 12:48pm
 Subject: Comments on Microsoft Case/Letter
 January 7, 2002
 Department of Justice:
 In today's economically down-turned
 climate, I encourage you to conclude the
 erroneous case against Microsoft. I also ask
 that you make this letter part of the official
 court record. Congressional analysts are
 predicting an expected \$11.3 billion shortfall
 in state education budgets in fiscal year 2002.
 Private gifts could be vital in this dilemma.
 But indiscriminate acceptance of
 contributions could have catastrophic
 consequences, and some philanthropic
 efforts may actually be wasted or cause
 inadvertently harm. As a result of more than
 100 class action lawsuits alleging Microsoft
 overcharged consumers,

Microsoft has proposed a 5-year program
 and education settlement. This agreement
 with private class action attorneys in which
 Microsoft will direct over \$1 billion in
 software, computer equipment, technology
 training and support to thousands of schools
 serving America's most disadvantaged

children. It can be correctly argued that lack
 of technology is not the major problem faced
 by disadvantaged children. Chester Finn
 appropriately maintains that the most
 successful schools that succeed with low-
 income pupils generally do not surround
 them with electronics. Instead, he writes in
 the Wall Street Journal: "they engage
 knowledgeable and committed teachers to
 deliver a powerful, coherent, curriculum
 built on high standards of skills and
 knowledge." It is true disadvantaged children
 may not necessary benefit. I would certainly
 suggest that both public and private schools
 be considered in this agreement. I would also
 advocate that low-income, high performing
 schools be given greater priority in this
 proposal. However, the settlement agreement
 could be a shift with tremendous potential
 for low-income and minority children.

Technology in the wrong hands could
 divert children from academic pursuits.
 However, technology in the right hands
 could easily narrow the achievement gap.
 Therefore the risks clearly outweigh the
 potential for harm. By targeting
 disadvantaged children, Microsoft's
 investment could transform the cycle of
 poverty, as well as empower many of these
 children.

Two innovative private urban schools in
 our state: Inner-City Academy and Bethlehem
 Academy for Boys in Chattanooga are using
 technology effectively to raise student
 achievement. Technology is a key ingredient
 in their successful program, but no more than
 excellent instruction, excellent textbooks and
 supplementary library books. The Bethlehem
 Academy for Boys has successfully
 incorporated parent involvement in their
 school using computer training. Will
 Microsoft raise its market share in schools
 and deepen their dependency on their
 products? Possibly. Yet nothing prevents
 other Silicon Valley billionaires injecting
 their vast fortunes into the equation. Apple,
 AOL Time Warner, Linux, Netscape, Oracle
 and Sun Micosystems are free to make
 contributions anytime. In my estimation any
 donation helps the tech industry in general,
 and is vital to our economic future.
 Governmental activism put us in this
 position; do we want more governmental
 activism to prevent this potential assistance?
 The answer is a resounding no. Conventional
 liberalism of the past must grasp an
 understanding of civil society and its
 inherent freedom, as well as seek to
 rejuvenate admiration for limited government
 and free-market economy. The values of
 entrepreneurial capitalism grease the wheels
 of democracy and we must attach importance
 to the social and cultural norms that make it
 possible. As my dad used to say "no dream
 comes true until you get up and go to work."
 Many students are motivated and enjoy using
 technology in their education experience.
 Microsoft has enriched the education
 experience for many children and our work
 environments are now more productive. It is
 also plausible that acceptance of this
 agreement will allow schools to focus on
 other areas of need without taking resources
 away from other academic programs. Granted
 donations must be considered in
 coordination with the overall strategic plan

and academic needs of individual schools. Partnering with a company such as Microsoft and use of technology certainly has the potential to enhance student performance. Microsoft has a history of corporate philanthropy both in America and Internationally. Their generosity and technology has helped schools and other organizations improve effectiveness and save needed capital, in fact well over \$6 billion in charitable or corporate contributions were used here in Tennessee for FY 2000. This court case needs immediate closure so we can begin to make dreams come true for children and teachers in the state of Tennessee.

Respectfully Submitted,
J. C. Bowman, Ph.D
Tennessee Institute for Public Policy
1808 West End Avenue, Suite 1214
Nashville, TN 37203
Telephone: 615-327-3120
FAX: 615-327-3126
<http://www.TNPolicy.org>
Bowman@TNPolicy.org

MTC-00009199

From: Mark Ratto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:53pm
Subject: They just keep lying...

To whom it may concern,
If you want to find out more lies that Microsoft keeps spinning you can look at the following site. You would think that they would have learned their lesson, but no. They just can't try and make a superior product. They want to own everything in the Computer Technology. They want to have all of the Networking business so bad that they lie about out product, which they know is much better than theirs.

www.whytheylie.com
Thanks,
Mark
Thank You!

MTC-00009200

From: hcg11426@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:53pm
Subject: Innovation

Everytime litigation is mentioned the stock market and the economy is affected. The comprehensive agreement, already agreed upon, is really a rough one. If further penalties are agreed upon, I can't imagine what will happen to the economy, which I think is coming back. The government gives large amounts of money to big business and to Columbia [which get into the hands of the wrong people] Let Microsoft have the freedom to innovate and not let the special interest groups defeat us

Make us proud of you,
Helen Gildea

MTC-00009201

From: anndean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:55pm
Subject: Microsoft

I feel this is unjust if all these states are against Microsoft he should have more time. I feel the whole case is unjust a monopoly?? Why Wal-Mart's sell food. drugs and now internet service! His product is the best.

Case closed.
Ann Reed
10 Dover Lane
Hendersonville, NC 28739

MTC-00009202

From: Shane Fausett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a computer user that hates using windows. However I feel that I am forced to do so. Because of Microsofts market position alternative operating systems don't stand a chance. I feel that the biggest abuse that Microsoft has been guilty of is that they restrict the boot loader on OEM computers. Making it next to impossible to buy a non-windows PC.

Thank you
Shane Fausett

MTC-00009203

From: David C. Crandall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sirs,
As a computer consultant, I have watched a large portion of the anti-trust case. In my opinion, the original suit did not go nearly far enough in exposing the depths of the anti-trust violations. The issue of collusion with hardware manufacturers in making hardware that was usable only with Microsoft products should have been extensively pursued.

Also, the issue of Microsoft's 'cooperation' with standards committee's for establishing standards for internet browsers, java (Sun Microsystems copyright, yet public domain), networking protocol committees, e-mail standards committees and so forth should have been prosecuted. The participation with Microsoft in these committees is not for the general public good, but is with the express intention and effect of turning 'public standards' into proprietary standards whereby Microsoft further locks out competition.

A split of Microsoft Corporation into at least two entities is a minimal remedy. Their continued monopoly in both the software and operating system arenas is not healthy for even the short term. Microsoft has become so large, that competition with them in either arena is a farce.

Sincerely,
David C. Crandall
481 Rose Garden
McKinney, Texas 75070
972-346-2249
dcc@topher.net

MTC-00009204

From: Meyers, Rich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:06pm

Microsoft is the most arrogant company in America. They monopolize and crush any competition unfairly. They need to be broken into three parts.

MTC-00009205

From: ROSE BUTKOVICH
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

PLEASE ACCEPT COURT OF APPEALS RULING!

MTC-00009206

From: avs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,
I am glad that the DOJ is trying to resolve the Microsoft case. I believe that the uncertainty surrounding Microsoft has and continues to hurt the economy. I believe the quicker this is settled and business can go back to "business", the better for all.

Thank you for your consideration.
Alan Spigelman

MTC-00009207

From: Matt Verran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US DOJ,
I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed, especially since Microsoft declared BeOS as a competing Operating System:

1) MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code license or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

2) The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

3) The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

4) The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

I would suggest that this is the minimum settlement, as financial settlement will merely be paying to maintain the status unfairly achieved so far. The damage to Be Inc, and their new owners Palm Inc, has been substantial to the point of inability to operate and compete effectively.

Regards,
Matt Verran

MTC-00009208

From: Curt Sahakian
To: Microsoft ATR, attorney. general@state.ct.us @ inet ...

Date: 1/7/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement will not accomplished any valid correction or even punishment of Microsoft.

The proposed contribution of software product to schools is a benefit.... it further's MS's Monopoly power by getting an early commitment from children to their operating system.

Please accept the RedHat proposal to distribute their software for free and instead require MS to contribute hardware not software. The rest of the settlement is such a disgusting sellout by the DOJ to Microsoft its hard for me to even comment on it. Please demand more of Microsoft.

Thanks
Curt Sahakian
847/676-2774

MTC-00009209

From: Thepomme@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:15pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

gentlemen: i am not an antitrust lawyer, i know nothing about antitrust laws and i only followed the legal proceedings in general terms. on the other hand, i don't consider myself stupid either. despite the judge's findings, i find it difficult to understand what microsoft did wrong—they negotiated hard. what is wrong with that—I don't understand why hard negotiating is illegal. the main evidence against microsoft was from their competitors—what do you expect the competitors to say?? the bottom line is now that the court has rendered its decision, and doj appears interested in settlement, lets end this litigation as fast as possible. in this era of business difficulties, microsoft appears to be one of the few that is not laying off employees—they are making a profit—they are paying their taxes. its time to end this as fast as possible. the federal government has proposed a fair settlement the "holdouts" have no credibility—I suspect they all have ulterior motives beyond the best interests of the consumer—like competitors being located in those states, etc.. incidentally, was there ever any proof (other than speculation from competitors) that the consumer was hurt by anything microsoft did. it looks like the consumer got the best product for the cheapest possible price. what's wrong with that?? isn't the government supposed to take care of the consumers most importantly rather than the interests of the competitors?? Incidentally and in the interest of full disclosure, I own 800 shares of microsoft.-thank you—rvp

MTC-00009211

From: DUTCHMAN79@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,
Please record my opinion to not punish Microsoft for its success. It seems to me that some states are trying to help their revenue shortfalls by going after a company that has a strong financial sheet in the name of fairness. Let Microsoft do what it does best and allow it to serve as an example for the way a business should be.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Peter Brown

MTC-00009212

From: Josef Lowder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:24pm
Subject: The Microsoft bully

The Microsoft problem can be summed up in one simple statement:

Microsoft should be allowed to run their business any way they want to ... as long as they allow others to run their businesses any way they want to. The problem with Microsoft is that they force themselves on the world to a ridiculous extent. They bully their way along in everything they do. They are predatory toward anything that is in any way competitive or potentially competitive toward them. Computers and their operation are so crucially important to virtually everyone today that it is a crime for anyone to try to dominate how things have to be done on computers. That is what Microsoft does. They do everything possible to force users into using Microsoft products. Even though I am "forced" to use a Microsoft operating system on two of my four computers, I do everything that I possibly can to try to minimize the extent to which I have to use anything Microsoft. But it is frustrating when Microsoft intentionally designs their basic operating system so that only Microsoft-based and Microsoft-dependent applications will run on their operating system and will run only on their operating system. Others are making a valiant effort to try to find ways around the problem, but Microsoft continues to bully their way along so that those without comparable resources can never adequately overcome all of the intrusiveness that Microsoft imposes upon the world. It is a travesty of incomprehensible proportions, and we can only hope and pray that the anti-trust suit will bring some relief to this untenable intrusion into our freedoms.

Joe Lowder
7514 E. Lompoc Avenue
Mesa, Arizona 85208
joe@actionline.com
480-325-5055

MTC-00009213

From: Bill Reilly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:24pm

Please know there are plenty of us out here, who believe the government should be out of this case as soon as possible.

Thanks
Bill Reilly

MTC-00009214

From: Ian C. Crooks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please protect the consumers from the Microsoft tyranny. BeOS was squashed because of Microsoft's heavy handed OEM contracts, forcing PC makers from bundling others OS's with the PC.

Allow consumers to make the choice of what they want to use as an OS not Microsoft.

Ian C. Crooks, E.I.T.
Operations Engineer
Pennsylvania-American Water Company
114 E. Lincoln Highway
Coatesville, PA 19320
610-384-4405 ext:112
610-380-8532 fax
IanCrooks@pawc.com

MTC-00009215

From: Bob Hannah
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:34pm
Subject: Microsoft case

I would like to thank you for pursuing the Microsoft case. I for one, find it difficult being a webmaster, never mind a software developer, with Microsoft having the power to set standards by just "reinventing the wheel" without any thought to industry as a whole. Please consider additional remedies.

Bob Hannah

MTC-00009216

From: Kirchofer, Richard A
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 1:40pm

Dear Sirs:

Sour grapes, Microsoft has done more to make computers useful to the common man than all the other companies put together. The trial is over, let's move forward on important issues like getting broadband into every home and business. I don't use all Microsoft products I do have a choice. However I do not have a choice for the phone lines coming to my house. Bellsouth is a monopoly in my neighborhood with no intension of providing hardware capable of supporting DSL or even a 56K modem. We live in a dynamic world; let's focus on the issues that limit our progress and productivity and that hasn't been Microsoft for a long time!

Sincerely
Richard Kirchofer

MTC-00009217

From: Rocky C. Burrous
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The treatment that Microsoft has received from the government is undeserved, and it is time that it ends. Luckily, a resolution has been reached; with its adoption, the years of litigation can once and for all be resolved. The resolution to which I refer is the one reached in November after years of hard fought legal battles. The terms of this settlement are ones that are beneficial to all the people involved and still keep competition within this market. The terms include a groundbreaking provision that requires Microsoft to disclose crucial interfacing information to computer manufacturers. It further stipulates that Microsoft cannot retaliate against computer makers who do not promote their software or promote a competitor's software instead. This is a resolution that preserves the spirit of a free market and still offers protection for the little guy. Well, folks, it doesn't get any better than this. More litigation could only complicate the issue, and it could only waste more time and resources. Therefore, the last thing we need is more litigation. I implore you to let the current agreement be the end of this situation. The resolution truly is the best that can be done.

Sincerely,
Rocky Burrous

MTC-00009218

From: RRP52@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 1:59pm
Subject: MICROSOFT

I think it is a waste of our (taxpayers) money what is going on it is just the states trying to make money. let the people decide if they want to use Microsoft or not not a bunch of crybabies (competitors) who can't do it on their own Rufus Richey

MTC-00009219

From: Janet Leih
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have never understood why the government was going after Microsoft in the first place. Because I have been in computer programming for and operations for 45 years, it seems idiot to me. It was the only stupid thing Janet Reno did while attorney general (I wish I could say I had only done one stupid thing in my life). Before Microsoft wrote it's Windows system and MS DOS, IBM was basically the only show in town. There were a few other computer manufacturers, but IBM had the lion's share of the market.

The way Microsoft wrote the Windows system, they let any company write software that runs under Windows, and may have been responsible for the greatest economic surge in our history. What did Apple do? Everything that runs on an Apple Computer is proprietary. Nobody but Apple can write programs for their system. Thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of small companies owe their existence to Microsoft's decision to allow anyone run their software under Windows. If Bill Gate gets wealthy by being inclusive rather than exclusive, that just proves that democracy works to everyone's benefit.

Before Windows, computers were huge, expensive, and were only owned by large businesses and wealthy people. After Windows, computers became small, inexpensive and everyone from millionaires to school kids own them.

Microsoft has "bundled" many programs with its system previously. I have "notepad", "wordpad", "paintbrush" and "games" and a "sound recorder" to mention a few "accessories" bundled with my system. Internet Explorer was just another accessory that Microsoft was giving with its system to enhance the product for the consumer. The fact that it was being given free makes it hard for me to understand why the government is saying that this is bad for the consumer.

I think it was bad for Netscape. Maybe it was bad for some other businesses. But the consumer certainly wasn't in any danger of being scammed because they were being given something free. That is frankly a bunch of crap.

Janet Leih
P. O. Box 164
Canton, SD 57013-0164
(605) 987-5070

MTC-00009220

From: Jason Withrow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has done a great deal for this country. It has propelled us to the forefront of the technological age. It has stiffened the economy by creating many well paying jobs, which are a by-product of the great many technological innovations they have introduced, and it has created a standard for which the internet was able to flourish. Before Microsoft, networks could barely speak to each other, with every subnet running it's own proprietary network kernel. Now, we have a TCP/IP standard, introduced and largely developed by Microsoft.

Let's stop and think where this country would be if it hadn't been for the endeavors of Microsoft. If you think we would be in a better place; history says you are mistaken.

The computing industry has had roughly 20 years to build a better user-friendly, operating system. UNIX, BSD, AIX, and Linux all have been around longer than Windows and have all failed to achieve the success that Windows has.

Not because of anti-competitive practices, but because Microsoft has a better product that is easy for people to use. How have they hurt the consumer? I can remember paying \$500 for a copy of Lotus' Office suite and a similar price for Corel's before Microsoft introduced MS Office.

Linux, which has less than a sixth of the features of Windows, sells for only \$20 less.

This is a Capitalistic Republic; the objective of a business is to over-come your competition, not to help them.

An anti-Microsoft decision in this case will be devastating to the economy and to the U.S.'s role of technological innovations. The only one's that would benefit from an anti-MS decision is Microsoft competitors and state governments that are always looking for a way to collect more money.

As a consultant that has worked on projects for the state of Massachusetts, I find it hard to believe that the government of this commonwealth knows what is good for the industry. Also, in correspondence with my state Attorney General Reilly, he certainly has had some very unprofessional replies, which seems to imply that he has taken this effort personally. The letter I received from his office in reply to an inquiry I sent about the MS case was nothing more than an angry juvenile rant that reeked of cynicism and offered no legitimate arguments other than hearsay.

An Anti-MS Judgment will set a very bad precedence; it will send the message that competitors are policing the market, not consumers. And that the company that spends the most money lobbying the government will come out the winner in the end. Instead of the company that spends the most time and effort on developing a quality product. None of the Microsoft competitors in this case have a product that even comes close to the features and ease of use of Microsoft products. In closing I would just like to say that during these times of uncertainty, we should be standing strong behind our ideals and the tools and vehicles

of them. Microsoft is one of the best examples of this Republic's Capitalism, and it should be an encouragement of hope and Patriotism for all American's.

Sincerely,
Jason J. Withrow
D8 Al Pace Drive
North Attleboro, MA 02760
508-643-0316
jwithrow@mediaone.net

MTC-00009221

From: Tom and/or Susan Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My message to the Attorney Generals of the nine hold-out states concerns their winning of a major victory against Microsoft and their refusal to let go when the fighting should stop.

There comes a time after many years of argument that settlement should be made, not only as common sense, but as a matter of business. Our economic concerns are not merely local, but national, and more importantly, global. Our position concerning the freedom to innovate involves national and international prestige, and it is in our "public interest" to remain the foremost nation on earth. Hampering one company can stifle innovation among all our computer companies, and at any time we must remain unified in our effort to provide the best that there is.

Sincerely,
Susan Church Moore

MTC-00009222

From: Dr. Hartmut Reh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I think that it is necessary to remedy the situation that has been brought on BeOS due to MS's strongarm tactics. I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed, for example: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, make dual-boot options mandatory. Furtheron it must be possible to sell PCs with pre-installed BeOS.

Best regards
Dr. Hartmut Reh

MTC-00009223

From: kevin murphy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 2:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madame:

I think it is time to settle and move on. Microsoft is willing to make the necessary changes to keep the industry competitive. The other nine states are looking for the next tobacco type settlement and this case just isn't the same. That would be excessive and unwarranted. (It smells of political agendas.) Unlike the Antitrust of Standard Oil early in the last century, we don't have to keep buying Microsoft products. With Gasoline we have to buy it every week and an anti-trust settlement of Standard Oil was warranted to protect us from price gouging. I don't feel

that Microsoft could gouge us since I never have to buy another Microsoft product as long as I live if I don't want to.

Let's wrap this one up and spend money on something else. I feel protected from Microsoft already.

MTC-00009224

From:

mgiblin@providentmutual.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:08pm

Subject: Let it rest

I think you have wasted enough time and money on this case. Fine Bill and Microsoft heavily and move on. Our country is built on the strong surviving and not hand holding the companies that can't play in the big leagues. Maybe Netscape should have just looked at their business model and watched the finances closer. I do not think the Netscape guy did bad for himself since AOL purchased them. AOL is another company that is a monopoly who put Comuserve and Protogy basically out of business. Why don't we look into that case? What about ComCast purchasing AT&T broadband to be the largest ISP provider. Do you think that is in my favor? Lets focus on real issues like economy, homelessness and joblessness. Let Microsoft make the money they want because they provide jobs to more people than the government can understand.

MTC-00009225

From: MEDIAPEDIA@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:19pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear USDOJ and Judge Kollar-Kotelly
I AM AGAINST THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT . IT IS AN INEFFECTIVE SLAP ON THE WRIST! I expect to see the USDOJ attorneys who drafted this sellout of the USA, working for Microsoft or it's law firms in the future.

This is a shameful scandal that will take its place in our government's history along with the Teapot Dome Scandal and the Watergate coverup.

I am a citizen of the USA. I have a degree in Film and Television from NYU and a Masters Degree in Interactive Technology in Education from Harvard. I also am President of a multimedia company.

MICROSOFT IS ALREADY WORKING TO LEVERAGE IT'S MONOPOLY IN OPERATING SYSTEMS AND EXTEND IT'S ANTICOMPETITIVE, PREDATORY TACTICS AND CREATE FURTHER MONOPOLIES IN COMPUTER SOFTWARE AND GAMES, INTERNET ACCESS AND CONTENT, VIDEOGAME SOFTWARE AND HARDWARE, COPY PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY AND UNDISCLOSED FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES

As a consumer, a technology professional and a small business owner: I HAVE PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED THAT MICROSOFT IS A THREAT TO THE SPIRIT, FREEDOM AND ECONOMIC FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; IF IT'S CONSISTENTLY(COURT PROVEN) MONOPOLISTIC,ILLEGAL, IMMORAL, ANTICOMPETITIVE, PREDATORY TACTICS AND ACTS ARE NOT STOPPED!

To add insult to injury, Microsoft exhibited it's arrogant disregard and disrespect for the citizen consumers, laws and courts of the USA by lying in depositions and court testimony and fraudulently misrepresenting facts in courtroom demonstrations in the recent trial.

Clearly the citizens and governments of Seven States have the courage to hold out for Justice. DO THE RIGHT THING, AMERICA IS WATCHING!

THANK YOU,
William J. Roberts
34 Byron Rd, Natick, MA
1-508-650-0015
mediapedia@aol.com

MTC-00009226

From: Jason Bennett

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:19pm

Subject: Public Commentary

Dear Sirs,

This letter is to express my support for the comments made in a previous email sent by:

Ganesh Prasad
sashi@easy.com.au
Dated January 1st, 2002.

You can find a copy of this letter/email on the web, here: <http://linuxtoday.com/news-story.php3?tsn=2002-01-02-002-20-OP-MS> I am an experienced Network Engineer (MCSE) specializing in Network Security. Ganesh Prasad's statements in his letter to the DOJ reflects my own feelings about what needs to be done for justice to be adequately satisfied. If you have not already done so, please take the time to read Ganesh's letter to the DOJ.

Jason Bennett—Network Engineer
Rural/Metro Corporation—Network Services

Office: (480) 606-3490

MTC-00009228

From: JREW600891@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:28pm

Subject: drop the case this is ridiculous there are going to be other problems the case is destined to thrown out

MTC-00009229

From: Mbstab@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:28pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please bring an end to this ordeal. The settlement appears fair, although I believe Microsoft has been treated unfairly from the start. But I'll let that pass for the sake of this settlement.

Sincerely,
Mark Bodenstab
West Chester, PA

MTC-00009230

From: Randy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:31pm

Subject: DEAR SIRS,

DEAR SIRS,

AS I CONTINUE TO READ ABOUT THE ONGOING " ANTI-TRUST " CASE AGAINST MICROSOFT I FIND MYSELF WONDERING THE SAME OLD QUESTION," WHO ACUALLY COMPLAINED " ????

I DO NOT NOW, NOR HAVE I EVER BELIEVED THAT IT WAS THE "CONSUMER ", THAT FILED THESE COMPLAINTS. IS'NT IT THE CONSUMER THAT YOU CLAIM TO BE PROTECTING ???? AFTERALL,IF WE WERE NOT COMPLETELY SATISFIED WITH MICROSOFT PRODUCTS I DONT IMAGINE THAT WE WOULD PURCHASE SAID PRODUCTS. SO NOW TELL ME,WHO IS IT AGAIN,,THAT IS BEING HURT..

RANDY WHITE
IDAHO FALLS,IDAHO

MTC-00009231

From: Mike Pritchard

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:32pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion... the DOJ should back off a little. I think the DOJ investigation is being driven by competitors of Microsoft. I also think Microsoft's competitors are jealous because they have been unable to duplicate Microsoft's success.

Do you remember what it was like to work with computers in the 70's and 80's??? Proprietary computers running proprietary software. Hardware and software costs were outrageous and maintenance cost weren't much better. Software programs were not standardized and they didn't always play nice with each other. The philosophy of big computer companies seemed to be, "Do it our way or don't do it". Trying to get different computer to work together was very frustrating (if not impossible).

Microsoft could have played by the same rules as everybody else (in the computer industry). Instead, today we have standards and tightly integrated tools for developing and running software.

I do not think Microsoft is a Monopoly. They do not own the hardware and software (unlike Apple and IBM), and there are many operating systems to choose from. You can run several types of UNIX, Macintosh, OS2, etc... Most people choose MSWindows. It is quite nice to have many tools integrated into the MS operating system.

Because of its size it may be a good idea to keep an eye on Microsoft, but in my opinion they should get a commendation for what they have accomplished. Microsoft has made my job easier and more productive.

Michael A Pritchard
Access Development
Director of IS, CIO
SLC, Ut

MTC-00009232

From: paul e jensen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 2:39pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft case should be settled in accordance with the reduced liability finding of the Court of Appeals. As a consumer, I agree that the settlement is good for all of us and the Government should not spend any more money with further litigation. If you wish to receive any more detailed comments from me, send your request to my email address.

Paul Jensen
CC:MSFIN@Microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00009233

From: Clay Bullwinkel
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:42pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 United States Department of Justice
 Dear Madams and Sirs:

Thank you for conducting and managing this call for input. No doubt you receive thousands of emails and letters with little or no new input, and in some cases crank content. Yet you must sift through all of them. I myself have encouraged and led on-line debate in the information technology industry on the Microsoft case. I hope here to offer you a few information points which probably will be unique and useful. I have an M.B.A. degree from Stanford and have held executive positions in the information technology industry with Hewlett Packard, 3Com, and now my own company E.W. Bridge LLC.

In a nutshell, Microsoft has broken the law with their overzealous channel control tactics. You folks can forcefully and effectively can deal with that. It should stop there. To have considered anything further in their activities as subject to legal scrutiny has been the concoction of their competitors, and, most frighteningly, outsiders in government, media and others who wish to seize influence and control in the PC industry. As you should be already aware, the overwhelming majority of software engineers favor a quick end to the Microsoft case with minimal intrusion of the federal government into Microsoft's affairs. If you look at any on line forum for the general programmer community, e.g. not specifically Apple or Palm people, you will find this to be the case. They especially do not want government dictating what should or should not be in a software product. Generally speaking, these people are the most knowledgeable about their industry. Their voice has to carry weight. They understand the benefits and threats from Microsoft better than any general businessman or politician. They, as well as myself, understand that the failure of Microsoft's competitors—Sun, Netscape (AOL), IBM, Apple, Palm, Borland, Novell, WordPerfect, Corel, etc. etc.- has been primarily due to mismanagement in these companies, and in some cases Microsoft's economies of scale, and not to illegal behavior by Microsoft. All of these companies have been plagued by lazy management lacking care and diligence for their future. Most executives, such as myself, understand that ruthless distribution tactics sometimes exhibited by Microsoft are part of every Business 101 course and practiced by all corporations in all industries, including by the companies named above. Please remember to monitor and utilize on-line forums for software engineers as a good source of input. Regarding the "outsiders" mentioned above, I could hardly be more alarmed.

If Mr. Gore had won the election, his DOJ would have continued to try to take control of Microsoft and allocate its pieces to cronies. The media largely avoided mentioning that the written remedy by Mr. Jackson included installation of on-site overseers (commissars) within the pieces of Microsoft, without

restriction on their authority. Mr. Gates would have been prevented from founding a new company with employees from Microsoft. This was a necessary measure because most of Microsoft's software engineers would seek to work for him. I have done business for 18 years in the formerly communist countries of Europe and the old U.S.S.R., and I am well read on their history. It does not take a rocket scientist to see that those in and outside the Department of Justice who were driving the excessive prosecution in the Microsoft case had Bolshevik intent, with courts replacing guns. I would bet that if you looked into their backgrounds, for example, Mr. Klein, you would find parents or grandparents with Soviet sympathies. In terms of threat to American society and culture, Al-Qaida is but a drop compared to that kind of bucket of trouble. In the mid-90's I met a DOJ attorney who questioned me about a company with which I dealt which had fairly obviously set prices with a competitor causing a few billion dollars in overcharges to customers. I said yes, I knew about it, and was even present when one of their key executives bragged about it. He told me a few days later to tell me to forget about what he asked me and not to repeat what I had said. I asked him why. He said that his bosses told him that the company was not to be a target, that it had untouchable status. So these are the people and methods which brought us the Microsoft case. I wish your Mr. Charles James well in his current "housecleaning" of personnel and procedures. May it last beyond the current administration, and be resistant to political tendencies of whatever party is in the White House.

Sincerely,
 Clay A. Bullwinkel
 President
 E.W. Bridge LLC
 70 Bear Gulch Drive
 Portola Valley, California 94028 USA
 tel. (650) 851-7421 fax (650) 851-0956
 clay@ewbridge.com
 <mailto:clay@ewbridge.com>

MTC-00009234

From: BIIJII@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 Please settle the Microsoft case. It is good for me, the industry, and the American economy.
 Ann Bobrow

MTC-00009235

From: Xavier Gu(00E9)rin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Hi!
 I'm a french BeOS developer, and I've decided to write this e-mail in trying to be the most honest I could never be. Microsoft used to have some commercial technics punished by the antitrust law. It's not a fable, but those technics are so hidid that they could appears like fables. MS have encouraged the piracy (not in a visible manner, but I'll never believe that an entreprise able to develop an OS couldn't do

better software protection), and in this way MS killed his enemies. In fact, around 90's, someone who would buy an office suite was able to buy many different kind of suite (like lotus, corel). The question was althought : "Hmmm, MS Office is really expensive.... I prefer buy Lotus Note". Now, this question is totally different! "Hmmm, MS Office is too expensive... No matter! I will burn it". You follow?

It's with this sort of technics that Microsoft win the OS and Offices suite market, and it's whith this sort of technics that Micro\$oft killed our beloved BeOS.

Thank you for your attention, and do the justice like the USA is knowed pretend to do it : in the better way.

Friendly,
 Xavier Guirin.

MTC-00009236

From: Rick Connell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:50pm

I am an average citizen. Not affiliated with Microsoft in any way. I feel that this whole anti-trust lawsuit is stupid. In our efforts to have a level playing field we have doomed those that would excel. Is it accurate that in our country it is alright to try and to succeed mildly, but not to compete? We as a nation have taken a thought or a notion and, as usual, distorted and perverted it to an embarrassing degree in order to perpetuate what we at one time thought was right. So now this noble notion is a bloody sledgehammer robbing from us what is truly rare. A company that can operate dept free. That contributes to our economy, instead of drains it...how sad.

Rick Connell
 San Angelo, Texas

MTC-00009237

From: Doug Gorman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:53pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

...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.

dg

MTC-00009238

From: Sharon Corboy
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 2:58pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

I find it difficult for state attorney generals carrying on a political war against Microsoft. this case should be settled and now. each one of these a.g. have a political motive. to further there on futures. if they want to carry on they should do so at there on expense. please get on with the job of a quick settlement Thomas corboy 3921 forest beach n.w. gig harbor wash.

MTC-00009239

From: Cameron Taylor
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 3:04pm
 Subject: Help

Microsoft has done more good for the nations economy than all government employees and officers combined. Microsoft should be praised not published or investigated for its accomplishments and valuable products it has created for consumers.

Cameron Taylor
Executive Director
NFTPAP
1-800-375-2453
1-801-374-1287 fax
2230 N. University Pkwy Bldg 5
Provo, UT 84604

MTC-00009240

From: John Weis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It's about time to get this settled and stop interfering with the capitalistic version of voting with your feet.

If Microsoft were not the consumers choice they would not be the success that they are. Stop harassment now let the consumer decide.

MTC-00009241

From: MizDotty@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:12pm
Subject: Settlement is called for

Gentlemen:

It is important to the economy to get this thing settled. I feel that Microsoft has been harassed enough and only because some people are jealous of its huge success. I do not see how marketing one's product can be unfair in the first place. I am sure no one had a gun held to their head! But prolonging this very unfair affair hurts everyone from the consumer to the employees, not only of Microsoft, but other companies as well. I feel personally, that this case should never have happened in the first place.

Dorothy A. O'Flaherty
Enumclaw, Wa.

MTC-00009242

From: Humphrey, Robert J
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 3:10pm
Subject: Another MA Bell

Seems like every time someone builds a better mouse trap the government steps in to take it away or makes them re-design it. Bill Gates simply built a product that became so good that no one wanted what the other guys were offering. And the other guys started crying.

Bill Gates has returned far more to society than he every took away.

MTC-00009243

From: Max
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear DOJ:

A dilute remedy to the case (as initially proposed) goes beyond erosion of our justice system. Microsoft is imparting a continuous flow of damage on Information Technology—damage that has already impacted individuals like you and me.

Their history shows clearly that any "Go Forth and Sin No More" resolution will be laughed at within the Company. Moreover, any resolution that requires a new Federal Agency to monitor their behavior will place a new burden on the Taxpayer.

Is the Taxpayer the rightful bearer of this burden ?

Max Gratzl
Engineer

MTC-00009244

From: Pierce, Ben
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs/madams,

I have been following the Microsoft case for some time now. It has come to my attention that the Department of Justice has reached a settlement with Microsoft. After reading excerpts of this settlement I have come to the conclusion that this settlement is severely insufficient. As was found by the Courts, and upheld in the appellate court, Microsoft is guilty of illegally maintaining a monopoly. A guilty verdict suggests that there would be a punishment for Microsoft that would try to curb its ability to commit this crime in the future. The settlement that was proposed does not do this. In fact, this settlement may encourage Microsoft to commit further illegal actions in order to create a more profitable corporation.

Microsoft has a history of unethical business practices. I find it absurd that I am unable to purchase a PC from most mainstream manufacturer's without purchasing Microsoft Software. Not only is it impossible to purchase a computer without Microsoft Windows, but most computers are required to come with several other programs whose genre Microsoft has used its monopoly to push its way into as well, including: Microsoft Office, Microsoft Internet Explorer, Microsoft Net meeting, and Microsoft Media Player.

It is clear to see that in spite of the ruling of illegality, Microsoft is unwilling to curb its appetite for using its operating system to gain footing in many other facets of the software industry. In closing, I ask this court to throw out the settlement reached by Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I also ask the Court to let the Department of Justice know that any settlement that does not let Microsoft know that it will no longer be acceptable to maintain its illegal and unethical practices will be unacceptable.

Thank you for your time and attention,
Benjamin Pierce

MTC-00009245

From: Dewey W. Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:24pm
Subject: American Company

One truly American Company with roots of building the computer industry and providing a standard for the world should not be discredited by those who feel they were cheated a part of the pie. The truth is they did not have the products to compete.

Dt

MTC-00009246

From: Heidi Blumenthal

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/7/02 3:23pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

<<microsoft doj comments lthd.doc>>

January 7, 2002

Renata B. Hesse

Antitrust Division

U.S. Department of Justice

601 D Street NW

Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ms. Hesse:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry.

It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

I work closely with economic leaders and grassroots taxpayer activists across this nation and I must point out that these free-market activists and leaders are virtually unanimous in their criticism of this trial.

Conservatives do not believe the government should be writing software, or picking the winners and losers in this industry. They understand that this effort to regulate the software industry is bad for the economy and the free market. These tactics are an anathema to business executives who understand free and fair competition is what drives companies to create better products and keeps America in the forefront of the digital economy.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views, and those of over 60,000 taxpaying activists.

Onward,

Grover G. Norquist

MTC-00009247

From: alexandw@tklaw.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is a good for everyone except those seeking to obtain more benefit for themselves than for consumers at large.

Since you are asking for opinions, I believe Microsoft is largely a victim of overzealous prosecution and a biased trial Judge. The only ones hurt by the settlement are the few state attorney generals who have not settled

for personal reasons (political gain) and Microsoft's competitors who, incidentally, conduct themselves the same as Microsoft.

The Appeals Court should have given Microsoft a new trial. As a citizen the whole case shocked and troubled me. If I owned or operated a company and was accused of wrongdoing, I would expect, at a minimum, a fair and impartial trial and opportunity to prepare my case. Microsoft was given less than 6 months to prepare for trial, limited in its witnesses (although the trial judge said he would "consider" any reasonable request) and was the victim of some seriously questionable evidentiary and procedural rulings at trial. Even car accident defendants get a more equitable trial and more opportunity to prepare in a state court action than Microsoft received in this Federal Court action involving billions of dollars and thousands of people. Why the trial Judge was biased against Microsoft will forever be a mystery but from his statements in and out of court the bias was obvious.

Any wrongdoings (if any) by Microsoft are adequately addressed by settlement.

The country and its consumers will benefit from this settlement. I urge the parties and the court to pursue settlement of the remaining claims on similar terms.

MTC-00009248

From: Louella
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:35pm
Subject: RE: TUNNEY ACT

My personal feelings in regards to the Microsoft settlement, is that enough is enough!! The settlement that has been made is agreeable to most and that should be sufficient.

I, for one, am sick and tired of my tax dollars being squandered on merry little trifles while people in the U.S. are homeless & hungry. We pay taxes & then are supposed to help these causes with our donations!! Leave well enough alone!! Put our tax dollars to work for us constructively & STOP spending your time & our money trying to tear down!!!!

Just remember, we not only pay taxes.....WE VOTE!! With the new awareness in America today, the government better hold on tight when it comes time for the next election!!!! You have spent millions so far getting to the settlement you now have w/ Microsoft, leave it alone.....it should be a done deal!!

Sincerely,
Louella B. Williams

MTC-00009250

From: james arnstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:40pm
Subject: 9 States vs Microsoft AntiTrust Case
Dear Sir,

I think the demands that the 9 states are attempting to place on Microsoft as punishment for their "anti trust" practices are ludicrous. The hidden corporate motives of various Microsoft competitors, all trying to disrupt and destroy Microsoft's market positions, are the real culprits. Let the consumer dictate what they want in the market place and not the attorney generals

from the 9 states trying to break up the business practices of Microsoft.

Thank you,
James Arnstein

MTC-00009251

From: Kinsella, Mary
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 3:53pm
Subject: Microsoft

Gentlemen: Bill Gates and his Microsoft team have revolutionized computer use. This is no small thing. Nothing in our world is the same thanks to the ease of use of the Microsoft products. I'm not saying there weren't any other important players because there were, however, in my view Microsoft was the absolute catalyst for it all, the information highway, the information age, the whole ball of wax. Rather than penalizing them over nitpicky stuff, we should really be giving Gates and his cohorts some kind of award. Bill Gates and Microsoft have changed the way we work, the way we live. Another plus which hasn't yet been acknowledged or reached fruition is that there are innumerable people who previously couldn't even type, didn't know a keyboard from a calculator, who are now clicking away, traveling the information highway, finding useful information, planning their life events, and without intending to becoming proficient at keyboarding and absorbing way more information than they realize. Their life skills and possibly job skills are improving due to the prolific distribution and reasonable pricing of Microsoft products, not to mention the 'free' added in products like Microsoft Internet Explorer and Microsoft Photo Editor. I've never heard one real (from the horses mouth) story about Microsoft people being coercive in fact I've heard just the opposite. It's my humble opinion that the law and the DOJ is being manipulated by Microsoft's enemies who will use you as a cat's paw to destroy the man, Bill Gates, who may be the greatest mind of our time. Many years ago a poet said he had seen the best minds of his generation destroyed by madness. I'd have to say I see the best mind of my generation being destroyed by jealousy and concerted legal malice. Please note that this is my personal opinion only, and not necessarily the opinion of my employer. May God's own wisdom aid you in making your decisions in this matter.

Sincerely,
Mary T. Kinsella
22 Rockhill Street
Foxboro, MA 02035

MTC-00009252

From: Robert Pretlow, M.D.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a pediatrician, and I manage two humanitarian health websites for children, one for bedwetting at <http://www.wetbusters.com>, and one for overweight children at <http://www.blubberbusters.com>. Approximately 60,000 children per month use the two sites. There are an estimated 7 million children with bedwetting in the U.S. and 15 million

overweight children. These websites allow children affected with bedwetting or obesity to learn about their problem and to anonymously interact, via chat rooms, with other children affected with the same problem. There are social stigmas attached to these conditions, and chat rooms allow the children to interact in a way not possible in face-to-face life.

Both of these sites use Java software (Sun Microsystems) for educational applications and for chat rooms. Again, chat rooms are highly valued by children with socially stigmatized conditions because of the anonymity of chat rooms. There is no other chat room software comparable to Java. Java also allows monitoring of the chat rooms to insure child safety. Previous versions of Microsoft Windows have included Java, but Microsoft Corporation has now decided to no longer include Java with their new version, Windows XP. Therefore, to use our chat rooms and educational areas, children with Windows XP computers must now first download Java, a process that is complicated and time consuming (15-20 minutes with a 56K modem). Moreover, with typical 56K dialup access, the connection may be interrupted before the download is completed.

Below is an email from a 12-year-old boy with bedwetting (who uses the wetbusters site):

Subject: hi
Date: Thu, 1 Nov 2001 20:08:30 EST
From: RobThGmHHH@aol.com
To: chatrooms@wetbusters.com

i have the new windows XP and i can't get in the room it say i don't have a java browser. what do i do.

Tony

Subsequent emails from this child indicate that neither he nor his family is unable to understand how to download Java:

no i did not down loda it because it did not ask me if i want to down load the java browser.

Tony

mom and dad had to get a computer guy to put a java browser on my computer. the computer guy loaded netscape so i could have a java browser on my windows XP.

Tony

Children using America Online with Windows XP do not receive a screen message that they must download Java. Moreover, if they are able to download Java, they are no longer able to use Java applications in AOL's browser environment. They must now use Microsoft Internet Explorer or install Netscape Navigator.

I have also been in the process of creating an interactive website for children with asthma, of whom there are 20 million children in the U.S., and who have the same social isolation issues as children with obesity and bedwetting. I have, however, currently abandoned the children's asthma site because of the Windows XP Java issue. I feel that Microsoft's decision to no longer include Java in the Windows operating system constitutes a significant hardship for thousands of users. Even though I have been a substantial Microsoft stockholder since its initial public offering, I feel that the lack of Java inclusion in Windows XP places an

unfair barrier for users of chat rooms and other Java applications.

Because Microsoft is allowed to have a monopoly on the PC operating system, I feel that Microsoft has a responsibility to not abandon consumers. Microsoft should therefore be required to include Java with the Windows operating system.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above matter.

Yours truly,

Robert A. Pretlow, MD, FAAP
eHealth International, Inc.
5406-K Lake Washington Blvd. N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98033
phone: 425-827-3719

MTC-00009253

From: Henry Sharp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:55pm
Subject: proposed settlement

I am disappointed that our government has not proceeded with serious action against Microsoft's anti-trust suit. Microsoft continues to flout the government and run their monopolistic practices and the justice department is doing nothing to stop them.

Harriet Sharp
1165 Harbor Hills Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

MTC-00009254

From: Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have designed industrial instruments and other products since 1970. As an independent consultant, it is necessary for my work to be installed and read by my customers' systems. So, I struggle to stay in business because I cannot afford the continual drain on my time and physical energy that results from Microsoft's periodic Operating Systems woes and planned product obsolescence. At the same time, I cannot provide reports and data to my clients unless I continue to remain up to date with my Microsoft software.

For the record, I started using Microsoft when it was Windows 3.1. I have changed to the next version reluctantly, and only at the point in time when Microsoft refused to continue its support of the prior product. That migration path wound through Windows 3.10, 3.10a, Windows 95, NT3.51, and NT4.0. I stare into the near future with dread: Windows XP is not for me, but I don't know what else I may be able to do. At each change, Microsoft collects more money. With each version, I spend no less than 100 hours getting my equipment to work again, sometimes finding that a printer (or other device) is no longer "supported" by Microsoft's latest product and must be replaced.

Mr. Gates is a pioneer. His company has found a method by which he can deliver a product that isn't finished yet, charge more for it than it will ever be worth, and have his quality assurance testing conducted by paying customers. The only partial success I have enjoyed is that I have avoided using Internet Explorer or Microsoft Outlook. Even without all those security problems (read,

design defects), other Microsoft products have consumed far too much of my time and patience.

The existing settlement seems to me a bald faced sellout. I would like to see my government (Federal as well as State) do more than cower uncertainly before such a large political contributor . . . who also happens to have been guilty of breaking the law. I would sincerely hope that we may find a restored balance in our priorities: it is an old principle of law that one who abuses the law should not benefit from that abuse. I would love to see that attitude regain its earlier vitality.

David E. Myer, Sr.
Vice President
Crow Feather Ent., Inc.
Innovation & Intellectual Property

MTC-00009255

From: Mader, John
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 3:55pm
Subject: Anti-Trust Settlement

To whom it may concern
I feel that if the present settlement is allowed to stand (Microsoft allowed to continue shipping their applications bundled with their operating system) the consumer will have to pay the cost of mitigation. With the clout that the operating system gives Microsoft they will be able to move into any lucrative software market after other firms develop those markets. This pattern is very evident (i.e. Java, Palm, Sun). Eventually most of the other players will be pushed out of the market, and Microsoft will be successful in creating a barrier to the software market. This loss of competition will not serve the interest of the American people. I ask the court to break Microsoft into 2 or more companies.

John Mader
10228 Gatemont Circle
Elk Grove Ca. 95624

MTC-00009256

From: john was
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:02pm
Subject: stop it already

Please stop this travesty of justice. Enough is enough of this capitalism hating antitrust law suit. I myself am not wealthy and probably wont ever be but I dont begrudge someone who has the where with all to achieve what microsoft has done. Show some common scence and put and end to this garbage once and for all.

MTC-00009257

From: PollyPops9@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:01pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
LET'S SETTLE THIS STUPID ATTACK ON MICROSOFT NOW.

MTC-00009258

From: Bill Turner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:02pm
Subject: comments on microsoft judgement
[Text body exceeds maximum size of message body (8192 bytes). It has been converted to attachment.]

CC: Dennis Powell, Steve Coe, Tony Charoen, Laurence Hunt...
Gentlemen:

First, I'd like to thank you for allowing this period of "public comment" on the Microsoft Anti-Trust Settlement. I have taken the liberty of cc'ing a few of my closest friends scattered "hither and yon" around the globe as well as a "Linux Columnist" because I think this really is an International, as well as very important, issue that should not be restricted to the views of a few people, or to "Americans Only." I suppose an appropriate beginning would be to talk a bit about my qualifications. First and foremost I am not an attorney. I am a "computer professional" with over 20 years of experience of all kinds in the "computer industry" and have worked on equipment ranging from mainframe computers (using punched cards as input and output) to stand-alone and networked PC's. I have a BBA in Computer Information Systems (Cum Laude) from National University in San Diego, CA from 1985. And an AS in Data Processing from San Diego City College. Since the fall of 1980 when I began classes at San Diego City College I have worked on many different types of hardware, and used many different Operating Systems. Back in the early 80's the world of the PC was still a "wild and wooly" kind of place. Many OS's and computer hardware philosophies existed to provide an environment where the end user had an incredible amount of choice. I have, as a computer professional, essentially "grown up" along with the PC. I have watched the hardware side of things advance rapidly from the "turbo" PC XT clone of my first system (10 MHz!), 640KB RAM (which according to Bill Gates at the time 'should be enough for anybody') and no hard drive at all to the situation today where a 1 GHz processor and 128MB of RAM (and a 20GB hard drive) is considered routine. I have watched as the business world embraced PC technology with open arms. To make them "more productive" and to cut costs (as compared to mainframes). I have watched while the PC was "standardized" to be a "Microsoft-Only" machine in so far as the OS and most applications suites are concerned. I have seen, for more than two decades now, the kind of company Microsoft is, and the kind of business practices that they consider to be "acceptable" I find to be so abhorrent I will do almost anything to avoid putting money into their pockets. Unfortunately, as a "computer professional," I find myself, more often than I'd like to think about, in the situation of having to recommend and then support Microsoft products because of the almost universal perception that "the Microsoft Way is the Only Way" and most companies will not even consider anything else. Even now.

There have been "alternatives" to Microsoft products all along. Back in the days of MS DOS there were products such as CP/M, 4DOS, and DR-DOS. But one thing Microsoft has always been a master at. Marketing.

They managed to convince the PC makers to include the MS DOS OS with every new system sold. Once PC's started being sold with hard drives installed it was even easier

to do this as Microsoft went to the companies (politely at first, the strong-arm stuff came later) and managed to get them to sign "exclusive" agreements with Microsoft.

These "exclusive" agreements meant that NO competitors OS software (or applications software for that matter) could be installed on any system sold. And of course, you could not sell a PC with NO OS installed.

According to Microsoft this was to "stop piracy" but in reality it was a ploy to make Microsoft, Bill Gates, Paul Allen, and all the rest of them so filthy RICH that it is more than obscene. How "powerful" is Microsoft? Consider the case of OS/2 and IBM for an answer to that. IBM is hardly what one could consider a "small company" and easily pushed around by anybody. According to documents published already from the DOJ's Microsoft Anti-Trust Trial even a company the size of IBM was "forced" to sign "exclusive agreements" with Microsoft to include a copy of Windows 95 with every PC sold, or not have a "license" to sell Windows 95 at all. If a company the size of IBM has "no choice" then the rest of the software and computer industry is pretty well screwed isn't it?

Today, Microsoft has a lot of very real competition. This is as it should be. For server and other "back office" applications Linux is "kicking tail" and that's only going to improve. However, if the U.S. Government "gives in" to Microsoft on this Anti-Trust Settlement, and you need to understand that the view "from the street" is that you are doing EXACTLY that very thing, then Microsoft is going to go on, just as before, and absolutely NOTHING will have been gained from the long, and expensive, anti-trust trial.

Red Hat Linux <<http://www.redhat.com>> has offered to take the proposal that Microsoft provide it's OS and apps software to the "14,000 poorest U.S. School Districts" one better. They have offered to take the money that would have been spent for the Microsoft OS and apps software, and use that to invest in more hardware for the schools instead.

The money can be used to provide a rather substantial increase in the number of computers provided to the school districts. Red Hat has agreed to "provide Open Source solutions" which include Red Hat Linux and any applications needed (perhaps the Star Office suite—a "worthy replacement" for MS Office in every way) and this will be something that is not going to require going back in a few years to "upgrade" all of those systems because the OS and applications software licenses will have expired.

Open Source is about Freedom. Freedom of Choice in just about everything. Linux is an excellent and probably the best known example of this. The Linux Kernel is "hacked" (coded) by people all over the world. It all flows through a small group of people (including Linus Torvalds, the creator) who ensure that there is "control" over what gets put in, what doesn't, and to ensure a central place to keep track of what bugs yet need squashing.

With Linux, you can run at the command line, or under X Windows (a graphical environment or GUI). If you run X Windows you then have a plethora of "environments"

to choose from and run. GNOME or KDE (both quite legitimate competitors to the MS Windows environment) or perhaps a "light weight" Window Manager such as IceWM (my personal favorite) or the well-regarded Enlightenment Window Manager.

The point is that with Linux, and with Open Source, you get a tremendous amount of choice "built-in" and it has always been there. With Microsoft the only "choice" you get is to open your wallet, when they tell you to, and to pay them what they tell you to, or to not use their products. If everyone else is using their products this can be "a bit of a problem" to put it politely. There are other issues as well. One of the things keeping Linux from being even more widely accepted than it already is has to do with the fact that when the consumer goes to buy a PC it is REQUIRED—still—to have a Microsoft OS on it. The consumer is not told how much of the cost of the system is due to the OS. The consumer is not told that they have any choice in the matter at all.

This needs to be changed, dramatically. Ideally when a consumer walks into a computer store he would be shown "that system in the window" advertized for \$499 and then it would go something like this:

Salesman: OK sir, we need to discuss how you'd like your system setup. What OS would you like?

Customer: What do you have available? What's the cost? What's included?

Salesman: We have Windows XP, Red Hat Linux, or you can get the system with no OS at all and install whatever you'd like when you get home.

If you want Windows XP that would add \$150 to the price for the "home" version, and \$250 for the "professional" version. We can install it for you free. You won't get a CD. And that includes no "office" or "development" software. If you want to add that we can discuss your needs so I help you with that. Also, you will have to go to Microsoft to get your OS "activated" after it's installed. You have 30 days to do that or it stops working.

If you want Red Hat Linux (the Deluxe Boxed set) it will add about \$80 to the price. Red Hat Linux comes with 6 CD's containing the OS, the Source Code for that, and a host of applications software of all types. We can also install that for you for free.

Also, you need to know that, by default, the system has a "win-modem" installed. What that means is that it will only work with a version of the Windows OS. If you want a "real" modem that will work with any OS then we have an internal 56K modem for \$50 and an external for \$120.

Customer: I never realized before how expensive it was to have Windows! What's the deal with this modem that won't work with anything else? That doesn't sound right to me. How hard is it to use Linux? Do you have classes for that?

Salesman: Yes sir, it can be kind of expensive to run Windows. The "win-modem" is a cheap modem that uses "software" to do part of the job "hardware" used to do routinely. It uses about 15% of the system resources to do that on average. It is much cheaper though at only \$25 instead of \$50 for the internal modem.

Linux can be kind of difficult to learn at first. But yes sir, we do have classes in Linux. We can also discuss what your needs are going to be and we can do all the installation and almost all the setup of it here in the store for you. Just like Windows.

Once it's installed and properly configured Linux is really no more difficult to run than Windows is. I think you'll find many things to like about Linux once you give it a try.

So what would you like to do sir?

Customer: I think I'll take the Red Hat Linux, installed, and the external modem as well. And I'd like to talk about getting some of those classes you mentioned.

Salesman: Yes Sir! I think you'll be happy with the choice you've made. Let's talk about getting you scheduled for some of those Linux user classes. Would evening or on the weekend better suit your schedule?

In an ideal world, this is what would happen. I've used Red Hat Linux as an example only. Could just as well be SuSE, Debian, Slackware or Mandrake Linux. Or something from another OS maker. BeOS. FreeBSD. or a host of others.

I think that if Microsoft is "punished" by putting their OS and applications software into the 14,000 poorest school districts in America then they are not actually being punished at all. The school districts are now pawns in a ploy to get Microsoft on every school desktop in America. If Red Hat Linux is taken up on their offer to substitute Open Source applications and OS software there is going to be, of necessity, an absolutely vital long-term benefit to this nation, and the world, that no one seems to realize. The students are going to be exposed at an early age to the "Open Source Attitude" and that is something worthwhile in my opinion.

Also, if you go to Linuxdot.Org <<http://www.linuxdot.org>> you'll find a couple of columns I've written. One of them, on "OS Arrogance" I think it is, has a link to an article where a description of the School System of Mexico choosing to use "Open Source" and how that has gone so far. Personally, I think that if "Open Source" and Linux is "good enough" for the schools in Mexico then it is surely "good enough" for the Public Schools in the United States as well. In a world where "the net" is almost everywhere, it is important that this "punishment" of Microsoft be seen in the larger context that it is actually a part of. The World Community. Not just the United States. For something of this magnitude "national borders" are irrelevant. Left unsaid until now is the absolutely horrific "security" aspects of just about any Microsoft OS or application you'd care to name. To call the quality of Microsoft's products "shoddy" is about as accurate as describing "gang rape" as "an amusing Saturday evening diversion". Microsoft released Windows 2000 to the world with a list of "known bugs" that totaled over 67,000. This is what they "knew about" and released anyway. Microsoft doesn't really care about security. All they care about is money.

Want proof? Do like I did. Subscribe to a few internet mailing lists on security issues (like the one from CERT) and you will find again and again "exploits" against Microsoft products. Microsoft products keep the "anti-virus" makers in business all by themselves.

Microsoft, even when someone takes the time and trouble to describe to them EXACTLY what the exploit is, how to use it, and (in many cases) how to "plug the hole" simply can not be bothered to even respond to the person letting them know. Let alone actually taking the time and trouble to work on making "security" holes disappear in their products. In the Linux world of course things are different. Linux, like any other OS or application, has it's own set of problems. Linux though, since it's "Open Source" has a huge advantage. Anyone that wishes to can take the source, fix a bug they found, and submit that back to the "Linux Community" at large almost instantly.

In practical terms this means that when an "exploit" is discovered in Linux there is a "fix" available for it in a matter of only a couple of days. Many times, it's available in a matter of hours. Word is put out on where to get it, and how to install it. Almost before most people even knew that there was "a problem" it has already been fixed.

Microsoft, on the other hand, quite routinely takes weeks or months to "fix" whatever security hole we are talking about. If they do so at all. Many of the people that write viruses to "attack" Windows do so because Microsoft has quite routinely ignored these problems in the past. If you have a "known exploit" that has been around for months and you know that Microsoft is not about to take one minute of their time, or spend one dollar of their money, fixing something like that then it becomes ridiculously easy to have something like the "Melissa" Virus spreading like wildfire all over the world.

If Microsoft is forced to compete on an equal basis with everyone else then Microsoft is going down the tubes, in a hurry, because Microsoft has never in it's life tried to compete on an equal footing with anyone and wouldn't have the slightest idea how to go about doing that. "Freedom of Choice" is one of the Open Source Credo's. Unspoken or not. Let's make it the "rule of law" so far as Microsoft is concerned as well please. I'd like to close with a short bit about "standards." Both the "real" and the "Microsoft" variety. "Real" standards of course are just that. Standards that a majority of knowledgeable people from around the world have agreed on "yes, this is how this will work" and everyone knows that this is how things will work.

"Microsoft" standards are standards because Microsoft says so. Microsoft is an "old pro" at taking "real" standards, like XML, and "improving" it. Microsoft's idea of an "improvement" however usually is along the lines of "it only works with Microsoft products" now. I recently read a bit of news where the Opera web browser was not able to connect to a portion of the MSN.com site unless it was configured to tell the server it was "Internet Explorer." Opera allows you to "tweak" many things. Including how to present itself to the web server. So long as "I.E." was selected Opera users could access anyplace on the site. When it was telling the server that it was, in fact, Opera, a cryptic message about "upgrading your browser" and quite specifically mentioning I.E. was displayed instead.

Microsoft claims that it was "an accident" and it was soon enough fixed. But it does much to show what the thinking of Microsoft is as regards the Internet, and standards for the Internet. I believe that Microsoft should be forced to adhere to standards that are really standards. I also believe that they should be forced to not only document their Windows API calls, but also to document their file formats. In particular their "*.doc" format. This is something that changes all the time. Also, Microsoft should be forced to document all the "improvements" they've made to "standards" such as XML, and other Internet related "standards" that they have "improved." As a company Microsoft wouldn't know "innovation" if it came up and bit them. All they know is how to take ideas someone else had, put it in a pretty wrapper, declare it to be the result of "years of research and development work" and then expect people to pay whatever they decide to charge.

We need to put a stop to this. If not for Microsoft and their decidedly "anti-competitive" nature the computing industry could be years ahead of where we are now. You have the power, and the opportunity, to make historic changes that will not only affect us, but indeed will affect most of the world in one fashion or another.

Please do not "roll over" for Microsoft. No matter how much money, or how many lawyers they throw at you. Let's see "justice" actually be just that for a change.

Thank you.

MTC-00009259

From: Don Bogart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 3:50pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Software Marketing Center, LLC
4149 Winfield Road
Columbus, Ohio 43220
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I believe that it was a tremendously important and beneficial decision for the Department of Justice to have settled the case against Microsoft. Having spent the past twenty years in the software business, I can attest to the positive impact that Microsoft and other innovative companies have had in contributing to the remarkable productivity gains which helped to generate a robust national economy for many years. Without this leadership and technological advantage, our country would be far less able to succeed in an increasingly competitive global marketplace.

I think that the current settlement is fair to both sides. I was happy to learn that The State of Ohio is ready to settle the case. Further litigation and congressional hearings would benefit no one but Microsoft's competitors. I support the settlement, and hope to see it finalized soon.

Sincerely,
Donald Bogart
President
Software Marketing Center, LLC

MTC-00009260

From: Eberhard Hafermalz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:05pm
Subject: Settlement with MicroSoft
Dear Sir/Madam

Following a request by Helmar Rudolph who is part of the BeUnited Team and with whom a DOJ person has talked on January 4, 2002, I would like to submit my views on what is necessary to remedy the damage done to the market for PC operating systems (OS) by MicroSoft.

I am not a developer but a user of the BeOS, an alternative operating system widely acclaimed for its potential as a desktop OS. I would like to stress that the BeOS never has taken off as a widely used OS on the PC market. Not because it does not have the potential; there is publicly available numerous evidence to the contrary. The BeOS has died because computer makers were not allowed to pre-install this OS on their systems instead of or even alongside a MicroSoft OS, thus precluding a broad distribution. It is a known fact that computer makers declined the offer of Be, Inc., the maker of BeOS, to ship their machines with the BeOS pre-installed because this would invoke the respective punitive clauses in the licensing agreement they had with MicroSoft.

Further, when installing a MicroSoft OS onto a computer already equipped with the BeOS (or any other OS), the MicroSoft OS wipes the so-called bootblock, resulting in the computer only booting into the MicroSoft OS afterwards. As is well known, MicroSoft OSs are prone to get unusable after a short period of time, requiring extensive maintenance which more often than not is easiest done by re-installing the whole system. This obviously invokes the bootblock problem every time a re-install is conducted.

These two issues alone make it almost impossible for the average computer user to (a) acquire a non-MicroSoft OS running computer, and (b) maintain a dual-boot system where one of the OSs is a MicroSoft one. The remedy for issue (a) would be to disallow MicroSoft in clear terms the use of any contractual clauses in their licensing agreements that restrict the decision of the computer maker on what OS, if any, to ship with the computer they manufacture.

The remedy for issue (b) is to disallow MicroSoft the overwriting of the bootblock when Windows (or another MicroSoftware) is installed. This is technically possible by giving the user the choice which systems to boot into. Resolving issue (b) is in fact complementary to issue (a) for the reasons explained above; otherwise MicroSoft would be allowed to abuse their dominant market position by simply accomplishing at a later point in time what they have been denied at the manufacturer's stage: killing the competing OS on the same computer.

In light of the MicroSoft strategy of the past, the above is not the only remedy I think necessary because it would only create a level playing field. MicroSoft would be allowed to maintain the fruit of their previous unfair competition practice. Thus it appears unjustified to require MicroSoft to cede proprietary information in areas where it has acquired a de-facto monopoly by way of

utilizing advantages from their unfair competitive behavior. Most importantly, this includes the "office" part of the company's business. Microsoft Office is the standard because Office was pressed onto the consumer as "part of Windows", which—as well as the Internet Explorer—it is not. Microsoft thus utilized the practice described above to eliminate any competitor in this software segment.

In order for rival makers of office software to compete they need the information required to create translators, software add-ons ("plug-ins" in Windows-speak) that allow the competing software to import from and export files to Microsoft Office (and other) formats. I would like to point out that in order to accomplish this it is not required that Microsoft open their source code of Windows, Microsoft Office, or any other software.

Moreover, I would like to bring to your attention that it is not only Windows, and Microsoft software running on Windows, that needs to be included in a settlement. Microsoft is already showing the same patterns of behavior as before in the market for handheld computers. Also they are obviously trying to delay any remedial action against the Windows monopoly in the desktop computer market until Windows is no longer their main product line. Any settlement that is to create and ensure a level playing field in the longer term not only needs to remove the Windows monopoly but at the same time include any future OS or, indeed, software Microsoft might sell, be it ".Net" software, Windows CE/Stinger, or any other product.

Finally, please revise your stance on the issue of Microsoft's "giving away freely" computers, software, and service for these to schools. This is no remedy but an opportunity. It will create a new market for the company. These days Microsoft's power to abuse their position stems from the very fact that for most people the term "computer" automatically means "Windows", i.e. Microsoft. Letting Microsoft "make good" for their abusive behavior by opening one of the few places where competing OS maker Apple still holds a better than insignificant market share would mean, as we say in Germany, to try to expel the devil with the Beelzebub.

The fate of innovation is at stake. Innovation cannot come from a company that has been holding the monopoly for almost ten years now. There is much better, much more innovative software out there than Microsoft one but it will never have a chance.

Unless Microsoft is forced to give it that chance.

Thank you for your attention.
Faithfully yours
Eberhard Hafermalz

MTC-00009261

From: Accounting
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 4:03pm
Subject: Microsoft
I support the microsoft settlement

MTC-00009262

From: Accounting

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft Settlement. Stop wasting taxpayers money. Microsoft has done more for computer technology than any other company in the world. Leave them alone.

MTC-00009263

From: Sara Peters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is time to settle the Microsoft case and let them get on with their business. This has gone on too long. I hope to read where a settlement has been reached and then that will be the end of this case.

Sincerely,
Sara Peters

MTC-00009264

From: Jason W Stiles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am currently participating in worldwide network, orchestrated through beunited.org, that is working toward bringing BeOS or the equivalent back into the market place. There is however little hope for success of any alternative operating systems making headway on x86 (Intel) architecture if the following issues are not addressed:

- Open Office Suite file formats
- Win32 APIs
- Boot sector control through restrictive licensing

- Dual boot availability with predominant platforms

It is commonly accepted among Operating System enthusiasts that BeOS was one of the most advanced, most promising, and at the same time most doomed operating system because of the inability to work with vendors to get the product to market. This was truly the demise of BeOS. Any settlement that allows any company to restrict what OS'es may or may not be installed by 3rd party hardware vendors and computer manufacturers would be simply forcing the fate of Be Inc and BeOS onto the next company that attempts to innovate in the OS marketplace. Further more, I think appropriate punishment of Microsoft should not come in the form of donations of hardware and software to schools, but rather it should include funding of Operating System research and development in the educational sector and no profit organizations. By taking advantage of and empowering the bright young minds our in country's high education institutions you would be fostering the same scenarios that led to the creation of Mosaic and the Netscape Browser and we all recognize how that changed the world.

Thank you,
Jason Stiles
Associate Consultant
CRM Alliance Services
stilesja@us.ibm.com
cell phone # 270-303-8322
home phone # 270-563-2403 v-
mail # 804-327-4854

MTC-00009265

From: RYDER385@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:15pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Further litigation should be denied for the following: —The Dept. of Justice reached a verdict and compensation agreed to by the party majorities. —To allow further litigation one has to only question the motives and rationale of the remaining few. —To pursue further litigation casts serious doubts on the credibility of the Dept. of Justice process and abilities of its hard working personnel.

MTC-00009266

From: Muller, Thomas
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 4:34pm
Subject: Penalties

I can't believe that you caved to the Microsoft monopoly and are allowing them to continue to rip the people off. They are overcharging the consumer for their operating system. They are subjecting us to operating systems that are full of defects, security flaws, and they are not being "innovative" as they claim to be. I hope the states that defected from your settlement are successful in braking the company up into at least two separate companies.

Thomas P. Muller—Project Engineer
TMuller@acfindustries.com
636.940.5281

MTC-00009267

From: Wweinzierl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:25pm
Subject: (no subject)

Gentlemen,

As a business leader I personally feel we have taken up enough of the public time and capital in pursuing MS to the ends of the earth. The remaining state attorneys general must feel a need for job preservation (i.e. reelection) by endeavoring to keep this case in the public domain unendingly. Please in the interest of all concerned, particularly the consumer, put this to rest asap.

Sincerely,
Bill Weinzierl

MTC-00009268

From: Berger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:31pm
Subject: change is needed

I think it is time to end Bill Clinton era anti-trust law abuse. Let's get on so the free enterprise system can produce jobs and financial assistance to the American people.

MTC-00009269

From: Kevin Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

BlankThe purpose of this email is to communicate my complete dissatisfaction with the ongoing anti-trust case against Microsoft. While I have my complaints against Microsoft and its products, it seems inconceivable to me that the company would be litigated against for being a monopoly. This is simply ludicrous, in my opinion. In

fact, I believe this case has done tremendous harm to those in our community who take the risks and innovate. The outcome of this case applies to everyone, not just Microsoft.

I don't know whether Bill Gates contributed to Bill Clinton's campaign or not, but it seems clear to me that this misuse of governmental power is abusive and harmful to the public and it is my strongest position that the case should be ended now with an apology issued to Microsoft for all the harm it has caused and another apology to the public for the waste of taxpayer dollars used to litigate this case. This applies to the states that continue to litigate as well.

Kevin Brown

MTC-00009270

From: Fran (038) Gene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:36pm
Subject: MICROSOFT LAWSUIT ?

I think you should let them off at this point—just look at all the good they have done — I couldn't have a computer if it wasn't for Microsoft ??

Virginia

Ralph Anderson
rea@preferred.com

MTC-00009271

From: Scott McLaughlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust

You have failed to prove your case. Drop it and stop wasting our money.

Success is not a crime.

Scott McLaughlin
President
MultiMedia Dental Systems, Inc.
www.multimediantal.org
877-770-8514

MTC-00009272

From: Guthrie Chamberlain
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust case

I am writing today to voice my opinion on the Microsoft Antitrust case. As an owner of a business that is part of the IT industry I feel this case has been dragging on for too long and it has hurt not only Microsoft, but also the entire IT industry. The government has no rights meddling in the affairs of independent business unless it is truly hurting consumers through unfair practices. This is certainly not the case with Microsoft who has facilitated computing technology to benefit the majority of the world's population. Productivity and creativity has been stifled and it is now showing in the marketplace. Our economy has grown so much in the past two decades, due mainly to Microsoft and other key companies providing innovative products to the general consumer.

I have firsthand experience dealing with Microsoft, as I work as a Systems Integrator, creating and installing networks. Their products have made our business run, as well as the majority of our clients. As Microsoft experienced problems due to these lawsuits, so have we and it has affected the entire economy. I feel part of the recession that we are now experiencing is due to these lawsuits. I ask that you please take the

public's concern into consideration and help put an end to the lawsuits. Additionally, I hope that remaining nine states can come to quick settlements, without further scrutiny from the government.

Sincerely,

H. Guthrie Chamberlain, III
501 Chamberlain Drive
Marietta, OH 45750
Guthrie Chamberlain
President
Eagle Technologies Group, Inc.
guthrie.chamberlain@eaglesgi.com
www.eaglesgi.com
740.373.9729 x101

MTC-00009273

From: DBHepp@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

The 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.

Please don't let special interests groups defeat the public interest.

Best regards,
Don Hepperle
Phone: 541-548-3354
Mailto: dbhepp@aol.com

MTC-00009274

From: MAXF4T@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:59pm
Subject: public comments on MS case

Dear Justice Department,

I have been following the government's misguided lawsuit against Microsoft. I have been a Microsoft user ever since I started using computers and I don't like the way the government has been attacking them.

In the first place, I like the way Microsoft bundles software. I think it's a big headache to purchase everything separately and then try to figure out what will work with what. Microsoft already does that for me; they perform all of the compatibility computations and work out most of the bugs before the product ever gets to me. I call that "good service." That's why I purchase Microsoft products.

In the second place, I have rarely (if ever) had a problem adding programs to my Microsoft operating system. I realize that there is a learning curve with new software and it may take me a while to figure it out; but that is not Microsoft's problem, nor is it the government's problem. Using Microsoft's operating system has NOT prevented me from using competitor's products. As I observe this case, I feel that any remedy that the Federal government proposes will probably cause me a big headache. It is not the government's job to work against the best interests of its citizens ... including me. This case should have been dropped a long time ago. In reality, it was nothing more than a witch-hunt proposed by President Clinton when he discovered that he couldn't shake-down Bill Gates for campaign contributions. In conclusion, I strongly urge you to drop this case totally.

God Bless America.
Respectfully submitted,
Max Effort
21609 Cedar, St. Clair Shores, MI 48081
Phone: 586-779-2028
email: maxf4t@aol.com

MTC-00009275

From: Alhstorz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:00pm
Subject: Lawsuit
Gentlemen:

I want to take this opportunity to say that I support Microsoft in this lawsuit brought by the federal government. This is in direct conflict to everything Americans hold dear. Our freedoms have been encroached upon too long and it is time for this nonsense to end.

Thank you very much.

Hilma Storz
739 Edgebrook
Houston, TX 77034
alhstorz@aol.com

MTC-00009276

From: Eleanor McCabe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:04pm
Subject: Stop the antitrust suit

It is time to stop the waste in continuing the antitrust suit against Microsoft. It is not needed with all the more important cases for the Justice Department to bring to trial.

MTC-00009277

From: Glenn and Wanda Trapp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft

I want to end the Clinton-era Anti-trust.

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Sincerely,
Wanda Trapp
Rt. 4, Box 327
McAlester, Ok 74501
gandwtrapp@myexcel.com

MTC-00009278

From: Michael P Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:05pm
Subject: Federal Gov't Settlement..

The settlement is a fair one and all States should accept it as being a reasonable solution to a very complex problem... We

ought to squash further litigation and get on with the job of growing American Technology...Let Microsoft get back to work!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Michael P Parker
Retired IBM Exec
Avid user of PC software

MTC-00009279

From: bobhague
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:08pm
Subject: Microsoft fiasco
Sirs/Ms:

It's time to end this travesty of justice. Bill Gates has done more for this country and the economy than William Jefferson did to it, yet Honest Bill got off scot free while you waste time and money persecuting a true American. It's time to go after the real criminals, Clinton-Clinton, Gore and Reno.

Get on with it!
Sincerely,
Robert E. Hague
261 Lafayette Drive
Roseville, Ca.

MTC-00009280

From: Larry Reich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge that this be done and over with, I support the Microsoft Settlement, Lawrence A. Reich 2445 Airport Rd. Eastman Ga. 31023

MTC-00009281

From: annie m. lane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:07pm
Subject: microsoft

i don't like bill gates, he is a dem. but i don't know what he did to them but LEAVE THEM ALONE. this has all been politacol. so drop it, annie lane, carthage, ms. 39051

MTC-00009282

From: theholdings@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:08pm
Subject: RE; MICROSOFT

I AM WRITING TO ASK YOU TO PLEASE END THE CLINTON-era ANTI-TRUST LAW ABUSE AGAINST MICROSOFT. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH ABUSE OF THIS FINE COMPANY THAT THAT SHOULD NOT HAVE HAD THIS ACTION BROUGHT IN THE FIRST PLACE.

SINCERELY,
HARRY HOLDING

MTC-00009283

From: gmewborn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:10pm

the govt and states and crying competitors need to get off this kick that microsoft is killing them. if they want to develop their own software operating system then go to it. everyone is jealous. microsoft should not stop others from doing there thing. I think a company can do whatever it wants to develop new products. you can buy or not buy. g.m.

MTC-00009284

From: Conley, David

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/7/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft case...
Gentlemen....

I think settling with Microsoft is a big mistake! They are, in fact, a monopoly...and should be divided into a systems company, an applications company...and an Internet company.

When I can't buy a new computer without having Microsoft's operating systems installed on it... thats NO choice!

Say NO to settlement!
David F. Conley
Citizens Communications
5600 Headquarters Dr., #A2014
Plano, Tx 75024
469-365-3467

MTC-00009285

From: Bud (038) Lyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ms. Hesse:

After perusing information provided the public regarding the Microsoft Settlement, and not being a "Wall Street Attorney", I wish to encourage the Court to be equitable and fair in its ultimate decision regarding the Microsoft case.

The Pacific Northwest, after September 11, has been feeling a domino effect from the tragedy that occurred in New York City. Our local NYSE and NSDQ stocks have suffered great losses, from which many will never recover. Granted, we are all in the same situation, but the State of Washington, on a daily basis, is losing high tech companies—just folding up, or consolidating out of state. Our unemployment rates are climbing rapidly with the loss of Boeing jobs, and frankly, the future for the State of Washington looks bleak.

A blow to Microsoft would simply add to the recession our state and country is finding itself in. As a citizen of the United States, I do not wish to see more businesses punished to the point of extinction. Mr. Gates has done, and will do wonderful things for education, world peace, and the welfare of children, worldwide, if given the opportunity under our free enterprise system. He has stepped down from a very lofty and important position in his company to cooperate in this matter. My greatest fear is that he will lose interest in the company he started, and not have an interest in promoting new and innovative ideas that will benefit everyone, worldwide. The states involved in this lawsuit are stamping their feet like children, refusing to be reasonable for the sake of everyone, to prove that they are mightier than Microsoft, its management, and Mr. Gates. These states and the rest of our United States will end up the losers. We all need to cooperate to reinstate a healthy economy, where business can thrive, thus allowing us to deal with important issues facing us in the future.

That future is now in jeopardy, and I wish to urge those who are charged with the decision in the Microsoft case, to take more than just the law into account. Real human beings, with families, mortgages to pay, children to educate, retirement to plan for, and a job to take pride in, is at stake.

This is not a chess game, but real life, and I pray that you will do what is right for all, not just a few

Thank you for listening to a citizen's opinion.

Best Regards,
Lyn Wessman
lyngwes@earthlink.net

MTC-00009286

From: John McClaughry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case is a long running embarrassment for Justice and damaging to the economy. The pending settlement is a reasonable conclusion. Please accept it, and tell the nine grandstanding AGs complaining about it to go chase some real criminals.

John McClaughry, Ethan Allen Institute, Concord VT
(I have no connection to Microsoft.)

MTC-00009287

From: Maher Saba
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Congratulations on signing the settlement with Microsoft. I hope all the states will follow suite. I am writing to offer my support and hope that the judge approves the settlement as soon as possible.

Thanks, Maher

MTC-00009288

From: Jean Galburt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse of Microsoft. Where would be all be technically if it were not for Bill Gates, his colleagues and his company. His programs & operating system's are wonderful.

Paula Jean Galburt

MTC-00009289

From: Frank Bankenbush
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:54pm
Subject: Micro-Soft settlement

Please end this foolishness.

Let the marketplace adjust itself.

Franklyn J. Bankenbush
11409 Washington Ave. #10,
Sturtevant, WI 53177
262-886-9249

MTC-00009290

From: Steve Wersan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed Microsoft Settlement, whichever way it turns out, will be a legal and business history landmark that will be pointed to by legal historians and business, academic, and government leaders for years to come.

Antitrust laws were drafted precisely for the purpose of curbing and punishing the not-alleged-but-proven sorts of misbehavior committed by Microsoft. If the proposed, slap-on-the-wrist settlement is adopted, the conventional wisdom of the future will say

that this decision amounted to a judicial repeal of the antitrust laws, and initiated an era in which antitrust enforcement became a lapdog for egregiously monopolistic and avaricious businesses.

Conversely, if the court rejects this pussycat settlement and moves toward the only logical and just consequence of these misbehaviors by ordering the breakup of Microsoft, it will be saying that this is still a country whose laws are fairly enforced and enforced all the time. It will also be said that this decision initiated an era in which the full power of the computer and the internet were liberated from the self-seeking domination of one company's restricted vision. "Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide ..."

Dr. Stephen J. Wersan
Ridgecrest, CA

MTC-00009291

From: pmckelvey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:36pm
Subject: String'em Up

Yesterday, I read in USA TODAY, that a VP at Microsoft had said that LUNIX was the next target. Microsoft keeps their code secret. I guess security by obscurity. LUNIX is out there for anyone to work on and improve. Even the National Security Agency has published code examples as ways to make a "LUNIX" system more secure. I expect Bill Gates to include the "Universal Plug and Play" in LUNIX, thus opening it up to the hackers. But the code will be proprietary so no one will know.

Of great concern to me is the requirement that to do any kind of business with Microsoft, you have to have a Microsoft "passport". As I have read in the papers, Microsoft had to shut the passport system down for 24 hours because it had been hacked into.

With the "I Love you" virus following the rising sun around the earth and catching people before they were expecting anything is not surprising. If there is one direct progenitor of something that is everywhere, such a spread can and will occur. We need different operating systems. How bad can it get.

The Irish potato famine was caused by a blight. All the potatoes in Ireland were descended from one potato plant of very good qualities. But when the blight hit, there were no natural barriers to stop the blight. According to the accounts of the times, people were actually dying in the streets as the blight did its work on what was genetically one plant. Potato Soup?

Patrick C. McKelvey PE
pmckelvey@zoomtown.com
3315 Ashwood Dr.
Cincinnati, OH 45213-2437
(o) 513-631-3486
(h) 513-631-1221
RA 11651752

P.S. Probably 20 years ago, AT&T's Bell Labs had a auto license plate created. White background with green lettering reading "UNIX—Live Free or Die".

MTC-00009292

From: Robert (q)Bob(q) Rood

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice.

I have followed the litigation and settlement issues with Microsoft over the last few years. To begin with, I have been quite upset over the handling of the case by the previous justice, and was extremely pleased that he was basically replaced. I am equally pleased that you apparently have arrived at a settlement with Microsoft. I believe this settlement to be in the best interest of the consumer. I still believe that as a consumer I was never hurt to begin with. I also believe that it is too bad that our justice system allows self serving companies and States to drag this matter on. Many of the concerns are from a few with products that were inferior to begin with. To allow this to drag on will hurt the consumer and product innovation.

Please enter my request to end this case with the settlement between the DOJ and Microsoft.

Thank you.
Robert J. Rood, 907 346 1563

MTC-00009293

From: Mark Palmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:39pm
Subject: Anti-trust Case

To whom it may concern,
I realize that many of you in the Bush administration are holdovers from the most corrupt administration to hold the office of President. I also realize that their probably remains a number of corrupt individuals who believe that all businesses should be sending large donations to the Democratic Party. (In addition to the foreign entities that bought legislation from Clinton) But, I request that you return the country to normalcy (ie Government not suing legal businesses because you want more cash to redistribute to the non-producers) That request includes any lawsuits against Microsoft, Gun Manufacturers, Tobacco Companies, Automobile Manufacturers.... All of this should cease immediately.

Mark Palmer &
Mark D. Palmer
CC Dickson CO
456 Lakeshore Parkway
Rock Hill, SC 29730
(803) 980-8000 Ext. 264

MTC-00009294

From: Bill Sherman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:38pm
Subject: Settlement is Fair
Sirs,

This settlement is fair to both parties. As usual the only people who made out were the attorneys. Thanks for your consideration,

Bill Sherman
Spill 911, Inc
800-474-5911
www.spill911.com
billsherman@spill911.com

MTC-00009295

From: ray—dubcak@tx.acer.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft and our free enterprise system alone!

Let the consumers decide in the marketplace which companies are the winners and which ones are the losers. I resent your interference in thinking you know better than us who have been in the information technology business for years.

We are talking about a \$99 operating system that nobody is forced to buy if they don't want it (the IRS takes much more than that away from me by the use of force and coercion and I don't get anything back in return). Consumers can always use the free operating system called Linux along with its free web browser. Any new features Microsoft puts into their operating system is purely for their own survival. Live and let live!

I thank Microsoft for driving down prices so that the common person can understand and afford technology. If you punish them, then you are no better than a communist dictatorship which desires to own and control all business! The shame of it all is that Microsoft's competitors refused to offer better products at lower prices and instead resorted to government coercion and force. What a sad day for American liberty!

If you are truly looking out for the consumers as you say you are then leave Microsoft alone! Answer this question—how many complaints have you heard from the consumers themselves (the very persons you claim to be protecting)?

MTC-00009296

From: Ben Allen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
I am a computer user of both a Microsoft Operating System and a non-microsoft operating system that is trying to market itself as an alternative to the Windows line. So far, the operating system I favor (the BeOS) and others like it have had major roadblocks thrown in our faces due to Microsoft practices. The OS's I speak of run well with their own software, or with each other's software, but have had a very difficult, if not impossible task of working with the Microsoft systems, which the majority of computer users use.

If these other businesses are to be given the equal right to develop a product, Microsoft must be properly dealt with in this case. Microsoft's Office file formats cannot be used by non-microsoft software and the Windows installer will not let me boot into my non-Windows OS, so I cannot try to develop software for the Operating System of my own choice. Many other hinderances placed by Microsoft prevent legitimate software developers from writing! software that people can use. Thank you for your efforts to rectify the issues at hand. I am not alone, users world-wide share my appreciation for your efforts.

Sincerely,
Ben Allen
ben_allen@bemail.org

MTC-00009298

From: Syd (038) Ron Corbett

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft

I think we should be more concerned with stimulating the economy and encouraging innovation in business than with shackling creativity and entrepreneurship. Penalizing achievement will simply drive our businesses and economy down. Leave Microsoft alone—that way it can add to the economy with jobs.

Sydney B. Corbett
231 SE 45th Terrace
Ocala, FL 34471

MTC-00009299

From: John T. Weisel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's put this one to rest, you've beat up on MS enough now, and we all got the message. Let's lay off now.

John T. Weisel
Sunriver, OR 97707
Voice: 541-593-8201
Fax: 541-593-7318
(jtweisel@teleport.com)

Mail: 20 High Oak Drive, Medford OR 97504

MTC-00009300

From: Brad Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

To whom it may concern at the Justice Department,

I support the Microsoft settlement as been proposed.

This case needs to be put to rest and get on with more important issues.

Sincerely,
Brad Smith
bradvs@preferred.com
423.743.5765

MTC-00009301

From: Marc H. Berblinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft

Stop wasting your time & our tax money on the Microsoft case.

Marc Berblinger
Registered voter
San Diego, CA.

MTC-00009302

From: Del / Sue Chase
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust.

Get it over with!! It's questionable it should have been an issue anyway.

MTC-00009303

From: Dick H.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:01pm
Subject: End the Clinton-Era Anti-Trust law abuse.

Enough is enough! We need to protect our brilliant entrepreneurs, not penalize them. Without these persons our employment opportunities go by the wayside.

It is time to end the Clinton-era abuses!

RJH

MTC-00009304

From: Gary Roush
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:03pm
Subject: anti-trust law abuse opinion

I want to state that I do NOT approve of what is going on with the States accusing Microsoft. Microsoft is merely trying to survive among the many rivalries and have already given a lot to the demands, more so than should be required. The rivalries and competitors as you can see are playing around with no ropes tied to them taking advantage of the opportunities to win unrighteously and unfairly, while Microsoft, of all the good they have done, have way too many ropes tied and this is unjust. Why penalize a company for being too good or for being too helpful? I want the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse to end and it should end now! Our tax money is being wasted by this type of trial.

Gary Roush
12712 7th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98177

MTC-00009305

From: volner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:05pm
Subject: Anti-Trust

I think it time to end the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse against Microsoft. As a user of Windows I applaud Microsoft. There product are top of the line and I use them daily.

Billy Volner
3615 Pennsylvania Ave
Mims, FL 32754

MTC-00009306

From: Ethel Feyertag
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please stop this Microsoft case...how ridiculous. With all the real crime which took place in and around the White House, 1992-00 [never prosecuted], and that among some senators/congressmen, how can they keep this up. I do not want our tax money spent going after Microsoft, and further, I think they deserve an apology.

E. Feyertag

MTC-00009307

From: Joseph Shields
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A few ywars ago now, i remember getting a CD free with an issue of PC Plus with a bootable demo of BeOS 4.5 on it. I instantly fell in love with the system, getting used to all the advantages it held over Windows, bemoaning only the lack of support for my (considerable) collection of Windows-only software and hardware.

I proceeded to buy BeOS 5 Professional about a year later, to help do my bit to support a fantastic piece of software.

However, I was most distressed to read online that the BeOS was officially dead. This is an extremely unfortunate state of affairs, and is solely down to strong-arm

tactics carried out by the Microsoft Operating System monopoly.

There is a large community at work, all of whom would like to see a viable update or evolution of the BeOS back in the marketplace. However, there are a number of factors which place Microsoft in a position which simply cannot be challenged now that their monopoly is in place.

The Windows system itself is a closely guarded secret, and as it is unfair to expect software manufacturers to re-write a version of their software for every Operating System under the sun, the only alternative is for an Operating System to have built-in support for another. In this case, BeOS (or any one of a hundred other systems) could sensibly compete with the Windows monopoly if the core components of the source of Windows, the API-related functions (especially the DirectX API, the workhorse of Windows as a platform for playing videogames), were made available. Lack of competition is bad for the consumer and bad for the economy. And leads to expensive anti-trust cases against monopoly-holders. Nobody wins.

There is a small list of other potential issues:

The leading office suite software, Microsoft Office, is, without a doubt, currently the best on the market. This cannot be disputed. However, there is no sensible way for companies to try to make a shot at trying to better Office, as the specifications for the Office files (.doc, .xls, .ppt etcetera) are ANOTHER guarded secret, and a business cannot afford to use software which cannot read or write files compatible with what the company down the road uses. I have personally experienced issues caused already by Microsoft's unnecessary changing of the specifications so that anybody who uses a recent version of the Office software must go to great lengths (losing much formatting information in the process) to be able to send documents to people with older versions. If you have Office 97 and really want to exchange with colleagues, then you're looking at a 250 upgrade for the privilege. Take this scenario, and it gets a thousand times worse when files created in Word XP with any advanced formatting cannot be opened in a suite for a non-Microsoft-endorsed system such as Gobe Productive under BeOS. The file specifications for most formats (HTML for web pages, JPEG and GIF for images, ZIP for compressed files) have been open to everybody for years, and the businesses behind them have NOT suffered as a result. Making the Office formats mandatory is more than a good idea, it's a required action.

The final suggested action is not rooted in Microsoft's monopoly, it's rooted in them being bastards and wanting to take advantage of their monopoly: When a new PC is shipped, Microsoft licensing states that the reseller's licence is void if the system isn't a "clean" Windows system. i.e. if the Reseller installed on it, say Windows 2000 Professional AND Mandrake Linux 8.1, the company loses its right to sell Microsoft-equipped machines and Microsoft will never speak to them again. Much as I've ranted, Windows is currently a requirement of a system you intend to use around the home.

Windows has been designed, however, to stamp out any other operating systems it finds on your computer. If you have a working BeOS computer and install Windows XP, then it will remove your ability to run BeOS. The same applies for Linux, and any REALLY alternative system you could name—Windows changes the Master Boot Record to disallow the running of other Operating Systems. Every other non-Microsoft operating system in creation provides a “boot loader”, which provides a list of the Operating Systems available on a computer when you switch it on, and all the systems in the list will co-exist happily. If you install a non-Microsoft system AFTER Windows, then it will put Windows in its list and the system will still work just as well. However, Microsoft simply do not ALLOW systems to include a dual-boot facility, which could threaten Windows as the user's operating system of choice. I'm pretty sure this license still covers the installation of any Internet Browser software other than Microsoft Internet Explorer (such as Netscape), as again that could pose a risk to Microsoft.

Dual-booting is NOT hard to program. Only obstinance prevents it from existing (and being permitted) in Windows as default. This is a crucial issue which on its own could make Linux much more marketable (if not help BeOS if implemented in isolation).

Thank you for (hopefully) reading through my \$0.02, and I hope the comments are helpful and are taken into account. I am NOT one of the pure anti-Microsoft fanatics you find. I'm a fan of superior products. I use my Microsoft mouse and Joypad as they're the best available. However, the strong arm tactics used by Microsoft for their Operating System and Office software is simply unfair.

Yours sincerely,

—Jo “directhex” Shields

MTC-00009308

From: Colleen Dunham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement and 15 U.S.C.
16

Dear Madam or Sir:

I have just returned from a long Christmas holiday. While I was away, family, friends, and other people engaged me in conversation about the Microsoft case. My conversations were with people from many walks of life in many parts of the country. I was surprised that so many people wanted to talk about the case and surprised that people outside of Microsoft have such strong feelings about the issues. All expressed some degree of approval of the Microsoft settlement for themselves, for the hi-tech industry, and for the American economy. None wanted to see additional litigation or further delay.

Please consider my observation as the United States determines whether to settle this antitrust suit.

Yours,

Colleen Dunham

MTC-00009309

From: Tom Arlin Dean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:13pm

Subject: re: STOP

The Microsoft trial has squandered millions of taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

I believe this single act of heresy perpetrated by Bill Clinton and his lacky, Janet Reno, may well have been the catalyst for the recession we have experienced since and are still experiencing now.

Tom Arlin Dean
22204 Pepper Road
Athens, AL 35613

MTC-00009310

From: enbcpa2
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Dear Sir or Madam at the Justice Dept.:

Microsoft has been a blessing bestowed to America, because that company's technology gave this country a great deal of productivity. The technological advances have been great and have been made available to everyone at a very low cost.

I think that the American people would be well served by ending the Clinton-era Antitrust law abuses.

Microsoft is good to our economy. These law suits are only good to the lawyers.

Edgar N. Baquero, CPA
1428 Heights Blvd.
Houston, TX 77008
Tel. (713) 869-5332
Fax. (713) 869-8385

MTC-00009311

From: Daniel Berger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS operating system back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

- 1) open MS Office file formats
- 2) open Win32 APIs
- 3) mandatory dual-boot options (i.e. multiple operating systems per computer)

In addition, it is clear that Microsoft should be split into two parts—one for the operating system itself, and one for software (and any other non-operating system components). This will help reduce the advantage it's own software has on the MS Windows platform.

On top of that, a huge fine for it's illegal and unethical strongarm tactics.

Sincerely,

Daniel Berger
Plymouth, MN

MTC-00009312

From: Rick Dassow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti Trust Case

Dear Justice Department,

As a consumer of software products, I would like to petition the Justice Department to break up Microsoft. I believe that Microsoft's monopolistic practices have severely limited the choices available to the end users. Additionally, I firmly believe that by tying the operating system and its software products together, Microsoft has not only limited consumer choice, but has also perpetuated the use of inferior software products in the marketplace. Without choices, the consumer is limited to using inferior software products, and does not benefit by natural innovation that comes about by companies competing in the marketplace. I would conservatively estimate that Microsoft has set the software development industry back 7-10 years.

I hope that when the final decision is made, consideration is given to not only Microsoft's competitors, but also to how this large monopoly has effectively stagnated the advancement of the industry as a whole.

Rick Dassow
Senior Vice President FOUR SEASONS SERVICE GROUP
303-367-1332

MTC-00009313

From: Dana Norton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:29pm
Subject: User opinion
Gentlemen:

As a user of the only available operating system, I am highly insulted by Microsoft's attitude. Windows is a monopoly because the software required for my appraisal business is simply not available for Apple or Linux. Not because Windows is a better environment, but because of Microsoft's predatory practices. I was employed by IBM in 1961, thus am familiar with the Consent Decree signed by that monopoly. While I was loyal to the company, I was also familiar with the heavy-handed tactics employed which artificially maintained that monopoly.

I see the same techniques employed by Microsoft. Every time a successful competing product appears,

Microsoft does one of four things:

1. Re-write the OS so that the offending program won't run, or;
2. Buys the offending company, generally killing it, or;
3. “Sells” a competing program at little or no cost, or;
4. Pressures it's large customer's (manufacturers) into not offering the offending program by predatory pricing or threats of actions which would put the manufacturer out of business.

If Justice had not acted forcefully with IBM, a personal computer today, including software would probably cost in the neighborhood of \$35,000. Microsoft must be broken up into, at a minimum, an operating system company and an application software company. Additionally, the heavy-handed tactics employed by Microsoft, outlined above, should be vigorously punished.

Sincerely,
Dana L. Norton, IFA

MTC-00009314

From: John Hughes

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to end the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse against Microsoft!

John Hughes
20811-D Bear Valley Road
Apple Valley, CA 92308

MTC-00009315

From: Kathy K.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:25pm
Subject: We Support Microsoft!

MTC-00009316

From: Robert Moran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Trial

I support ending the Microsoft Trial. This a waste of tax payers (my money) money. This is about special interest groups and nothing more. The consumer is going to be the victim in anything but an ending of the Trial.

Robert Moran
9624 Kini Place
Diamondhead, Ms 39525

MTC-00009317

From: Jim Lasch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The government has no business trying to break up Microsoft. It's time that we got over the idea that if a company is big and successful it must be bad. Those Democratic Party ideas are no longer in power. Just get out of that business and let Microsoft alone. They got where they are through hard work and a lot of effort. The government should not penalize that.

James H. Lasch

MTC-00009318

From: SANFORD SHIFRIN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:30pm
Subject: United States vs Microsoft

We have spent more time pursuing Microsoft than pursuing Osama Bin Laden. It is time to stop persecuting Microsoft and drop this case against a truly great American Company. They have done more to advance our economy than any other American company.

Sanford Shifrin
P.O. Box 5013,
Scottsdale, Az. 85261-5013
480-948-4676

MTC-00009319

From: Edward Middleton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:33pm
Subject: Anti-trust law abuse

MTC-00009320

From: Sean Klope
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You've wasted enough of my taxes on this outrageous trial. Please approve this settlement and save us further loss of

precious dollars. You wouldn't even be receiving this email if it hadn't been for Bill Gates. He has saved so many people, companies and government agencies so much money by increasing their productivity with Personal Computer's and you have the audacity to cite him for poor business practice. Talk about biting the hand that feeds you!

Sincerely,
Sean L. Klope
Director of CIS Operations
Manufacturing Company in El Cajon, CA

MTC-00009321

From: rossenter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:40pm
Subject: Microsoft

Let us put this to bed, enough money has been wasted, all for nothing. I am almost 78 years old, computers are a great thing in my life, without Microsoft, I would have never learned how to use them. Bill Gates has done more for the nations around the world than any company I can think of plus all of the people that have jobs. Let this all go away and they will have more resources to develop new products for the USA and the world. Clinton is gone, so should the phony charges against Microsoft.

L H Ross
Tucson Az

MTC-00009322

From: CZackim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:44pm
Subject: Let's make an end to the Anti-Trust Case

To whom it may concern:

Few company's have created the type of wealth that Microsoft has helped their employees accomplish. In addition they have provided ways for all types of people to earn income more easily then ever in the past. Let's make an end to all this nonsense and allow Microsoft to work without interference.

Sincerely,
Carole Zackim
River Vale, NJ

MTC-00009323

From: GARY STOLP
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:47pm

Please end this persecution of a successful industry that has done more to inform the world and this country than all the television and newspapers combined.

Sincerely,
Gary C Stolp
1218 Boston Street
Muskogee OK 74401

MTC-00009324

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft
ATR,rremington@webv.net@inetgw
Date: 1/7/02 6:50pm
Subject: "Red Letter Day" Review

During the slo-motion chess moves of the Microsoft Anti-Trust Trial it is interesting to note a few of the "extraordinary events" in Orange County since the New Year, in order to gain an overall perspective of the "big board".

An LA Times chess column after New Years hinted at the "greatest, largest real estate chess game", beginning right now. Certainly COX Communications, Orange and San Diego counties are involved with major pension funds and investments behind the chessboard.

On a smaller scale, my sister & her husband, Bonnie & A1 Rex have placed their home for sale with a realtor and friend. My feelings are that their home, my brother Barry's home, and perhaps my cousin Robert Miller's home in suburban Chicago were purchased with funds illegally appropriated from me, using a variety of underhanded methods. My parents' visits to the IRS confirming sales of these homes leads me to believe that a court order has finally been enforced. My Friday "Knight" move, motoring the silver Celica chariot to Kinko's Irvine center signaled additional documents for the US v Microsoft litigation for those who followed. The subsequent road trip to LA's Westwood FBI office and a visit to the Los Angeles Federal Building were closely monitored by others loyal to Disney, Oracle, Apple Computer, and multinational affiliates. Castrol GTX was even kind enough to award me with a print ad in AOL/Time Warner's Sports Illustrated later on Friday evening, confirming it's OK to drive your car "hard", as long as you use their oil. The wonders of today's electronic/print advertising at lightspeed! My Wilshire 5-speed legal Celica sprint from the FBI offices in Westwood to the Federal Building in downtown LA in under 40 minutes during Friday's rush hour was definitely noteworthy.

Tony Tavares, President of Disney's Anaheim Sports knew he was finished at Disney/Anaheim Sports, resigning on Friday, about the time my documents were printed. Some of my recent writings had references to the PAC funding from Arrowhead Water Company & Disney, stalling my employment search & documents regarding antics at the Crystal Cathedral's concourse elevator, where I provide volunteer service on Sunday mornings. The Crystal Cathedral's music & creative teams use Macintosh computers for music scoring & multimedia creations. This team recently received new IMACs and other Macintosh computers, perhaps as part of a "grant". Some of the administration uses PCs running versions of Microsoft Windows. Email can be sent across the platform at the Garden Grove campus.

The volunteer security service I provide on Sunday's has really evolved into a political position. Most of the choir members meet at this area when forming for each procession (usually two each morning), musical and pulpit guests are escorted on the concourse level via the elevator nearby. As I have mentioned in an earlier memo, I have purchased a small 13" Sony TV in order to view the telecasts downstairs, and coordinate the security efforts with others. Each week at this service brings new challenges, mostly social skills answering guests questions, and providing friendly service to the staff. That's no problem. Other times, a few of the Crystal Cathedral's family members scheme a few events targeted to challenge me. Most events are harmless pranks, I just roll with the humor.

Yesterday, however, I believe additional pollen was placed in suspension on a table, perhaps through oil in a perfume, or sprayed on the Sony TV, exasperating my bronchitis/upper respiratory infection, challenging and overwhelming double 24 Hour Sudafed medication ingested before I arrived. My sinus and face could hardly stop from running, after the previous bronchitis had mostly cleared up. I know from educated biofeedback when an accelerant or another "piggyback" attack would occur from experience. Fortunately, my experience as a professional and athlete (just as the Crystal Cathedral members are) allows me to perform even with a fever & cold, as I never missed a live Blackhawks Hockey game during the three seasons I performed at the Chicago Stadium.

The Orange County Register had their Show section cover page with the title "Blackhawk Down", a double meaning for the editors. Fortunately, my conditioning allowed me to run 12 miles at Newport Beach the day before the Crystal Cathedral security gig. President George Bush and his family were vacationers in California and Oregon this weekend. "W" visited a predominantly Hispanic group of supporters in Ontario on Saturday morning. We had heard rumors that the Presidential family may visit the Crystal Cathedral, however their afternoon trip to Portland, Oregon on Saturday signaled a different agenda, perhaps to visit with some of the of the Nike, HP & Intel Beaverton Bunch, and to show support for this heavily Republican area.

Sony Pictures' "Blackhawk Down", like several of Hollywood's recent titles, "The Rat Race", "Ocean's Eleven, 12/07/01 'Are You In?'" and others have had a subliminal theme regarding foreplanned activities for me. While I was training for the LA Marathon with the Roadrunners in Venice Beach last August & September, "The Rat Race" began to appear on billboards throughout Hollywood, beginning in late September/October. One of the best "Amway" motivational tapes I heard was, "When You Know Why, You Can Endure How!" This philosophy is truly inspirational, with a success story from one of the hard working members of the INA group. A lot of people criticize the methods that "Amway" people use, in the media especially, however their perseverance is incredible, using group training as one key for success!

The Hollywood movie "moguls" continue to spend millions of dollars on schemes in order to stall my financial settlement. Most of these companies had been fuelling the subversion against me for years, for unknown reasons other than the Wirtz/Blackhawk connection I had many years ago. I have detailed some of the "forced labor" in the multi-decade plot to "clone" the replacement hockey musician, and the multinational million dollar plot to cover it up afterward. In 1977, the first edition of an advertising book for cable and broadcast television authored by San Diego State University Telecommunications Professor, Elizabeth Heighton, was released. The second edition, dedicated to "Bob & Dorothy, again!" was re-released in 1985-86, the years I attended SDSU's Telecommunications program. In

other words, an eight year "overtime" forced labor period occurred because I first refused the Stadium opportunity in 1977. I received my BA from Northeastern Illinois University in 1979, and continued to perform live music and represent information technology products in the Chicago area until 1985.

Closing, with a few words about last week's "Red Letter Day" courtesy of local Aliso Viejo USPS workers and several large companies. Geico insurance, Spiegel Catalog, and I'm certain, the investment side of Wells Fargo in Orange County, CA conspired to send their "red letters" at one time, distributed by the Aliso Viejo USPS for delivery last week. That takes quite a bit of coordination folks, almost as much as a "grassy knoll/textbook depository" conspiracy.

I have appreciated the USDOJ confirmation that some Crest toothpaste has been spiked with a sedative in my parents home, stored in their bathroom. I used one of the new tubes a few months after my mother had purchased these "especially for me" for one application, wondering why the tubes had never been used. I could feel the sedative reaction to my day's performance. The Crest tubes have a "gold leaf" shape on the box, and a similar printing on the tube. I have never used the toothpaste after the first trial, knowing the "Muenchausen's Proxy Syndrome" and previous food packaging/intentional poisoning experience my family has. This Blackhawk was never downed by the anthrax attack. I only had a few easy days after the new year running at Newport Beach, Niketown & shopping visits in LA shopping & USDOJ document processing in between! My father had called one of his Chicago area sisters on Saturday. I overheard a part of the conversation that stated, "It's like the flu, when you're down for a few days!" My father hasn't been sick for over a month, and this conversation was most probably a confirmation of the anthrax or bio attack on me.

Thank you for listening,
Robert Remington

MTC-00009325

From: Dave Bowling
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
I think that it is time to end the action against Microsoft. The settlement that is currently on the table is more than fair. I feel this entire process was a poor use of taxpayers dollars not unlike the waste involved with the impeachment of President Clinton. It is time to end an era of Anti-trust abuse. Please remove the deterrent to investors in the high-tech arena so that we can get the economy moving again.

Thank you,
David Bowling
212 Orlando Avenue
Normal, ILLinois 61761
dave.bowling@gte.net

MTC-00009326

From: Pat (038) Jim Dougherty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:53pm

Subject: End the persecution

Please do what you can to end this fiasco. It has cost everyone enough and it is time to aid our economic recovery.

Thank You.

Jim A. Dougherty

MTC-00009327

From: Don Blume
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:52pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please drop the case. This was a vicious Clinton/Reno attack because Gates is successful. Don't frighten would-be entrepreneurs out of their dreams, and further damage our great Country.

Thanks,
Don Blume

MTC-00009328

From: Rose
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:54pm
Subject: anti-trust case

Leave Microsoft alone! Without them, people like me would not be able to do so much with our computers. Clinton created the decline in tech stocks with his assault on Microsoft. Only his buddy at Oracle did ok. I hope you listen to the many voices like mine and settle once and for all!

Rose Hutchinson

MTC-00009329

From: Frederick D Eggert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish it known that we support the subject settlement!

MTC-00009330

From: Pat (038) Jim Dougherty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 6:56pm
Subject: End the persecution

Please end the persecution of this company and lets get to work ending our recession.

Thank you,
Jim A. Dougherty

MTC-00009331

From: Bob Curtis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I am writing in support of the settlement reached between the Federal Government and nine states in the Microsoft case. I believe the settlement is in the public interest, and I am distressed that Microsoft's competitors and other special interest groups are continuing their efforts to prolong this litigation. I am a consumer and I use Microsoft products extensively. They are the main reason that I can use a computer in my personal life and business. Their products are reasonably priced and are superior to most of the others I have tried. During the comment period, I urge you to look at the benefits that Microsoft has brought to the industry and to our nation. Let the special interest groups turn to their own devices and spend their time and efforts on improving their products, the way that Microsoft has improved theirs

over the years through innovation and dedication to their ideals in a highly competitive industry.

MTC-00009332

From: Keith Godfrey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:01pm
Subject: acknowledgement
Greetings,

I submitted a public comment last week and did not receive any confirmation. Should I expect something of the sort? Also, what is the deadline for filing comments relating to the case?

Thank you,
Keith Godfrey
Senior Software Engineer
Wolfetech Corporation

MTC-00009333

From: Mr. Don
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:10pm

Why are Microsoft's competitors allowed to influence the outcome of a court case? No matter what the outcome, they would say it's not enough (of course they would!). \$1 Billion in computers to low income schools is bad? Apple isn't happy because that's their market—OK, then have Apple supply those schools with computers and software.

Has anyone looked at AOL/Time Warner lately—how about instant messaging, isn't this an FCC issue, yet I hear nothing about it. All I ever hear from AOL, Sun, Oracle, etc. is bad mouthing of Microsoft. If their product(s) were better we would be using them—period. And please don't tell me they can't compete, these guys OWNED the server market, but Microsoft built software to COMPETE with them. They didn't cry, they created & innovated. Don't tell me \$100 Billion dollar Corporations can't compete.

Linux, Palm, and a myriad of other OS's exist, but I'm not going to use them if they don't do what I need and I need business ready applications. Windows is extremely rich in what it provides, and Office does everything anyone could possibly need. Word Perfect and Lotus didn't evolve fast enough, so how is that Microsoft's fault?

I would have had a problem if Microsoft stood still and didn't improve their products, but every one of their releases takes huge leaps forward. They hire some of the brightest minds in our country, and their "ex" employees have gone on to create untold numbers of jobs by starting other technology companies.

Microsoft continues to provide leadership and direction to an entire industry, and believe me not everyone hates this company, in fact many of us are big fans.

MTC-00009334

From: Patricia Birren-Wilsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:13pm
Subject: Shameful Abuse of Microsoft

As a discriminating consumer, I would like to see an end to the Anti-Trust abuse in which Microsoft has so long been ensnared. We should applaud, rather than condemn, Microsoft, who has so steadfastly provided handsome compensation to so many, as a result of superb design, marketing and

distribution. I say, leave Microsoft alone, so it more continue, without distraction of chastisement and penalty, to represent itself as a glowing illustration of American Capitalism!

Patricia Birren-Wilsey
Winnetka, California 91306
818-718-6390
CC:Jerome Birren,Kerry Penn,Daniel Licon

MTC-00009335

From: Emmet Rixford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:16pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
JUSTICE DEPT.

Please stop wasting my tax dollars on the Microsoft Case and interfering with Business & Investment.

Accept the settlement!
Emmet Rixford

MTC-00009336

From: Brenda Pope
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:34pm
Subject: No more Microsoft abuse!!!!!!!

Hello,
Please leave Microsoft alone. Don't continue the Clinton-era meddling where you don't belong. This is a country where you are supposed to have the freedom to succeed without government intervention!!!!

Thanks,
B. Pope

MTC-00009337

From: RichHarold@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:17pm
Subject: Law Abuse

We urge you to end the Clinton-era Anti-Trust law abuse.

Richard and Phyllis T Harold
205 E Florence Ave
Glenwood, IA 51534-1107

MTC-00009338

From: Allen Bossa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:15pm
Subject: Microsoft

It's time for the government to quit harassing Microsoft. That company has done more to make computer use easy for everyone to master than anyone else. Stop wasting our tax money.

Allen Bossa
Brigham City, UT

MTC-00009339

From: Bill Mann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello, I wish you and yours could settle the microsoft settlement as soon as able. Much good and saving of money will come of it!

Thank you,
William R. Mann Jr.
942 Viscaya Blvd
St. Augustine Fl. 32086

MTC-00009340

From: Dr. Chuka Okafor
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 7:21pm
Subject: Confidential Business Proposal
From the desk of:
DR. Lawrence Ubah,
Tel No: Your Intl. Access Code + 873-762-692484
Fax No: Your Intl. Access Code + 873-762-692485

Email: Lubahbt_01@eudoramail.com
Lagos, Nigeria.
ATTN: MANAGING DIRECTOR/CEO.
REQUEST FOR AN URGENT

CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP

After due deliberation with my colleagues, We have decided to forward to you this business proposal. We want a reliable person who could assist us in the transfer the sum of Twenty Million, Five Hundred Thousand United States Dollars (\$20,500,000) to your account. This fund resulted from an over-invoiced bill from contracts awarded by us under the budget allocation to our Ministry. This bill has been approved for payment by the other concerned Ministries. The contract has since been executed, commissioned and the contractor was paid the actual cost of the contract. We are left with the balance US\$20.5M as part of the over-invoiced amount which we have deliberated over estimated for our own use. But under our protocol division, we as civil servants are forbidden to operate or own foreign accounts. This is why we are soliciting your assistance in this manner and regard. As you may want to know, I am the Chief Accountant/Internal Auditor of the Contract Award Committee (CAC) of the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC). This transaction is very much free from all sorts of RISKS and TROUBLE from my Government. We the N.N.P.C. Officials involved in this deal have put in many years in service to this Ministry. We have been exercising patience for this opportunity for so long and to most of us this is a life time opportunity we cannot afford to miss. You need not to worry about the responsibilities of transferring this fund into your account, because all the administrative step needed for the transfer of this fund into your designated bank account will be done by us. We have agreed to COMPENSATE you duly if agreement is reached by both of us and I and one of my colleagues involved in this deal will come to your country to arrange for our share, upon the confirmation from you that the money has been credited into your nominated bank account. Consequent upon your acceptance of this proposal, kindly confirm your interest by Telephone to me, through my Direct Tel No: 234-1-775-5558 and Fax No: 234-1-759-7416. Your indication by revert Telephone to me of your sincere and serious interest will enable me send you or brief you of the PROCEDURES FOR THIS TRANSACTION. If my line is busy, please be persistent enough and you will surely get through.

NOTE: In the event of your inability to handle this transaction please inform us so that we can look for another reliable person who can assist in this respect. It might surprise you why we choose you and trusted you for this transaction. Yes, we believe that good friends can be discovered and business like this can not be realized without mutual trust. This is why we have decided to trust

you for this transaction. Be further informed that everyone's interest and security had been considered before you were contacted, so be rest assured and feel free to go into this transaction with us. But let Honesty, Trust and Confidentiality be our watchword throughout this transaction and your prompt reply will be highly appreciated. Thank you, and God bless.

Best Regards,
Dr. Chuka Okafor.

MTC-00009341

From: Mary Rasmussen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:22pm
Subject: Justice Dept. Suit

MTC-00009342

From: Peter Olsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:24pm
Subject: Comments on the Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the proposed settlement is fundamentally flawed. I think that the settlement as now written will further entrench Microsoft's monopoly position and will not be in the public interest. I believe that Microsoft's exercise of its monopoly power has harmed me both personally and professionally. I believe that I am still being harmed.

1. I believe that Microsoft has used its monopoly power to charge me predatory prices. In particular, I believe Microsoft has used its monopoly power to implement business practices designed to drive competing products (such as DRDOS, among others) from the market so that it can set prices unilaterally.

2. I believe that Microsoft has supplemented these monopoly business practices with technical measures designed to reduce or eliminate my ability to use alternative products. In particular, I believe that Microsoft has used its monopoly in operating systems to prevent competition in its Office applications.

3. I believe that Microsoft has designed its products to make it difficult or impossible to recover my own data for my own use in any form other than that designed for use by its own products. In particular, Microsoft has refused to release the file formats in which my data is stored by its applications, thus preventing me from using other programs, even ones I design and build myself, to further process the data.

I do not believe that this settlement does anything to remedy the injuries Microsoft has done to me personally. I do not believe that the proposed settlement addresses my injuries in any way. I believe that any solution involving the provision of software or hardware to the public schools should:

1. allow local school authorities to purchase software and hardware from any source whatsoever, and

2. as a condition for the use of any Microsoft software, require Microsoft to publish without restriction the full technical specifications of any software it provides, including, but not limited to, all application programming interfaces and file formats.

I believe that this latter point is particularly important for any plan aimed at

improving the public education. True education requires understanding. The goal of education is to prepare students to understand and cope with new circumstances. To do this, students must come to know the fundamental principles underlying software design and implementation, not just how to manipulate screen images. This type of knowledge is best imparted by providing students with actual examples of working programs and then allowing them to extend or expand them.

If Microsoft truly wishes to improve education, then Microsoft will provide the information about its application programming interfaces and file formats to make that improvement possible. If Microsoft does not do so, then I believe that it should exercise no control over how the money is to be spent. In particular, schools should be free to spend all of it on hardware and then choose free software, such as RedHat Linux, if they wish. I believe that this will be a much better solution.

Peter Olsen

MTC-00009344

From: George Skezas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:27pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sir:

I strongly support the Microsoft settlement. I believe in strong competition and the waste of taxpayers money on this case is unacceptable. Please continue to pressue the states who have continued this battle against one our greatest companies.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
George Skezas

MTC-00009345

From: jagelk469@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:31pm
Subject: Microsoft

It's time that our government stop playing the Clinton Era Corporation Bashing and shakedowns. It's also time for our Justice Department to stop wasting taxpayers money on pursuing Microsoft on behalf of their competitors.

Drop the Microsoft case.

Sincerely,
Two overtaxed taxpayers,
Mary and Jim Gede.

MTC-00009346

From: Geoff Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:33pm
Subject: Stop

Enough is enough. Its time to end the Bill Clinton shakedown of Microsoft.

Geoff Miller

MTC-00009347

From: Andrejus Stavickis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Sir/Madam,

This message in response of the message from Microsoft, dated Wed 1/2/2002 12:20 PM, Subject: DOJ wants to hear from you on MS settlement.

I'd like to make a few short statements. From one point of view, it's looks like the MS must be punished for their monopoly, but from the other point of view, there are NO any harm to end-users. Looks like this is a battle just between gigants. And nothing more, except lobystic movements, are found in that case.

The monopoly can be reached in a few ways, one is when the government gives the monopoly rights to a company, another one when users just use only that service—this can be done in a 2 ways—there are just no competitors, the monopolist's product is so cheap, that there are no other competitors.

As far, as I know there are always a choice for users to install or not an operating system when they receive a new/OEM computer. And when I bought a computer they always asking me do I want Windows or Linux, or you can deal with the manufacturer what to install—even, if they have an agreement with MS, that—may—prevent them to install Linux on their system.

Last, but not least: The harm to American economy (and the Global economy itself) would be much more higher, than meaning results archieved with the more strict settlement. Just imagine—Microsoft will bankrupt within 6 months after settlement—how we will work on our pc's? Even Your pc will be left without any support. The whole state will loose a job, American Government will loose hundreds of billions in taxes. Or just imagine—The Microsoft will transfer it's main office to another country—it's excellent solution for destination, but for United States it's whould be a long and really deep recession. Microsoft even whould be able to just "buy" a small country.

Conclusion: I think, that there should be some limitations for Microsoft, but just keep in mind, that the "stick always has a two ends", if you will "bend the stick too much" the stick will broke—then there will be no way back. I believe, that you will come to right and fair settlement.

God, bless America.

MTC-00009348

From: Randall Jarrell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MTC-00009349

From: The Dixon's
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:40pm
Subject: Antitrust Case

I switched to Windows ME this year from MAC OS. The ME OS product is riddled with problems. I had hoped that the Win ME platform was as stable as Win 98 rel 2. It is not. Windows XP does not hold much promise either. PC World Magazine has had several articles concerning the bugs in XP. If any other manufacturer sold a product with as many defects as Microsoft, the would be sued out of existence or run out of the market place by poor sales. Internet Explorer 6.0 is full of security bugs.

There is little choice in certain business applications when it comes to an OS. The strong tie between Microsoft OS and networking and applications lends itself to

monopolistic practices. For example—Where can I get MS Office XP for a Linux platform? Where can I get a MAC version of AutoCAD? There is not a strong effort for compatibility across OS platforms. Ask Jobs what it took to get a current MS Office Suite for MAC OSX.

Microsoft has a major PR problem. If my ME system worked well I would not be as upset. Microsoft dictates upgrades through compatibility and support issues. At work, we have 2 years on the Win 2000 OS before support ends and we are forced to upgrade. My 5 year old MAC did not give me as much trouble in five years as this system (ME) did in the first 5 minutes. If MS products worked I would have less complaints. The image of Microsoft is upgrade and it will resolve itself. I have a new computer with a half baked operating system. To fix it is time consuming as well as full of conflicting options on how to resolve it. I started with a DOS 2.1 PC. I am not a first timer. I went MAC to find a stable platform. When the system works it can be good.

Follow the release bugs on the systems and applications. Not impressive. Also not competitive.

Chuck Dixon
Parkville, MO 64152
email:sdixon@kc.rr.com

MTC-00009350

From: Patrick R. Lizot
To: Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/7/02 7:43pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please settle the Microsoft's case! We have to admit that they are the Best of the Best all around the world!

USA should be proud to have such a "computer-firm"! a hand-user.
Patrick R. Lizot
Senior Procurement Specialist
Central Operations Services
Ext 5746

MTC-00009351

From: Angelo Campanella
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Posture in the software reatik market.

I use software as a means to an end; engineering consulting. I used DOS (pre Windows) most successfully from 1985 to 1995, because it offered the widest choice of software to do a wide variety of important engineering support services.

These days, the widest variety of useful software (for engineering) is written for Windows. I don't mind this directly, but indirectly it is a HUGE nuisance because, unlike DOS, Windows is huge, taking up astronomical amounts of memory, and often very much slower for relatively the same tasks. The slowness truly comes from huge embellishments that few of us ever asked for such as multi-color, imagery (pictures and artwork not related to my work product), security, conversion of other software, etc.

The Internet has made this scene even more complicated. Microsoft, instead of continuing the philosophy of DOS (of being compatible and simple to use, has made extremely complex enhancements), and at the same time made it difficult to use other software items.

Microsoft, instead of making compatibility its theme, has instead promulgated exclusivity. To me this act is tantamount to causing a monopoly. If there were wide choices in the marketplace, Microsoft's attempts at such exclusivity (like pushing their "Explorer" in our face at every turn) would be avoided by we users, by simply not using Microsoft products.

But we cannot do that because of the breadth of the use of Windows systems. It borders on being a public utility. I can communicate with colleagues around the world, and exchange Windows documents easily. I know that that last statement flies in the face of my Microsoft Truculence theme, but in reality, both are true, and I should want also both of them to be right; not one right (worldwide commonality) and one wrong (domestic exclusivity and failure to enhance ease-of-use).

One thing that Microsoft MUST be FORCED to do is to offer on-the-telephone assistance to any and all of we software users 24 hours a day and seven days a week including holidays for a period of not less than FIVE years. Never mind trying to squeeze money out of Microsoft. Just get them to operate a large multiplicity of 800-lines "free" (in lieu of your settlement dollars) so that they really help us as a public service while they also "feel our pain" in using their software. This will be turn out to be a win-win situation, in my opinion.

This service is easy for your agents to police since any one of them and of their family members can call anytime during the year period to poll the ongoing utility proffered.

Angelo Campanella
"I have simply studied carefully whatever I've undertaken, and tried to hold a reserve that would carry me through."—Charles A. Lindbergh.

MTC-00009352

From: Michael J. Masquith
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/7/02 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,
I am part of a global network that is focused on getting the BeOS (or an equivalent, possibly open-source) back into the market place, but there is little hope of success if the following issues regarding Microsoft aren't addressed:

Open Office file formats. MS Office file formats are unfortunately simultaneously ubiquitous and proprietary. Because there is realistically no chance of them being superceded by any open standard, they need to be made non-proprietary. (probably by court order).

Win32 APIs must be documented and made available.

Dual-boot options should become mandatory. The single most damaging thing that MS has done was largely ignored (except by those whose businesses were destroyed). Their ability to force the major OEMs to only install Windows precluded any competition whatsoever in the Operating Systems market, precisely where BeOS attempted to compete. Not even the most microscopic vestige of these onerous strong-arm 'agreements' with

the OEMs should be allowed to remain. Enormous, crippling penalties should be swiftly and irrevocably levied if it recurs.

Anti-trust measures must break down and stomp completely flat all barriers the monopolist erected against competition. BeOS, even in it's current weak condition could at least attempt to compete if the playing field were set level again.

Thank you.
Michael J. Masquith
Barkin' Beaver Studio,
Herndon, VA

MTC-00009353

From: Ken Howe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:48pm
Subject: Justice

Dear Sirs;
It is my belief that we have had enough of Clintons slime and it is now time to get on with it.

As part of getting on with it, it seems to me that we should discontinue the persecution of a successful effort named microsoft and start fighting our way back to what America was founded on, Freedom to do, Freedom to be and Freedom to have.

Please stop using tax dollars pursuing someone who is good at what they do.
Sincerely
Ken Howe

MTC-00009354

From: Philip Casey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:49pm
Subject: Antitrust Case

Please end this case against Microsoft. This has been a waste of tax dollars and has kept more important matters from being heard in court. This country is based on capitalism and until this case, it has not been against the law to produce a product and sell it.

Thank you very much.
Sincerely,
Philip L. Casey

MTC-00009356

From: Gilles Desaulniers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:56pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Having been around since the beginning of the "micro computer industry" since I bought my first radio shack computer in 1977, I can comment that Microsoft controls everything and we now have no more choices.

The industry is dominated by them. the enthusiasm that created this industry is now gone and hopelessly forever linked to Microsoft tentacles that we can't shed no matter what we do. Their software needs upgrading every couple of years that demands more money from the consumer. They integrate every new innovation into their operating system and destroy the incentive to create new stuff.

Their bullying of the JAVA language the Sun Computers invented is a perfect example of hijacking innovation.

The zest and fervor surrounding the industry is slowly dying. I used to look forward to programming and trying new things and being part of an ever expanding

industry. Now we sit on the sidelines and watch "Microsoft do their thing". Punishment should be very severe. A company like Microsoft that has endless resources also has numbers of tricks up its sleeves. The idea that they will just sit and behave is ludicrous.

The wealth accumulated by this company is directly related to its forceful actions. Some of it needs to be taken away.

I slimmed down version of windows would be very useful and any patents they hold with the operating system should be invalidated because of their actions.

I suspect that they will only continue to corner the industry and hold many companies hostage to their petty demands because they can. If only in subtle tones it is enough to make and small innovator capitulate to a giant like Microsoft that has unlimited legal help and dollars. No company would ever think of taking them on except maybe IBM and SUN. Everyone else is lost.

As I write this text on my WINDOWS computer and you receive it on your windows computer. . . . think about the choices we really have. NONE NONE. . . .

HELP us to reinvigorate this industry again and allow the genius that every single one of us can perhaps bring to this industry and let them benefit from the ideas and share in the wealth.

Thanks
Gilles Desaulniers
San Francisco
415-637-6415

MTC-00009357

From: MRW
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:53pm
Subject: settlement

Let Microsoft alone and let them continue to provide jobs for a lot of people.

Merle Weinman

MTC-00009358

From: Bill s.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sir,

It is about time that you allow Bill Gates to do what he does best and that is to use the American System of Free Enterprise.

Bill Gates did not do anything wrong. 1) He came up with a product that is superior to anything else on the market; 2) Most of the intelligent manufacturers decided to use his products; and 3) people became adept at using his products and, regardless of what they say, are desirous of maintaining compatibility in their systems and continue to purchase Microsoft software.

Bill gates did it the correct way. It is about time that the U.S. Government gets off of his back and allows him to continue to provide the American public with the products (software) that he want.

How about the Justice Department really going after the "BAD GUYS" in our society and letting Bill Gates and Microsoft alone.

Thank you very much,
William J. Staskel
Janet Staskel

14 First Avenue
Central Islip, NY 11722-3010
(631) 234-6628

MTC-00009359

From: george mezori
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:58pm
Subject: more

Dear sir; Please stop this mud slinging on Microsoft. We are having enough problems with the stock market currently.

Stop the trials.

G. Mezori

MTC-00009360

From: Bob Patterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 7:54pm
Subject: End

Please end the Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse. I support the Microsoft settlement.

Bob & Judy Patterson

MTC-00009361

From: Giles Constant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:02pm
Subject: A small comment about Microsoft

Dear sir/madam,

It is impossible to buy a laptop computer in the UK without giving money to Microsoft. Really—I've tried. Even if I intend to use Linux on the machine, due to the OEM licensing restrictions (which the DOJ settlement has failed to effectively address), licensees are not allowed to provide me with the hardware without Windows. The EULA has a clause which says if you do not use the software, you can take it back to the vendor for a refund, but unfortunately, this is only applicable for the price of the entire laptop. This is (in my opinion) the most definitive example of the term "monopoly" I can possibly imagine. Although I speak from the UK, where the problem is likely to be addressed by the EU, I would hope that after the considerable expense involved in finding Microsoft guilty in this dispute, the USDOJ is capable of dishing out a *resolution* to the problem of Microsofts continuous attempts to gain control of every single aspect of computing from hardware to software to networking, at the expense of the people who actually work to make computers better for everyone.

If Microsoft's software were superior to (say) BeOS, which failed to survive as a consumer operating system due to the very licensing restrictions I object to, then I would be happy to use their software, but unfortunately, I only ever find myself FORCED to use it against my will, due to the viral nature of the company and its software.

Very disappointed.

Giles Constant

MTC-00009362

From: george mezori
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:02pm
Subject: support

We support the current Microsoft settlement. Please, please discontinue the court proceedings.

G. Mezori

MTC-00009363

From: Frank Meyers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs/Madams
I support the Microsoft settlement. Please add my comment to the public record.

Thank you
Frank Meyers Jr.

MTC-00009364

From: Dale Malott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:06pm
Subject: Microsoft—Clinton Anti-Trust Law Abuse

Gentlemen: It is time to end yet another attempt by left wing liberals to fleece an American Company as Clinton's pay back to the lawyers for their contribution to his two disastrous administrations. Microsoft was built by imitative and hard work. If the companies that run to the Justice Department to complain about Microsoft had exhibited the talent and hard work, they would be in a position to compete.

Please end this Anti-trust Law Abuse now.
Thank you,
Dale Malott

MTC-00009365

From: Annette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:10pm

Leave Microsoft alone PLEASE! Don't wreck it like AT&T was wrecked! Look at our phone system now!!!!!!

Annette Crane
Keystone Heights, Fla.

MTC-00009366

From: JAMES B. LINTON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:11pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Sirs:

I think it is about time that we get on with business and leave microsoft alone. Bill Clinton is out of the White House now so we don't need any of his anti trust laws.

Thanks,
James B. Linton
204 S. Wise St.
Samson, Al 36477-1510

MTC-00009367

From: barbara ball
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:11pm
Subject: Anti-trust abuse

Will you please stop all this nonsense about Microsoft. The only people who have been hurt are those who put their money in for retirement and education for their children etc.

Please stop hurting myself and others who trust you to have common sense.

Do you not realize that the economic problems all started when Clinton decided again to hurt the people he was to protect? All our economic problems right now can be traced right back to that law suite.

Barbara Ball
La Crosse, WI 54603

MTC-00009368

From: The Galli's
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:13pm
 Subject: The "Case"

The nine States and the Dist. of Colombia would be much better off starting to tend to their own increasing economic woes and stop Beating the "Help the Consumer Drum" for a cause which was dubious from the onset.

Don't we have enough Economic Behemoths" gasping for air without putting another to the test? If I was Bill Gates I would move my Corporate Headquarters off shore in a show of Disgust"

A concerned citizen-consumer

MTC-00009369

From: barbara ball
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:17pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

This is supposed to be a free country, free enterprise, etc. This is an outrage companies should be allowed to do what they want and the people will decide whether or not they wish to support said company. The government has to get over the idea that we are children and need them to tell us how to spend our money and that we can and do make decisions all the time.

Barbara Ball
 La Crosse, WI 54603

MTC-00009370

From: David Hebert
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:19pm
 Subject: Please end the abuse!

To Whom it may concern,

It's time to move on and end the ridiculous law suit against Microsoft one and for all. Bill Gates has done great things for the Personal Computer world and the liberal elite can't stand it. It's time to quit spend taxpayer dollars in an attempt to ruin a company that has been key in economic growth in America.

Please stop the litigation's now.
 David Hebert
 Psalm 119:9-11

MTC-00009371

From: Frank Jett
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over.

I Support the Microsoft settlement.
 Sincerely
 Frank Q. Jett

MTC-00009372

From: Gorman Blanton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:17pm
 Subject: Re: Antitrust Microsoft

Dear Sirs:

We have had enough of the Clinton era Anti trust against Microsoft. Please end this fiasco against the only American Company left in the United Sates. Stop all The Chinese

Products that are flooding USA. there is the reason our economy has bottemed out and the reason is Bill Clinton SOLD OUT THE USA TO THE CHINESE!!!!!!

Gorman T Blanton

MTC-00009373

From: Seth Held
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:17pm
 Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Case

If Microsoft has broken the law, fine them and moniter them but don't make the consumer suffer by doing what you did to AT&T. Please . . . seth held

MTC-00009374

From: Judith Gersting
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my belief that the Microsoft settlement should go forward so that this company can get back to its main business of developing software and that its competitors can also move forward and develop their own products. Too much time and money has been spent on this process, diverting energies and funds from a more useful purpose.

Dr. Judith Gersting,
 Chair Computer Science Department
 University of Hawaii at Hilo
 200 W. Kawili St.
 Hilo, HI 96720

MTC-00009375

From: Maurice Knudsen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:27pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

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.

Please help to end this Clinton-era Anti-trust abuse!

Thanking you sincerely, I am
 Maurice J. Knudsen
 4428 Main Street

Elk Horn, IA 51531-2000

MTC-00009376

From: Richard Elfers
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:30pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

This message regards the Tunney Act. We urge settlement of the Microsoft case, with no further litigation.

Sincerely yours,
 Richard and Priscilla Elfers
 6823 Ripley Lane
 Renton, Wa. 98056

MTC-00009377

From: Patricia Burke
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:33pm

Please put an end to the anti-trust litigation against Microsoft. Why do we punish a company that comes up with working and workable ideas and puts its competition to shame?

Patricia J. Burke
 1427—100th St. S. W., Sp. 156
 Everett, WA 98204-1107
 (425) 355-5800

MTC-00009378

From: Jane Calvert
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Would you please end this "going after Microsoft" fiasco. No one forces anyone to do business with Microsoft or like their inventions. They obviously have many talented people in their organization that comes up with technology that people want to spend their money on and I can not see where they are putting anyone else out of business by underhanded schemes. Just save the taxpayers a lot of money and settle this thing once and for all. Let the young and inventive people of this country know that it is okay to go out on a limb and invent and invest in their own ideas.

Mr. and Mrs. Earnest L. Calvert
 Rt. 1 Box 699
 Camdenton, Mo. 65020
 janie@advertisnet.com

MTC-00009379

From: SMax283@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:35pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Department of Justice:

It is time to bring this most unfortunate chapter, the lawsuit against Microsoft, of our nations history to a close. I wholeheartedly support the settlement as drafted between the nine states and the Federal Government; and only wish to include the suggestion that time is a wasting!

John S. Hoke
 1146 Fairways
 Lebanon, TN 37087
 615-443-3633 (H)
 615-405-2954 (Cell)

MTC-00009380

From: Hunt4Him@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/7/02 8:35pm

Subject: End Government attack on Microsoft
To whom it may concern:

The Clinton Administration has past. Hopefully the multiple abuses of the Justice Department has past with them. Please end this travesty of justice against Microsoft. Being successful should not be a crime.

Steve Hunt
6429 Colchester RD
Fairfax Station, VA 22039

MTC-00009381

From: Mike (038) Sandra Bottorff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:43pm
Subject: PLEASE!

PLEASE!
It is time to leave Microsoft and Bill Gates alone!

Stop the Clinton-ista type persecution!
Sandra Bottorff
12750 170th Avenue
LeRoy, Michigan 49655

MTC-00009382

From: Bruce Sparks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft

Drop the stupid persecution of a company that has excelled. It has become fashionable in America to penalize those that have done well, and reward those that can't make it on their own. Microsoft has done more than any other company to advance technology in America. No, I don't have any interest in Microsoft, (wish I had bought their stock years ago) other than a belief that excellence should be rewarded, not penalized.

MTC-00009383

From: William R Mattingly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:53pm
Subject: End Anti-Trust Law Abuse

OK! Finally, the Clinton era is over (Thank GOD!) and now it's past time to end the unlawful disruption of business at Microsoft. Clinton and his anti business, anti-American antics have cost the taxpayer millions of dollars. Money which would have been better spent tracking these cowardly terrorists such as bin laden. Let's get back to better business please and end the charade.

MTC-00009384

From: Lou Placette
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:49pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust suit

I am appalled at the flagrant disregard Microsoft has for the laws of the U.S. The only benevolent monopoly that has been in the 20th century was AT&T which provided very low cost phone service to the nation. It was broken up and phone service has been less than adequate since.

Microsoft, on the other hand, forces inferior software on buyers of computers and willfully suppresses other providers from competing in a free market society. The cost is maintained at a high level because no competition is allowed.

The fact that no punishment or dissolution of the company has occurred so far, feeds the idea that judges can be bought off by Bill

Gates because he has the billions necessary to find anyone's price.

I urge you to uphold the welfare of the nation and dissolve the Microsoft monopoly so that other companies can compete in a fair market allowing consumers to have choices for their spending which stimulates the economy and provides jobs in technology.

Thank you for hearing my concerns,
Elsie B. Placette

MTC-00009385

From: RickValusek@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope the settlement as proposed can be accepted soon. I have never felt comfortable about this entire mess, but I believe the settlement is at least fair to most parties involved. I thank Microsoft every day for my access to the internet through the Microsoft network that powers WebTV. I want Microsoft to be able to get back to business doing what they do best, i.e. make competitive products, and let the free market decide who's product they want. I thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,
Rick Valusek

MTC-00009386

From: William Bethel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:52pm
Subject: (no subject)

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

William Bethel

MTC-00009387

From: F M Byford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:56pm
Subject: Support

I support the Microsoft settlement. Let's get it over with.

MTC-00009388

From: Pat2946@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs:

The US court has come to an agreement with Microsoft. Please accept this agreement and let Microsoft get on with its business.

Murray Paterson
pat2946@aol.com

MTC-00009389

From: Cathleen Wedlake
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:57pm
Subject: RE: Message

Dear Microsoft

I want to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse.

Thank You!

Sincerely,
Cathleen Wedlake

MTC-00009391

From: Cheryl Caraglior
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:12pm
Subject: Reticulus lawsuit

It is time to end a reticulus witch hunt of Microsoft which Clinton began. Too much taxpayer monies have been wasted on this as is. Let consumers decide what is in their own best interest. Microsoft may have bundled its browser on Windows systems, but nothing prevented the public from installing whatever browser they chose to.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Caraglior

MTC-00009392

From: Kim Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:02pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement Date : Jan 7, 2002 To : Department Of Justice From : William G Peterson Subject : Microsoft Settlement

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 have read extensively material and document on this case and settlement including : "Complaint(5/18/1998)", "Stipulation(11/06/2001)", and "Competitive Impact Statement(11/15/2001)". Its a good thing you folks and JANET RENO weren't around at the turn of the last century. If you were I wouldn't be driving my FORD.

The Department Of Justice gave Microsoft very strong order, stronger than the competition complaint about. I'm very happy that Microsoft agreea to this final settlement.

Sincerely
William G Peterson

MTC-00009393

From: Lester Hopper Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 8:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

To The Justice Department,
I purchased windows95 with the IE4.0 together several years ago and did not mind a bit. Should a jury have any say so about this, the Law or laws used to incriminate this Nations leading contributor to our economy would be nullified. I am aware of Mr. Gates and what he did but many othe free downloads are available and were then. It is also fact that some of Microsofts competitors held contracts with the US and installed faulty servers and software. Clinton in my opinion is who we should be prosecuting for his treasonous acts of selling some of our most Secret Information to China while prosecuting Mr. Gates.

These facts could only be denied by LIARS!!!!!!!

Lester Hopper
6294 Southlake Drive
Hickory NC 28601

MTC-00009394

From: JJHeilman@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:04pm
Subject: Settlement

This lawsuit has done enough damage to the economy of this country. More than enough consideration has been given to the issues. Let's accept the judgement and move on.

Virginia Heilman

MTC-00009397

From: Ross Nooney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT TRIAL

When are we going to give up on prosecuting Microsoft for being such a good company. I own no stock, but hate to see my tax dollars being wasted. Oracle, Sun Systems, etc. . . . need to get on with their business. Prosecute terrorists, organized crime etc. . . ., but be done with Microsoft already!

MTC-00009398

From: andrew
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear sirs,
I, Joel Mann, support the Microsoft settlement.

MTC-00009399

From: Rudolph Hensley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement (ENOUGH IS ENOUGH)

I support the Justice Department Microsoft settlement, as a consumer and taxpayer. Stop the financial waste of this legal maneuvers. Consider the roots of Microsoft, etc., etc., and the detriment to free enterprise.

Rudolph Hensley
912-876-6398
401 Club Drive
Hinesville, GA 31313

MTC-00009400

From: donna faye
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:14pm
Subject: Ending the Clinton-era
Please end the Clinton-era of Anti-trust.
Thanks

MTC-00009401

From: Norm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:16pm
Subject: microsoft
I would like to see the action against Microsoft dropped. No punishment necessary.

MTC-00009402

From: Carol Wilkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:07pm
Subject: Clinton-era Anti-trust law
The Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse was wrong, and I want to see it ended.
Sincerely,
Carol Wilkins

MTC-00009403

From: ROBERT MOELLER

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:21pm
Subject: Justice Department,
Justice Department,

It is my opinion that it is in the best interest of the United States to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse.

Microsoft got to where they are by hard work and American free enterprise. They should not be penalized for being an over achiever. They have a line of great products that greatly enhances American business and personal use of computers. For example: if a cow produces more milk the farmer does not reduce its amount of feed. No; he gives it more grain thus encourages it to produce more milk!

By penalizing Microsoft you are telling other businesses not to over produce least they face the same consequences thereby limiting economic growth.

Robert Moeller
4350 E. River Rd.
Mt. Pleasant, Mi. 48858
bmoeller@quixnet.net

MTC-00009404

From: bradley c francis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:29pm
Subject: microsoft

Leave Gates and his company alone, he has no more a monopoly then the power company, postal service, water company , This is free enterprise, supply and demand and if he supplies better so be it . . . just like the power co, the postal service and everyones water companies so I say leave him and his company alone and focus on real hurtful things like child abusers and predators.

MTC-00009405

From: Nicole Demas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:32pm
Subject: Enough's enough
Microsoft has spent millions defending itself. When I think of the software applications that kind of money could have gone toward I find it insane. Let them do what they do best. The DOJ should concentrate on terrorists, organised crime families and all the undesirable elements who belong behind bars for life, not a company that can make our lives better, richer and more enjoyable.

MTC-00009406

From: Harold Cantley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:36pm
Subject: settlement
I think you should leave Microsoft along, they have provided great service to the American Public. All the litigation cost lack business tax is passed on to the consumer, so the longer you keep them in court the more it coasts we the people so let stop.

Thanks
Harold Cantley

MTC-00009407

From: Service Plus—Jason Kozdra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

I believe, with many others, that Microsoft has made agreements with hardware vendors, to develop their products so that they will not operate on "alternative operating systems", especially those that are Open-Source, such as Linux, and some which are not Open Source, but which are given away at no charge, such as BeOS's Personal Edition. It is nearly impossible to purchase a PC in the United States without some version of Microsoft Windows being included on it (OEM). The cost for this operating system is passed along to the end user, whether he or she uses Windows or not, even if that person purchases that PC with the intent to install an alternative operating system on it.

Many of these users, due to the aforementioned lack of support for alternative operating systems by hardware vendors, are forced to switch back to a Windows operating system, just so that their PC hardware will work.

There are plenty of developers out there who would develop drivers that would make vendor's hardware work in the alternative operating systems. It is not a lack of diligence that keeps these developers from creating drivers for the alternative operating system if they want to, it is the alleged agreements made between Microsoft and hardware vendors not to release the necessary information to these developers. This forces millions of users to "conform" to the Microsoft operating systems, strengthening the Microsoft Monopoly.

I do not believe that settlement discussion should proceed any further until any alleged agreements between Microsoft and hardware vendors is investigated.

Thank you,
Jason Daniel Kozdra
5893 Pine Top Road
Blairsville, GA 30512

MTC-00009408

From: Marc Trepppler (038) Angela Grupas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I think it is time to leave well enough alone. Microsoft is doing a great job for everyone concerned.

Without them we will have chaos with no clear standard and no usable interconnection between systems.

It is wonderful that they have the operating system and the applications that work together to provide true benefit for the user. Prior to MS back before DOS, PC's where little more than toys for nurds.

Everyone had a program that did very little and didn't work with anything else. Users had to learn every program from scratch. Even the most basic things like saving a file had to be re-learned because there was no standardization. LET Microsoft alone and QUITE SPENDING MY TAX DOLLARS ON A NON-ISSUE. If MS is so bad don't buy it. There are other choices—you can use Lenex, Apple, Sun, etc.

Use whatever you like. Buy whatever you like. MS is not monopolizing the industry they are just doing the best job for the consumer.

Marc Treppeler PE

MTC-00009409

From: Duffy, Bob W Mr USAMISSA

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/7/02 9:29pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

CC: Duffy, Bob W Mr USAMISSA

To the DOJ:

1. I have always been opposed to the DOJ anti-trust case against Microsoft. Reference my previous comments in my letter to President Bush (below).

2. I have always been opposed to the actions of the 9 states that are seeking remedies above those which the majority of the states and the Federal Government agreed to in the initial settlement agreement.

3. I am adamantly opposed to any further escalation in the remedies imposed upon Microsoft via any means.

4. With respect to the 9 states that did not agree to the initial settlement: they represent a MINORITY faction considering . . . only 19 of 50 states joined the DOJ suite (Texas dropped out)—38% of the 50 states sued—62% of the states did NOT sue—only 9 states opposed the settlement . . . 18% of the 50 states—47% of the 19 states that remained a party to the DOJ suite—82% of the states either did not sue or were in agreement with the settlement. Conclusion: The DOJ and 82% of the 50 states favored the settlement . . . 18% of the states did not.

My position on this matter: The court should approve the settlement that the DOJ and 10 states have agreed to.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Duffy

7811 Pinebrook Dr

San Antonio, TX 78230-4810

My letter to President Bush:

Dear President Bush:

I am becoming increasingly displeased with the prolonged attack by the state and federal governments on the behalf of Microsoft competitors via the misguided antitrust suite initiated by the Clinton Administration. Not satisfied to remain within the scope of the current bogus allegations, the states are once again attempting to muddy the waters with complaints and allegations antitrust violation claims directed against the next generation of innovative products that are beneficial to the consumer . . . Windows XP and .net.

The only reason the antitrust case got past the district court level was because David Boise was able to befuddle a senile, computer illiterate district court judge who placed more emphasis on his personal biases than the hard facts relating to a rapidly changing technological revolution. His biggest complaint against Microsoft was the belligerent attitudes of the MS executives—they were justified in being belligerent solely on the basis that their valuable time was being wasted in court defending themselves against the Govt bullies and their state cronies and competitors (the same competitors who had to resort to Govt subsidized competition because they had

already lost the battle in the open market place).

I have personally experienced the technology evolution. By profession I am classified as a computer specialist. My background includes programming and systems analysis and development—beginning in 1971. I have lived the transition from the mainframe to the desktop PC to the networked PC to the WEB/.com explosion. Anyone with similar experience can attest to the incompatibility nightmares of the early transition from centralized processing on the mainframe to the total chaos of incompatible hardware and software on the desktop linked by only the “sneaker net” of hand carried (or snail mailed) 360 KB 5¼ in floppy disks. There was no interoperability, compatibility or common operating standards. There were no standard networking environments, this is another story but one that has a good ending at least the Govt didn't try to legislate the innovation out of it as it is attempting to do to Microsoft.

Microsoft observed this inefficiency in the market place and listened to the anguish of the early PC users and developed a strategy that made things easier for the end user, the computer novice—the average consumer that did not want to have to become a techno guru to get something done. Microsoft transformed the PC into a tool that provided value to the consumer by enabling the consumer to be more productive via a user friendly environment—Hardware, Operating system and an interoperable suite of productivity oriented software. This constant focus on integration for the betterment of the end user experience is why Microsoft has evolved to being the 800 pound gorilla of the desktop, because the consumers did not want the “best mousetrap ever built”—they wanted one that was easy to set and could actually catch mice.

In my own personal evolution I have been exposed to almost all of Microsoft's competitors' products . . . Word Perfect, Lotus 123, notes, ccmail . . . Sun Solaris, Unix . . . Novell, Apple, IBM PC DOS, OS/2 . . . Harvard Graphics . . . Correll Draw . . . All good products but one almost had to become a PC techno-nerd-geek to get something done and God help you if you had to get one product to read something from a different product that had been sent to you via an email attachment, provided your email was compatible with the sender's email. These were the days when you had to have that young pimple faced smart aleck “go to guy” that knew the option, or setting, or the right format conversion, and what was most irritating is the fact he got the fix or the Utility program some somewhere that only the true nerd-geeks-who-didn't-have-life-outside-of-his (always a “he”—never a “she”)-pc knew about. In short, Microsoft's competitors were 100% focused on the best whiz banged techno solutions and products in a market that was evolving into a consumer commodity world—the consumer wanted something that was easy to use, did something of value, something that could be done again (repetitive) without taking notes, and something that did not break (reliable)—Microsoft listen to and satisfied the needs of the people who were out there, the

consumers. Their competitors lost sight of this and have suffered the fate of many who, in the past, did not see the handwriting on the wall, how many buggy whip companies are left??? what about those Beta formatted VCR tapes, how many 8-Track tapes are there?

When Microsoft got the PC and the Work Stations hitting on all cylinders with Windows 3.x . . . Windows95 . . . they ported the same user-friendly operating system with the same GUI and “point and click” behavior to the Server platform . . . What a concept??? take something that everyone is already familiar with on the PC and stick with it . . . don't reinvent the wheel, don't try to razzle-dazzle people with new whiz bang OS, directory systems, commands and super cool behavior . . . stick with the KISS approach . . . Keep It Simple Stupid! This approach is why Microsoft is the dominant computer Software, internet and networking solutions provider in the world—it has nothing to do with anti-competitive behavior. As some who has professionally evolved along with Microsoft I'd like to share with you some interesting personal observations, early in the game when Microsoft was coming out with their 1st generation products intentionally designed to be simple and easy to use—these same competitors (and a few that aren't around any more) actually snickered and ridiculed Microsoft's feeble attempts at trying to compete with their hot shot best of class leading edge (bleeding edge??) technology . . . I have had sales reps tell me personally that Microsoft could not compete with their products, where did all the IBM OS/2 PCs go??? Has UNIX vi replaced MS editors, where did Netware go??? All of these products failed . . . not because they were inferior but because they did not focus on the needs of their markets, the changes in the market place—and most importantly, because of their hatred for Microsoft they purposely omitted Microsoft friendly interoperability features, at their peril.

Today we observe the US Justice department still engaged in a punitive action against a company that has succeeded in a market place seething with competitors who's primary objective was to crush Microsoft . . . all one has to find out who they were is read the list of the companies who testified on behalf of the Justice department. Most of the states involved are the home states of these same MS competitors. There is not a single individual, private company, local, state or Federal Govt agency that does not reap the benefits of Microsoft's innovative technology on a daily basis.

Now that we are in this WAR on Terrorism, I ask of my elected officials to observe just how similar the behavior of those against Microsoft is to that of the terrorists is to the global symbol of freedom, it seems that any one, any company, any nation that attains the pinnacle of success and become an icon of something good and successful becomes a target to those who have failed. I find it very disturbing that the Bush administration has not put a stop to the persecution of Microsoft that seemed to be the “Jihad” of the Clinton Justice department.

Given the situation we are in, the government should be appreciative of the fact that Microsoft has evolved as the PC and networking standard—one that the Govt can embrace and turn to for the propose of securing America's information highway . . . Microsoft has the technology and because it has become the de facto "standard" security strategies can easily be designed around this technology, rather than wasting valuable Microsoft resources in a protracted ill-advised anti-trust battle, the federal and state leadership should embrace Microsoft as a valued partner in the "War on Terrorism".

Sincerely,
Robert Duffy
7811 Pinebrook Dr
San Antonio, TX 78230-4810

MTC-00009410

From: R. G. Montgomery
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:40pm
Subject: Don't penalize success.

It is the view of the left, i.e., former President Clinton and former Atny Gen Reno, that suces is wrong. Such is the basis of the case against Microsoft.

Bill Gates, et al, built a "better mousetrap" and made money due to their superior product. This shouldn't be actionable. Whatever "monopolizing" was done, if it were in violation of law, is a minor matter. Deal with it as a minor matter. Shut out the individual states who are now trying to turn a profit from Microsoft's misfortune.

Please un-socialize and de-politicize the Justice Department.

Thank you very much,
R. G. Montgomery

MTC-00009411

From: trina hollander
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:42pm
Subject: comment

We support the Microsoft settlement. We want to see an end to the Clinton era anti-trust law abuse.

Sincerely,
Trina & John Hollander
Calhoun, KY

MTC-00009412

From: Brenda Ann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:43pm
Subject: Re: Anti-trustlaw abuse
To Whom it May Concern,

Please end this Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse with the Microsoft case! It's such a waste of money, time and talent that could be spent on something that is truly illegal. In my view, this is a case of, class envy, and liberals promoting socialism. Very dangerous business.

Thank you,
Brenda Shumate
Marysville, Ca.

MTC-00009413

From: Patrick Lawrence
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi just wanted to write a quick email to voice my concern that something is done

about Microsoft and there tactics so that we can have real choices for our operating system. I would at the very least like to see duel-boot options mandatory on all new computers so that other operating systems like Linux and BeOS have a chance in the future.

Thanks
Patrick Lawrence

MTC-00009414

From: MaryFK@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen I wish to express my frustration with the government's continuous pursuit of the Anti-Trust Case against Microsoft. I believe that the case should be settled and finalized. Too much money has already been spent trying this case. I would have rather seen the money spent on education.

It it my belief that Microsoft has enabled the general public to be able to use Personal Computers and has enhanced the industry with it's innovation. Stop spending our tax dollars on this case and spend it instead on bettering our education system.

Thank you for reading my comments.
Mary F. Kush

MTC-00009415

From: Gabriel Georgeff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Law suit

Dear justice Department: Microsoft has stole,pirated, and crumbled companies with their literally stealing the work of many software developers. It also has a strangle hold on a large part of the hardware companies that threaten Microsoft. The Microsoft system is a drag on many users, due to the unreliability of Microsoft Windows crashing, hard to recover your computer to open, and run after multiple crashes. Having to call for help, that you are charged \$34.00 per hour for over the phone assistance to get your lousy Microsoft Windows back up and running from their technicians. It is a said situation the way Microsoft has a strangle hold on computer users. Please free computer users to have a open source operating system (example Lynux), and open Microsoft's hold by having the coding all of their software. Their software to where you have no choice but to be in a stangle hold of MICROSOFT. It is a situation computer users deserve better in these United States of America.

SET US FREE, Please SET US FREE.

Gabriel T. Georgeff
1217 SW Morningside Drive
Blue Springs, MO 64015-4905

MTC-00009416

From: s(038)s
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:56pm
Subject: leave microsoft alone

MTC-00009417

From: Beri Bek
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

I wish the government would just leave Microsoft alone. A monopoly does not exist. It would really help the economy if this case was dropped.

Beri B. Bek
Kentwood, MI
49508-6556

MTC-00009418

From: Pamela Schmidt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:56pm
Subject: Ending Clinton Anti-trust abuse
To whom it may concern:

You have my full support to do what is just and lawful to correct any abuses allowed through the Clinton years. I know that you will know just what to do.

Sincerely yours,
Pamela J. Schmidt

MTC-00009419

From: Vivek Velso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 9:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A FINFlash Alert: The DOJ wants to hear from YOUDear DoJ Rep; I have observed the ongoing economic trend for the past years, and, I would like to offer my suggestions for sustaining growth in the high-speed digital age.

It gives me immense pleasure to write about Microsoft's approach in the industry, which is based on central theme of Rapid Innovation.

The full credit goes to key strategies played by Microsoft and the Leadership demostrated in bringing the great innovations to life, encouraging people, engaging customers with their feedback on products which can change the future in a "boundaryless" fashion. I appreciate Microsoft's customer centric policies, and I am fully confident that very soon, the new image of Microsoft's Innovation will take the responsibility for upholding and rolling out a new Digital Age never experienced before.

Today, the freedom to innovate and to keep America rolling is only possible after removing the bureaucratic hurdles from the society, and encourage key players like Microsoft to keep innovating at speed of thought.

There are many aspects currectly worked upon by Microsoft which need your utmost support for the freedom to innovate— Digital Signatures which can also benefit FAA, Wireless with .NET Infrastructure for security, Education Telecommunication policies e.Business Customer Trust and Privacy

We, as the end consumers and residents are trying our level best to suppport Microsoft with all means like providing inputs for next generation of Internet Protocol, .NET, beta testing, product evaluation, to name a few.

I have also urged Microsoft to publish Bumper Stickers, and dynamic NewsFlashes for encouraging their spirit of innovation.

Microsoft has always respected small emerging companies and entrepreneurs worldwide, not only in Ohio, who are working hard and committed to innovation by sharing technology ideas and creating

value added partnerships for enabling win-win solutions.

Only the hurdles of few arrogant CEO and open minded gurus have misled the path towards innovation and creating Economic value add. This will only add towards the worst scenarios of global recession in a cascading fashion, thereby impacting every vertical industry.

I appreciate your valuable time and hope that my views will go in a long way to establish a valuable communication link for sustaining ever expanding growth in the Digital Economy, which is only possible by the FREEDOM TO INNOVATE...

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Vivek Velso

2216 Albemarle Dr Apt#102
Fairfield, OH 45014-4343

From: MSFIN@Microsoft.com

To: vivek.velso@poboxes.com

Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2002 12:20 PM

Subject: 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-00009420

From: AEKHLHL@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 9:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled now.

There should be no further litigation.

Audrey K. Leaser
723 Southmeadow Circle
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

MTC-00009421

From: BGABRAB@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 9:57pm

Subject: (no subject)

regarding your e-mail on microsoft court case i do believe that consideration should be given to a lower settlement figure and bring this case to an end.

MTC-00009422

From: Daryl D.Lettie

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 10:02pm

Subject:

DROP IT DROP IT

MTC-00009423

From: Drew D. Read

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 10:14pm

Subject: Stop Wasting Our Money

Stop spending my tax dollars on battling Microsoft anti trust lawsuits.

It's a free market economy and if other companies can't compete against Microsoft, they should go out of business.

If you need to find a good cause to spend our tax dollars fighting, try reverse discrimination with Affirmative Action. They mandate lesser qualified ethnic minorities just to meet the lawful quota. I see this happen first hand in the state university system in PA. If I were a parent with a college student and I knew they weren't getting the most qualified professor for the money, I would be furious. Yet this is exactly what's going on today in our education system. It's happening in other areas also. People should be hired on qualifications, not skin color or ethnic backgrounds in order to meet quotas.

Have a great day.

Drew D. Read

MTC-00009424

From: Frank Allegretta

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 10:19pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I am interested in taking part of worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: examples: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, make dual-boot options mandatory, etc..."

Best regards,

Frank Allegretta

mailto:jean11@sccoast.net

MTC-00009425

From: Pat Riley

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 10:20pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear USDOJ,

Please settle the Microsoft case soon and let the country get to work using this standard.

The private sector can not afford to create custom programs like the federal government.

The MS windows, explorer and family of products work with great success and dependability.

Patrick and Alexis Riley

262-15-6722, 527-11-3644

El Cajon, CA 92021

MTC-00009426

From: cattmail@mac.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 10:20pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department Of Justice,

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

1. MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

2. The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

3. The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

4. The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

The above facts and opinions have been drawn up by a non-profit group who's goal is to shed some light on things that have become apparent in the consumer market concerning the way Microsoft has acted with its monopoly power. The consumer and its freedom of choice has been heavily damaged by such misconduct from Microsoft. As you and I know, the consumer reality has been tarnished into thinking that Microsoft and its products are the only choice or alternative to solutions that not too many years ago had

flourished with products and solutions from a wide range and it is understandable that some products and/or solutions would and will disappear.

You and I usually assume (by natural occurrence) now that there are no alternatives for products and/or solutions in the computing world when it comes to the PC market other than Microsoft and Windows... yeah sure there are alternatives, but most of the consumer market is blind to these alternatives due to Microsoft's strangle hold on the OEMs with its strict licensing issues. Is Microsoft totally at fault over this?... NO! I think that the OEMs should be also held accountable for irresponsibility to the consumer market by forcing a product and/or solution in giving the consumers no freedom of choice and blinding them from the alternatives and staging such a market as if Microsoft and Windows is the only choice by default.

I do not wish for Microsoft to be split as a company, in my opinion that would only hurt the consumer market even more and hide the fact that Microsoft is still Microsoft. I also believe the latest settlement offer is only going to make Microsoft's monopoly more powerful with forcing Microsoft to donate Billions of dollars worth of products and/or solutions (which would cost only pennies for Microsoft) to the educational sector in need of such is only going to worsen the blow to the rest of the competitors affected by Microsoft's anti-competitive practices already. I am in no way undermining your decision or proposal of settlement, but I think that Microsoft would have another advantage over the rest of the industry in the education market by planting Microsoft's reach in the way of the back door so to speak. The schools in need should be given donations of a cash amount and let the schools decide on what is needed for their children, not Microsoft!

I as a consumer feel that Microsoft has heavily damaged the freedom of the consumer in a way that has almost damaged the economy of the US and the economies around the world. I have much faith in you, the Department Of Justice and I feel that you will resolve and bring to justice that is rightly deserved to the consumer world and hopefully protect us (as you always have) from such dangers to our way of life and our freedom of choice as our ancestors fought so hard to establish in America. I believe you will do the right thing. I thank you very much for your time and patience in reading this letter and good luck to you.

Best Regards...
Dennis

MTC-00009427

From: Carma Woodward
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:25pm
Subject: I want to end the Clinton era.
I want to end the Clinton era.
Carma Woodward

MTC-00009428

From: Hans Schieder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:29pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Gentlemen:

Please cease your foolish and wasteful trial against Microsoft.

An American company should not be penalized for having been successful. Let others who would like to make money in that field also be as creative as Microsoft was to earn their share of the market rather than crying to the courts.

Sincerely,
Hans Schieder

MTC-00009429

From: Bruce Faling
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:

I understand that the US Department of Justice is seeking opinions of concerned citizens over the proposed settlement between Microsoft Corporation and the US Department of Justice. My opinions on said settlement appear below: Contrary to popular belief, Microsoft Corporation wields no power over their customers, potential customers, computer manufacturers, competitors, or the population at large.

As a private company, Microsoft relies upon voluntary transactions with its customers in order to continue to do business. Customers, potential customers, and computer manufacturers alike are under no obligation to accept Microsoft Corporation's terms before buying and using its products. They are free to accept, decline, or ask to amend the terms, but they cannot be "made" to do anything as such. That Microsoft has sold millions of copies of its broad offerings is evidence that people have accepted their terms voluntarily in large numbers, and thus any claims of harm perpetrated against consumers is baseless.

In short, Microsoft has done no wrong. That being the case, any proposed "settlement" cannot sensibly be construed as "fair," to either the shareholders of Microsoft or their customers. Being how this settlement, by its very nature, must force Microsoft to operate in ways it did not see fit to do voluntarily, I must condemn the settlement for what it most apparently is: An attempt to limit the competitiveness of Microsoft for the benefit of its rivals. The marketplace of software products has clearly—and freely—chosen Microsoft.

That last statement is significant. The ignorance of many people of the difference between high market share and true power astounds. However, the difference is real. Where Microsoft relies upon voluntary exchange with its customers for its very existence; true coercive agencies, such as the US Department of Justice, require no such consent from "its" "customers." Funded by monies expropriated from productive persons, their function is to force people, and associations of people, to comply with written law.

Granted, such force is not always employed, but the threat and ability to employ it is always present. Consent cannot rightly be said to be given under such circumstances. This is true power. It is clearly demonstrable that it is by no means the equivalent to attaining a high market

share. Having said that, I can only recommend dropping the proposed settlement out of hand as well as the very suit it was meant to settle in the first place.

Sincerely,
Bruce Faling

MTC-00009430

From: George Polycrates
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:35pm
Subject: MICROSOFT
Ladies & Gentlemen,

I am a Civil Engineer. I remember how intimidating was at the beginning to use computers even though I had experience from my schooling. I still see people that they are afraid to get involved with the computers. I have bought computer from GATEWAY, DELL, COMPAQUE, PACKARD, HP AND

MTC-00009431

From: Lou Cori
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:36pm
Subject: Get Though

Bill Gates has been crapping on the competition and the buying public from the word "GO". He doesn't leave a choice to anyone. I resented the way that he screwed Netscape and then tried to force people to use his Internet program without any choice. This scum ball has destroyed more companies than you could possibly name. Even the computer manufacturer's have little choice in how they place software on their products. He has also forced the software magazine's to use his product article descriptions to the detriment of any competitor. Don't let up on him.

MTC-00009432

From: Danny Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:38pm
Subject: Hidden Microsoft Training Sham

Please restrict the Microsoft training scam they are perpetrating on people like myself. Microsoft is conspiring with a group of approved training centers, book publishers, and testing centers to fraudulently take our money in a training program scam.

At age 53, I was "downsized" by my former employer. To enhance my ability to find work, I spent \$8,000 of my savings and 200-plus hours of classroom time in a "Microsoft approved" training school, using "Microsoft approved" textbooks, taking a series of 6 "Microsoft approved" exams at a "Microsoft approved" test center (at \$100 per pop) to obtain my Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer certification (MCSE)... only to be notified by Microsoft that they have decided to make all MCSE's retake their exams over mostly the same material to remain certified. NONE of the students who paid their thousands of dollars in fees were ever told that the certifications could be cancelled at the whim of Microsoft in order to keep their relationships with their training centers, text publishers, and testing centers secure and very profitable.

These Microsoft approved training centers, text book publishers, and testing centers MUST have a constant flow of students to keep profitable and in business. In addition,

Microsoft gets a cut of the action at each level.

I know improvements are made in the software over time, and have I have no problem taking one or even two exams over the software improvements to keep current. However, to make us take all (now SEVEN) exams over 75% of the same material has only one purpose—to keep the grist in the Microsoft training mills and keep their approved training partners, approved text publishers, and approved test centers busy and profitable.

I pointed out to Microsoft that CPAs, Attorneys, and MDs attend classes and seminars to keep current on changes in their profession, but they do not have to retake all the exams of the CPA exam, bar exam, or medical boards every time rules, laws or procedures change.

Microsoft, as a monopoly, has said “too bad”, you must retake exams over the same material at our approved test centers, anyway. Please insist that they can put together tests covering changes to their software and make us take them, but that they cannot insist that we be forced to retake exams over already tested material to remain current.

To do otherwise gives Microsoft permission to use its monopoly power to force us to spend many thousands of dollars in courses and testing that no other profession is compelled to do. Microsoft can do for one reason only—they are a monopoly and if we don't like it, tough!

Thank you.

Danny Brown
15818 Knoll Lake Drive
Houston, Texas 77095
Tel. 281-859-5174
dannybrown@mail.com

MTC-00009433

From: Chris Chauvin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:49pm
Subject: Microsoft—Justice Dept. Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I am just an average citizen, but I would like to express my opinion on the Microsoft settlement.

It seems to me that all that would be accomplished by not settling would be to punish Microsoft for becoming a great company that the U.S. can be proud to call our own. All this so that the competition who would and does do the same marketing practices when they are given the chance can be satisfied.

Our country was not founded on condemning free enterprise.

Christine Chauvin
Billings, Montana

MTC-00009434

From: Mntman45@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

NANCY MOREHEAD
638 Heidi Lane
Mansfield, OH 44904
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to request that there be no more litigation in the Microsoft Antitrust case, and that the federal investigation be brought to a close with the agreed settlement that you reached with Microsoft. A balanced, equitable settlement has been negotiated between Microsoft and the Justice Department, and this document should put the matter to rest.

The agreement will require Microsoft to share information, and to change some of its marketing and licensing practices, provisions for those who felt they weren't getting a fair shot at the market. The settlement you developed includes definite, realistic provisions, which will create more openness throughout the I.T. industry. This settlement will be beneficial because it will improve the software field, and—perhaps most importantly end this case once and for all.

I hope you will be able to work towards bringing this case to conclusion. Please continue your fantastic work supporting the settlement from the Department of Justice and Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Nancy Morehead

MTC-00009435

From: Greg Peck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 10:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: I would strongly support the settlement of the Microsoft case. It is in the best interests of the industry and the economy in general. There has been enough time and money spent on this case.

Microsoft has gone out of its way in meeting the conditions of the settlement. I would like to see Microsoft turn its creative energies into new technology and struggling with this case.

Greg Peck

MTC-00009436

From: Tim Coy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:00pm
Subject: Microsoft did not get there by creating poor software!

The American dream is to be able to become a Microsoft by having a great product and great timing. Its seems as time passes those that are the failures now use the court system to attach those who make it. The fallacy is that Microsoft is where it is because it a Monopoly, this is a joke. I can remember when Windows was a joke and Mac OS was the way to go. As Mac laughed at Windows, Microsoft always went to consumer and asked how can we make or software better. The result is that Microsoft did build a much better OS than Mac. This a true example of the “tortoise and hair”. I wish you would quit trying to destroy success. Jealousy in the power of the courts system is scary.

Tim Coy

MTC-00009437

From: Jim Illback
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:03pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft Case

I believe that the Microsoft Anti-trust settlement case's proposed settlement is in the 60-day comment period which started 11/28. Here are my comments.

I am absolutely appalled that the settlement has not rectified the basic issue which is monopolistic control over PC suppliers. When I go to the Dell Computer web page, there is ONLY Microsoft Operating Systems available to my on the portable PC that I desire. That is the problem. I don't want to be FORCED into choosing a Microsoft OS, especially not XP. Please get this problem fixed with your settlement, not just let go. The DOJ has been at this since before Janet Reno and their “victories” have been so benign that it has only re-empowered Microsoft to higher bullying tactics. FIX THE PROBLEM—DIVIDE THE COMPANY ALREADY. Hold them accountable for their illegal actions, so consumers like me will have a choice of Operating Systems on Dell (or any other) computer. Do your job already!

Jim Illback
PO Box 627
Ravensdale, WA 98051
425 965-6871
CC:attorney_general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009438

From: Larry Burkett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The law requires a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the Microsoft settlement is in the “public interest.”

My comment is in support of the Microsoft settlement. In my opinion, Microsoft, while not perfect, has done more to advance computer usage by the general public than any other single company.

sincerely,
Lawrence L. Burkett,
30 Ebersohl Cir,
Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889
(lburkett@rcn.com)

MTC-00009440

From: J. Thomas Broyles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:19pm
Subject: Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse

I think the Justice Department needs to move on and away from the pursuit of Microsoft. I believe Clinton and Reno's pursuit of this fine company precipitated the decline in the economy triggered by the major drop in the stock market.

J. Thomas Broyles M.D. and victim of the Clinton follies

MTC-00009441

From: Mary Jo Reddick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

We think it is a tough but fair settlement—for all parties involved. Stop wasting the tax payers money—competition is wonderful for consumers like our family. We are an average working family who appreciate good quality products at fair prices that Microsoft has made available to us. We don't appreciate our

hard earned tax money being wasted on frivolous, vengeful lawsuits. Enough already.
Donald and Mary Jo Reddick
Lancaster, CA

MTC-00009442

From: Blain Hamon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

There seems to be a lack of listed courses of action to take if and when the defendant fails to meet the criteria of the final judgement. I do not have any law training, and as such do not know if such a provision is possible. However, I write this with Microsoft's previous actions in mind.

* This settlement is because Microsoft broke a previous antitrust agreement.

* During the 5 years of this battle, MS has continued with its practices.

* In the court, Microsoft was caught committing perjury a full three times.

* Microsoft has been lobbying to lower the DOJ's funding in order to reduce its effectiveness.

* Microsoft delayed, agreeing to a settlement only when a full ultimatum was issued and failure was outlined.

Microsoft has continued to do acts which can be construed as attempts to monopolize a high-competition market, such as Windows XP's built-in advertising of MSN (In order to take over the ISP market) and Windows Media Player disabling high-quality playback of MP3s, for no other reason than to push Microsoft's own sound file standard. And I fear Microsoft will not comply to the agreement unless a sword of Damocles is fully hanging overhead. They have the funds and the lawyers to continue to break agreements, delaying in court the actions to be taken as punishment, and finally sign a new agreement where the cycle continues.

I feel there needs to be a provision that spells out the possible punitive actions that the TC can and will do if Microsoft refuses to comply, including drastic measures such as the proposed alternatives, even such things as restricting Microsoft's assets, or confiscating payments to Microsoft, in the same way the IRS is entitled to garnish wages of those who fail to pay taxes.

It appears that also missing in this agreement is any form of public interaction over the long term. I do not see any course a citizen of the United States, can 1) alert the TC of practices that I feel should be looked at as possible violations, and 2) obtain reports, records, or any other documents the TC creates in order to aid making an informed opinion and alerting others to possible concerns.

This information is of public interest, and it is mentioned, "Plaintiffs may use information obtained from the TC as the basis for commencing a compliance inquiry or investigation." (Competitive impact statement, IV B 2 b) I feel that future plaintiffs wanting to commence an inquiry should also be given access to this information. In short, as much nonsensitive documents as possible should be public information, under the rules of the Freedom of Information Act.

It is because of these reasons that I would like to see amendments added that grant the

TC powers of enforcement as well as to give the general public an ability to aid in ensuring that Microsoft does not break its settlements again.

Thank you.

MTC-00009443

From: Robert S. Kirkwood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:33pm
Subject: Stop the Prosecution of a legitimate, competitive business.

Stop the Prosecution of a legitimate, competitive business.

Robert S. Kirkwood
PO Box 2078
LaBelle, FL 33975
BobKirkwood@bigfoot.com

MTC-00009444

From: Keith Fouts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:37pm
Subject: Let's end the Microsoft lawsuit.

Please end the suit on Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Keith A. Fouts
108 N Parkview
Coffeyville, KS 67337-1237
kfouts@kscable.com

MTC-00009445

From: barneydoogan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:38pm
Subject: Microsoft fiasco

Let's end the nonsense and put this sad chapter of anti-business crusading behind us. In these trying times, my government resources can be better utilized combating the terrorism and fanaticism that threatens my children and the generations that follow us.

Sincerely,
Thomas J. Fay
9 Greenhurst Road
West Hartford, CT 06107

MTC-00009446

From: John Tegen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings:

I started a company to provide applications for Be Inc. operating system—the BeOS. The company is OmicronSoft (www.omicronsoft.com). I started it in 1996 so that I could provide better quality applications found on other Operating System, including Windows and Apple. Due to the unlawful practices of Microsoft, they were successfully able to prevent Be Inc. to enter the market place by restricting OEM vendors like Hitachi, Dell, and Compaq to provide alternative operating systems to the consumer. This crushed Be Inc. as well as software providers like ourselves. Microsoft's actions prevented us to earn a living and prevented the consumer to choose an alternative and better solution for their computing needs.

It is our opinion that the current settlement with the DOJ is far too weak to be harmful to Microsoft. If similar actions were enforced during anti-trust litigation earlier last century, we would have one oil company,

one railroad company, and one telephone company. In some regards, it has allowed them to unfairly to penetrate markets that they have been trying to enter (e.g. Education). The longer Microsoft is allowed to continue in their normal fashion, the longer they have to make billions of dollars, eliminate competition, and provide the US consumer and Government poor quality products. As the DOJ is fully aware of, anti-trust behavior is economically and physically harmful to the general consumer and business community.

We are looking for the DOJ to enforce the anti-trust to include:

1) Full application document format disclosure and POSIX sample to read and write to and from those documents. This include Word, Excel, Power Point, Visio, Outlook/Exchange email, Outlook/Exchange contacts, Outlook/Exchange events, and MS proprietary audio and video formats.

2) Full disclosure of Win32 API calls. Those not officially supported should be noted as such.

3) To allow OEM manufacturers the full ability to provide alternative OS's to the consumer in both single and dual boot configurations. To prevent them to hide alternative operating systems.

4) To natively support open multi-media formats including MP3. It is uncertain that these remedies will counter-act the damage that has already occurred to software manufactures like Be and ourselves. Even if the BeOS had 1% of the consumer market, it would have been a multi-million dollar business to ourselves. If we had a few million dollars, we would probably take legal action against MS for punitive damages. I would suggest that Microsoft should pay damages to companies like ourselves and pay a company to license the BeOS from Palm, plus \$500M to allow the BeOS be offered to the consumer public.

Please contact me with any questions you may have regarding this.

Regards,
John Tegen
OmicronSoft
President
(858) 695-0088

MTC-00009447

From: Robert L. Duerler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs;

We support the 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.

Yours truly,
Robert L. Duerler
Cathy C. Duerler
Cincinnati, Ohio

MTC-00009448

From: Wade
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/7/02 11:43pm
Subject: MicroSoft

You know I hope that the federal government doesn't make it a policy to shut

down all successful businesses because the unsuccessful ones don't like it!

Spare MicroSoft!

Wade Bush, a user for 20 years,
US Army Retired

MTC-00009449

From: Eworksart@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We can't afford to let this go on. Settle now it is important to the citizens of this country.

Respectfully submitted:

Cynthia Hoskins

MTC-00009450

From: hampreal@lanset.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:48pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft has provided a user friendly environment for computer users, I fail to understand why the government must intervene in any business that is successful. America was supposed to be a Republic, a free enterprise. However, with the Socialist attitude of many, those that do succeed are frowned upon. Microsoft should be allowed to carry on their business as a business without unnecessary government intervention. Microsoft has paid a price for the success they have. Let them continue. Others can have success but they do have to pay a price and a lot of work to get there. I feel Microsoft has paid their dues and should be allowed to continue. The states that want more should not be allowed to proceed with their arguments.

MTC-00009451

From: Dwriter01@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:56pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just settle the darn thing! Let's get on with life. How wonderful to think a company can be penalized for being successful!

Diana Bress

MTC-00009452

From: F Leonard

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/7/02 11:59pm

Subject: Leave Microsoft alone.

Leave Microsoft alone and go after America's Biggest Criminals—the Clintons!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

fjl

MTC-00009453

From: Doris (038) John White

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:01am

Subject: Anti-Trust Suit Against Microsoft

We feel quite strongly about the government filing suit against Microsoft. We have always felt that the Clinton Administration envied Bill Gates for his financial standing.

We would like to see this suit dropped. Microsoft has been very good to its employees. It has also done a great deal of philanthropic work. Let's end this legal fiasco by dropping this suit and letting them get back to doing what they do so well. Let them help the economy by creating jobs.

John and Doris White
1195 Christopher Drive Apt. 1
Neenah, WI 54956-6349

MTC-00009454

From: Sbuff64@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:14am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am not quite sure this e-mail will be heard, but I would just like to share my opinion on this matter.

When did it become fashionable in this country to punish a company for being successful? When was Capitalism replaced with Socialism, where Big Government determines what's best for everyone? Microsoft, as a company, basically carried the world into the computer age. They used their expertise, innovative products, and relentless marketing to "sell" mankind to the fact that everyone needs a computer.

So they benefited from this, is it a crime?

Was Henry Ford persecuted for changing modern industrialism? No, but you didn't hear GM and Chrysler whine like small children that Ford was unfair. They just went out and did the best job they could, and caught up (and surpassed Ford in GM's case). Why is it that the brakes must be put on technology moving forward so a few misguided companies can catch up?

In addition to this, as you destroy Microsoft's stock value, did anyone take into account how many "normal" people's 401K and retirement funds have stock in this? To save a few dollars in software costs, people's retirement savings are being decimated. Somehow, I cannot believe this is a better solution. I would certainly hope that everyone would come to their senses and follow the Federal government's lead to just settle this case and move on to the business of getting our economy in gear.

Sincerely,

Steven Buffamonte

MTC-00009455

From: Chaim Klein

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:25am

Subject: microsoft

Its time to settle—the faster you reach a deal and let microsoft get back to doing what it does best making software. this country needs is dynamic corporations especially in the high tech field to focus on innovation and not law suits.

thank you,
Chaim Klein

President & CEO

IglooSunset, L.L.C.

<http://www.igloosunset.com>

MTC-00009456

From: Dick Haring

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:37am

Subject: Microsoft anti trust suit

This ridiculous suit should be dropped immediately. Thanks to stupid government bureaucrats, the economy took a major hit when this bogus suit was brought. It impacted the stock market, significantly, and started the tremendous decline that we are just now turning around. This is government

at it's worst, unproductive trouble makers doing nothing but getting in the way of productive job providing Americans. As might be expected it was formulated and pushed along by a leftist administration headed by people who really don't like capitalism very much.

It should be sent back to where it belongs, limbo.

RW Haring

MTC-00009457

From: James THOMPSON

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:39am

Subject: Microsoft case

Throw the book at Bill Gates. He has destroyed one little computer company after another. He and Microsoft need to be punished in the worst way possible. Breaking Microsoft up into two companies is not enough. Make Microsoft pay and pay dearly. Even if it means a complete shake up or near confusion in the computer industry.

MTC-00009459

From: William A Guy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:44am

Subject: Microsoft is a monopoly. As a

monopoly, Microsoft has crippled the

Microsoft is a monopoly. As a monopoly, Microsoft has crippled the computer industry as a whole by stifling innovation and competition in that industry. Microsoft needs to be broken into three companies, one, operating system, two, programs and three, internet. As a microsoft customer, if I had a real choice, I would never use a Microsoft product again. If you investigate the new features of the new Microsoft XP operating system, this software is a violation of fair business practices and should not be allowed to be marketed. This is Microsoft's way of tumbing its nose at the judicial system.

Rod Guy

MTC-00009460

From: Curtis Porter

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 12:45am

Subject: Anti-trust abuse against Microsoft.

Dear Sirs:

Please end the Clinton era's persecution of Microsoft. This company has blessed and benefited all of us who use computers. They should be able to enjoy their success and rewards for doing so. Other companies want to take advantage of Microsoft's success, and not have to develop their own. Do not allow this.

Thank you.

Curtis T. Porter

Kansas City, Missouri metropolitan area
816-525-5277

MTC-00009461

From: Tom and Nancy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:10am

Subject: STOP THE MADNESS!

Stop wasting taxpayer money on the Microsoft Case!

MTC-00009462

From: John Bronger

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:28am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The anti-business climate of the U.S. Government, Department of Justice, is misguided effort and uses Public funding. In my opinion the government should spend more time working toward borders, language and cultural matters-enforcing the constitution and using English as a standard language as is used for aircraft control. Microsoft is an enabler not an impediment to furthering U.S.A. D.O.J. should be focused on threats to people instead of focusing on the people and firms competing. Eliminate the anti-business approach in the D.O.J.

MTC-00009463

From: atkins

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:30am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing in regards to an article involving the US v. Microsoft Corporation anti-trust case, posted at < <http://www.beunited.org> >. The article pertains to the fateful demise of Be, Incorporated—a California-based software company that began developing the Be Operating System (BeOS)—and calls me to join a world-wide network of my fellow BeOS companions in making a request of the Department of Justice.

It is very unfortunate that Be, Inc. was unable to obtain the success projected several years ago by myself and many of my computer-savvy colleagues, as well as several well-known critics and analysts of the computer sector. As a user of BeOS, I was able to experience first-hand the numerous superior features of the operating system over any of Microsoft's Windows family of operating systems.

BeOS breathed much more life into my computer than Windows NT or 2000 ever did—it was much faster, more stable, more reliable, and just as user-friendly. After becoming familiar with lightning-fast application launches and superior access to files in BeOS, I was disappointed when I was forced to boot into Windows 2000 to correctly view a webpage in Internet Explorer or open an email attachment with Microsoft Word.

The fact of the matter is that BeOS was predicted to be a major success and somewhat a competitor to Microsoft Windows. It was believed that the operating system would weave itself into the mainstream of the computer market—machines would dual-boot a Microsoft OS and BeOS and the user, depending on his or her needs, would choose which one to boot from a start-up menu. But Microsoft managed to keep that situation from ever happening by using their strong-arm tactics against OEMs that attempted this, as is defined in Section III paragraph 49 of the Findings of Fact—United States of America v. Microsoft Corporation, “when these dual-loaded PC systems are turned on, Windows automatically boots; the user must then take affirmative steps to invoke the BeOS.”

To cut to the chase of the matter, Microsoft used its monopoly power to crush Be, Incorporated and halt the development of

BeOS. For this, Microsoft should be punished and stripped of its monopoly powers. As is the case in BeOS, Linux, and many other operating systems, services are extended to the user that allow for better application programming, better access to operating system functions, and more cross-platform “open” standards. In BeOS and Linux, I can access the files on my Windows hard-drive partitions; in Windows, when I attempt to access a non-Windows partition, it prompts me to totally wipe the disk so that Windows can recognize the file system. Microsoft uses its monopoly extensively, and therefore it should be forced to adopt more open, universal, cross-platform and operating system independent standards. It should also be punished, as is seen fit, by a stern and unforgiving judge.

I fully trust that you, representing the Department of Justice, will use all of the resources at your disposal to make correct the situation that Microsoft has created using its anti-competitive and monopolistic grip over the computer industry.

Most sincerely,

William Dee Atkins

atkins@ptsi.net

MTC-00009464

From: Nelsons

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:43am

Subject: It will be very good for the US economy if this case was settled

It will be very good for the US economy if this case was settled prior to the March hearings. The nine states that are holding out are obviously trying to protect their companies in their own state. e.g. Oracle, AOL, Sun Microsystems etc. They are putting themselves above the consumer by delaying the settlement. All they want is their pound of flesh, nothing more. It is getting so obvious that hopefully the judge will see through it. It was a good thing the DOJ made the effort to settle with Microsoft. The sooner it is over, the better it will be for the stock market and the consuming public.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Charles D Nelson

nelsons@altavista.com

MTC-00009465

From: Richard Isley

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:44am

Subject: Microsoft

So Microsoft did it bigger & BETTER than the other guys and made it to the top of the mountain. That's the American Way folks. Let's stop beating up our winners and start rewarding them instead. It's time to lay off Microsoft folks and get on with some important things.

MTC-00009466

From: larry hall

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:52am

As a Microsoft software consumer and stockholder, I feel that the settlement is fair. To be honest, I have not followed every aspect of the case and must rely on the wisdom of our judicial system. I feel that a company should not have to spend as much

time and money to fight court cases as Microsoft. American businesses and consumers appear to be jealous of business success. Microsoft was always the best game in town in my opinion, because its products fit together and are easy to use.

Connectivity and easy-of-use appeals to me as a consumer.

MTC-00009467

From: david@look4m.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:55am

Subject: Think

Dear Justice Department,

Pls forget about Microsoft case. They have done something for this country that could not be forgotten in the history of this entire world. They have brought enough money to feed millions of Americans. I believe that's enough. In any free world people just want to sue people for fun or nothing or to satisfy themselves by taking the shadow of the law. Just kick these people out so Microsoft can do some other job and shake the World. Please.

Thanks

David John

MTC-00009468

From: Felipe Contreras

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:57am

Subject: My opinion

I'm not a technology profesional, nor an important member of any relevant organization, I'm just a young Linux user from Mexico. Anyway, I heard that even my opinion could be important for this matters so here it is.

I started with computers about 10 years ago, I in that moment there was no option for an OS, only Microsoft's DOS, or Windows 3.1. I was influenced by videogames and I was very entusiast about doing the mine one, unfortunately the best development tool I had was Microsoft's QBASIC, and I had not any help to develop a game.

As the time went on I learned more and more, until one day I finally tried the new operating system for experienced computer users, Linux. Since then I learned a lot of the UNIX systems, and the OpenSource movement. This was a complete new world for me, and withouth knowing it endless possibilities for development were at my hands. I became aware that best of the best in the computer world was in the linux world, and the best, they were working by will in doing this world better, working for giving people like me the possibilities for developing whatever they want.

In my humble opinion commercial companies are just that, as the name says they exist to make money. Also, as far as I know it's much easier to make money doing bad things, inversely proportional. Microsoft, being a company with so much money, I can't think that their main concern is anything else than money, and that they gathered so much that they must have been some things not very good, at least not ethical.

When I became concerned of such thigs, I saw the workings of the world different. If one gets involucred with the Linux world it

becomes obvious that Microsoft is evil, and Linux is good. Nobody is perfect, but the intentions of the OpenSource movement are good, while the ones of the Microsoft Corporation, are bad, making money. The OpenSource movement consists of scatered efforts withouth one main organization, at the contrary of Microsoft which is very organized and doesn't live any matter untouched, even with the great power they have, Linux, a hobbie work of some people done at their free time, is getting each time bigger "market". Obviously this means competence to Microsoft and it will not stand with arms crossed, if the resoulution of the DOJ let's them, they'll try to make clear to everyone that Microsoft is better (win over Linux), and their strategies obviously work.

Although I think that everyone with enough intelect to analyze the implications of OpenSource, or at least with tasting the power of it will never return to the propertary and closed environment of the Microsoft's realm, if Microsoft win, some people (like me) might never try Linux.

Felipe Contreras

MTC-00009469

From: gleam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:16am
Subject: Microsoft

It's time to stop this unwarranted assault on American businesses.

Stop the Microsoft war started by that criminal Clinton.

Why is the government punishing achievement, instead of rewarding it?

Gary & Mary Martin
4148 Meade Lake Road
Millington. TN 38053

MTC-00009470

From: John Shea
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:50am
Subject: Clinton's Anti-trust Abuses

Please end this crapola now, today! Microsoft has been kind to individuals and businesses and does not deserve the beating it continues to receive from the Justice Department and individual states. Microsoft has done a lot of good for America and the world. Bill Gates is a champion and should be treated as such..

Thanks for listening.
John Shea
1673 Springbrook Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

MTC-00009471

From: Sandra Dillard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:13am
Subject: Microsoft lawsuit

Please bring sanity back to government and stop the Clinton-Reno antitrust suit. I don't believe there was any real basis for the suit. It was all politics to attack big business. I even suspect it was because Bill Gates wouldn't be black mailed into a large contribution to the Democratic party. This is very important to our economic recovery and the stock markets recovery too. Thank you for listening and good luck on cleaning out the Clinton messes.

Mrs. Sandra A. Dillard

P. O. Box 39
N. Bonneville, WA 98639
SandraFromWA@webtv.net

MTC-00009472

From: Jinny Dorner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:24am
Subject: Lawsuits

Please get off the back of Bill Gates and Microsoft. When did it become a crime to be successful in this country? Any of us can compete if we want to and have a better product.

regards,
Jinny Dorner

MTC-00009473

From: David Brosnan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 4:02am
Subject: Right or wrong?

To whom it concerns,

It is well documented that Mr. Gates and Mr. Allen "stole" the ideas that gave them the foundation to build their fortune on. Now they have the money and the power to buy up anything that looks like potential competition, re-jig it to their ethos and call it a Microsoft product. Their list of failures after they took over good potential products makes for quiet interesting reading, if you take the time, and their answer is to bring out the "latest" version (i.e. patch up the mistakes and see does it work). There is no come back for "down time" for users. If it was any other industry, you could sue their butt off to recover lost time and profits, but because they monopolise the market, there is no alternative worth having. They give the consumer the "middle finger" and know that they can do so without worrying about repercussions. Mr. Gates now gives a lot of money to good causes and that is commendable. But Mr. Gates only did it when he had more money than he or his heirs could ever spend, and it would seem, when the writing was on the wall that the industry was getting fed up with being told what the future would be according to Microsoft, that becoming a great philanthopist would fool the public into believing that a nice man like him could not possibly be an ogre. Competition begets corruption and in this case megomania, but it also fosters new ideas and inovation. Mr. Gates by his actions would like to control the market and dictate what we will have in "the future according to Gates". God better look out if Mr. Gates ever "gets religion". You as a nation do not put your fate in the hands of your President alone, you have your fail safe procedures. Please do not allow this man to be above all others. He does not need the money anymore so why should he object to his company being divided up into smaller parts and creating healthy competition, unless it is his ego he sees as being tampered with. You are our fail safe net, don't be deterred it what you believe is the right thing to do.

Rgds
<<http://www.dbcomp.ie/>> anim.gif (59787 bytes) <<http://www.dbcomp.ie/>>

David Brosnan * Managing Director * DB Computer Solutions

Limerick Business Complex * Raheen
Business Park* Limerick—Ireland
Phone: +353-61-480-980 Fax: +353-61-225-131

<<mailto:David.Brosnan@dbcomp.ie>> David Brosnan@dbcomp.ie *
<<http://www.dbcomp.ie/>> <http://www.dbcomp.ie/>

MTC-00009474

From: Kathy West Woodward
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:18am

I wish to thank you for your continuing pursuit of a fair settlement for the people and corporations of this country that have, for years, been covertly violated by Bill Gates and Microsoft. His mafia-like tactics, and proclaiming of innocence, as well as his propensity for getting away with most of it, are legendary within the computer industry and obvious to the educated consumer.

Both Mr. Gates and our previous President have had the opportunity to lie, cheat and spiritually mess with this country... maybe there ought to be a "reality show" competition between them to see which one more deserves the "Slick Willie" moniker. :)

Please dont let Microsoft continue their illegal and uncapitalistic practices. Fair competition, without fear of reprisals or blackmail, is what our phenomenal capitalistic system should be based on. Those who don't respect that premise, regardless of how many pockets they line, should be held strongly and surely accountable for thier actions.

Kathy Woodward
dreamskate1107@yahoo.com

MTC-00009475

From: olivier serrano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

sir,
the beos operating system was a serious alternative to microsoft. in my opinion, it could be even better. I think the position that has been brought to beos was due to microsoft's monopol. i would like the beos project to come back on worldwide network place of operating systems to bring people possibility to choose between several products. and different ways to use computers.
sincerely
olivier serrano

MTC-00009477

From: Biggy Boy Toddy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:07am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is clearly a monopoly, and clearly at fault if not directly then indirectly (thru its intimidation) for BeOS and the BeIA failure in the marketplace. I'm for a decision to make Microsoft pay a penalty, not with software or with hardware (used and worthless) but with hard cash, cash as in American dollars. A fund should be set up for the billions it should pay, and that fund should immediately be used to educate the public that users of computer hardware have alternatives. Education to the users is important, and then the funds be distributed

to the schools in question who have been educated they have an alternative to choose. Bottomline is this, Microsoft is a monopoly, and it has clearly abused its monopolistic position in the past 10+ years to make substandard software, which has caused billions in damages and made more than enough folks that know better about technology pull their hair out knowing such technology is being lost forever and not marketed because folks are flat out afraid of the Microsoft you folks seem to love (by giving them a settlement that is beyond comprehension, you folks at the DOJ should either be fired, or slapped around with a wet trout).

Best wishes

MTC-00009478

From: Don Bowler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:24am
Subject: Give it a break

Out here in the real world the public considers the entire government case against Microsoft to be a sham.

It's time to stop. Go find some real criminals and stop wasting my money.

Don
Donald E Bowler
1090 Forbes Street
Fredericksburg, Va. 22405
Don@Bowler-Va.com

MTC-00009479

From: Rick Friedman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:43am
Subject: Microsoft Case
Justice Department

Stop the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse.

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

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.

Rick Friedman
104 Charlemagne Circle
Harvest, AL 35749

MTC-00009480

From: Tony Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:44am
Subject: Comment
Good morning

I am chief geek of my enterprise. As system administrator I have considerable freedom to do what I wish but the requirement to relate to Microsoft using clients, who produce for example .doc files, means that we have to own use Microsoft products. I have asked for information about file structures but am told it is proprietary information.

For some of my clients, we go to considerable lengths to allow them to reproduce material in non Microsoft format. Why? The suggestion is that Microsoft will move to annual licensing. Should they do that and, for whatever reason, my client choose not to continue to purchase these licences all their intellectual property held in Microsoft proprietary file formats will become inaccessible to them. Please require Microsoft to release the structure of their data forms so that users of other software may import their files.

Please insist that Microsoft take no action which will deny any user of their software continuing free access to that user's intellectual property.

Tony Davis
DAVIS INTERNET CONSULTING

MTC-00009481

From: Sam Sheterom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:49am
Subject: Microsoft

It is time for the Justice Department to end this witch hunt against Microsoft. Free Enterprise works if the government will let it. Former president Clinton was against Free Enterprise and therefore sent his lap dog Janet Reno to attack Microsoft. Why? Because they were successful? Because they were innovative? No because they were the number one in software. The competitors whined and cried to Clinton and he said "Oh, how awful, you're not the best so I'll attack the best and break them up. that way the not so goods can be bigger." (Not an exact quote).

It's time to stop! To put everything to bed and leave well enough alone. Let free enterprise work the way it's supposed to. The cream always floats to the top.

Respectfully
Samuel G. Sheterom, Jr.

MTC-00009482

From: Velma
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:54am
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

I believe the government should keep it's hands out of the Microsoft situation. If other companies don't like the way Microsoft is selling so well in the market place, they should invent another system that is better. . . isn't that the American way??? The government should drop any and all lawsuits against Microsoft.

Velma A. Moore

MTC-00009483

From: rkeller3@csc.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:56am
Subject: Microsoft Case

You need to get off the back of Microsoft. Microsoft has provided us with standardization which has increased the productivity in application writing, as well as, the use off OS and office components. Every corp., including the government has benefited.

Besides, I observe prejudice. Why are you not equally concerned about the harmful internet, media monopolioies ie. AOL and COMSAT? In my opinion, they exist only to be damaging.

MTC-00009484

From: Alex Burkhart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alex H. Burkhart
6607 Northshore Dr.
Knoxville, TN 37919
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The intention of this letter is for me to go on record as being a supporter of the settlement that brought an end to the antitrust lawsuit between the Department of Justice and the Microsoft Corporation. The lawsuit dragged on for three years, and now that it is over, the economy has a chance to get back to where it used to be.

The economic downturn actually started when the suit against Microsoft was announced, and now the United States is in a recession. I cannot understand how the government missed the fact that the suit against Microsoft was actually detrimental to the economy. However, all of that is behind us now, and we must focus on getting back to where we used to be. The settlement is good for competition and the economy, and we must push forward.

Thank you for your time, and again, I am going on record as supporting the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice.

Sincerely,
Alex Burkhart

MTC-00009485

From: Milo—Valencic@fpl.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:05am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get on with the real world and finish this waste of taxpayers—mine—dollars.

Complete this phony anti trust farse.
Milo valencic

MTC-00009486

From: joel lewis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a taxpayer and a citizen of this great nation, I urge you to agree to the settlement with Microsoft and end this abuse of the Anti-Trust Act by the Justice Department.

Sincerely,
Joel Lewis

MTC-00009487

From: Ingo Stainer
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:25am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Anti Trust Division of the
 Department of Justice

Let me just mention a statement from the settlement itself: "Following a 7-day trial in late 1998 and early 1999, the United States District Court found that Microsoft had violated both sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. On appeal, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia unanimously affirmed portions of the district court's finding and conclusion that Microsoft illegally maintained its operating system monopoly in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act, but reversed and remanded other portions of the district court's determinations. Specifically, the court of appeals reversed the district court's determination that Microsoft violated section 2 by illegally attempting to monopolize the Internet browser market and remanded the district court's determination that Microsoft violated section 1 of the Sherman Act by unlawfully tying its browser to its operating system."

That means Microsoft found guilty in illegally maintaining its monopoly. With the settlement agreement Microsoft would be allowed to further on maintain this monopoly.

That would bind the whole Operating System and Internet development to Microsoft.

And that would result into the well known development speed of selling a release, releasing some bug fixes, selling a new version (with some new features and even more bugs), releasing bug fixes again and then starting all over again.

Microsoft is not interested in putting more effort to improve its product but in selling more software at high prices with low reliability. And the reason why they can do that is that they have the OS monopoly. Probably you are wondering why I say so and still use Microsoft. The reason is that our company sells solutions of third party software developers who only provide support for Microsoft Operating Systems due to the monopoly they have.

I am trying to avoid Microsoft Software in many cases because of its low reliability and incalculability. Being a System Administrator for Windows and Unix I know what I am talking about.

Agreeing to this settlement would be a big win for Microsoft and its lawyers but would mean great loss for all Computer users. This is my personal statement and does in no way reflect any company opinion.

Best regards
 Ingo Stainer
 Jambou
 (+49 (89) 410 738—82, mobile: ++49 (0) 179 510 38 99
 mailto:ingo.stainer@jambou.com Visit our
 WebSite: http://www.jambou.com

MTC-00009488

From: The Dour Celt
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:38am

Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust Case

Let's drop the charade perpetuated by Bill Clinton and Janet Reno that successful businesses must be engaging in unfair business practices. Microsoft has no more a monopoly in software than IBM had in desktop computers. When someone comes along with something better, the consumer will buy it.

Arthur McGinley
 mcginley@chartertn.net

MTC-00009489

From: Barbara Tomek
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:34am
 Subject: Microsoft

I think it is time to end the abuses of the Clinton administration and time to quit wasting the taxpayers money on Microsoft. It does not make sense to punish a company for being good and being able to capture most of the market.

Thank you, Barbara Tomek

MTC-00009490

From: Duane Erlandson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:57am
 Subject: Settlement

I support the Microsoft settlement that has been proposed—please do not waste any more time and money going after a company that is not causing harm.

Thank you.

MTC-00009491

From: adinardi
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 8:04am
 Subject: please wake up

Get off the stick and let the company that had more to do with advancing technology do business their own way. If you had some sense you would tell would be entrepreneurs to follow Microsoft's lead. Truly this is what America can offer you if you develop a product so good that people DO NOT want anything less. Yet you stifle the best to prove some juvenile point.

A DiNardi
 East Haddam CT

MTC-00009492

From: Hasenbein George-G14197
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/8/02 8:22am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the Clinton-era misuse of the Anti-Trust laws. Let real competition settle the issue.

Sincerely,
 George H. Hasenbein

MTC-00009493

From: Eric Kassan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 8:24am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement To whom it may concern,

I believe the proposed federal settlement is excessive and I am more than appalled that my state, California, claims more damages are in order. My state's attorney general and the Department of Justice to a lesser extent are NOT acting on my behalf or in my best interest or the interest of the citizens of the

United States by attacking the company most responsible for the solid economy of the 1990s. It is not a coincidence that the economic downturn and the initial judgment occurred near the same time.

Thank you.
 Eric Kassan
 Woodland Hills, CA

MTC-00009494

From: Brandyrd@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 8:28am
 Subject: trial

BILL GATES SHOULD BE GIVEN A TRIAL DELAY!

MTC-00009495

From: KGRRS@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 8:30am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a consumer of computer hardware and software products, both as a retail home user, and as owner and operator of an \$18,000,000 per year information technology services consulting company. My viewpoint encompasses both personal and business aspects, and it is that my government should settle this lawsuit immediately, without further harassment of Microsoft, on these grounds.

1. I remember when there was no real market leader in this area and there was rampant, costly, unproductive competition. Companies and consumers wasted much money on products that were incompatible, inefficient, poorly produced and all too often short lived. Microsoft's technical and market leadership has produced an orderly market, where users of this technology can invest with the certainty that the product and vendor will be there tomorrow, and that this investment will not be wasted. Yet there is still room for true invention, as new products are still produced, even today. LINUX software is an example.

2. This entire litigation has roots in the political process. In the pre-'96 national election process, Bill Clinton went to Silicon Valley to raise funds for the his reelection and his Democratic party. The largest contributors were the Barksdales and Ellisons (Netscape and Oracle) of the technology world, the biggest complainers about and competitors to Microsoft. Lo and behold, shortly after he raised millions of dollars from them, the United States Department of Justice initiated this lawsuit.

3. At a personal level, I see the United States government using my tax dollars to cripple one of the most successful companies, and entrepreneurs, of our modern times, for very dubious reasons and non-existent benefits to anyone but the trial lawyers and the Silicon Valley moguls. And as an entrepreneur in my own right, albeit a lesser scale than Bill Gates, I see my government's efforts here as a disgusting bullying by lawyers who produce nothing against people who actually produce goods, services and jobs for society.

Kenneth Podd = KGRRS@aol.com

MTC-00009496

From: John Paoloemilio
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:31am

Subject: Please stop the govt. intrusion on microsoft and any Please stop the govt. intrusion on microsoft and any other co. in the US, let the free market determine the outcome of microsoft.

Thank you
John Paoloemilio

MTC-00009497

From: FRANK MEGOW SR.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:33am
Subject: microsoft farce

Get off microsoft's back the only reason this has gone this far is Bill Gates wouldn't lay down and play dead to the democrats demand for money.

Sgt Frank J. Megow Sr. (retired USA)

MTC-00009498

From: Josephine Cunningham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:35am
Subject: Picking on Gates

Why doesn't the justice department go after the big monopoly of our government instead of picking on Gates who has done more to keep our economy growing than any fat politician in Washington? Michael Gates has earned every cent that he has. I thought there was some-thing called "Free Enterprise" in this country. I do not begrudge anyone the fruit of their own labor. The government should not be allowed to take anything from any individual (or his corporation) and distribute it to another. By squashing those we deem more successful than ourselves we stifle our own quest for excellence. Let's learn from Gates instead of destroying him.

MTC-00009499

From: MFave64687@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen.

I don't often write to voice my opinion, I guess that I'm just part of the so called "silent majority." But in this case, I'm very happy to report that you, my government did the right thing by settling the Microsoft case. It's not often that I can say this with conviction. Now we can all go back to doing more important things, like finding Osama Bin Laden and finding what really happened with the "Rich" payoff to President Clinton.

Sincerely,
M. V. Favetti
6445 State Rd.
Parma, OH 44134

MTC-00009500

From: tim1holtz@keyconn.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:48am
Subject: get it over with

I am commenting on the Microsoft anti-trust case. Please accept the settlement on the table and end the witchhunt. I can't believe that in America if you build a better product and proceed to whip everybody's butt in the marketplace that you end up in court over it. What kind of message is this sending to would be entrepreneurs in the greatest country in the world? We are not (yet) a socialist country and freedom to make the

best products and the most profits must be preserved. End it now. Thank you for accepting my comments.

Sincerely,
Timothy J. Holtz
Altoona, PA

MTC-00009501

From: Bruce H. Uhl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Justice Department

I am writing to let you know that I support the Microsoft agreement.

It is time to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse. The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

The Microsoft 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.

Sincerely,
Bruce Uhl
bhuhl@rcn.com

MTC-00009502

From: gary n. hays
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:50am
Subject: microsoft settlement

i support the microsoft settlement. it is time to let the companies and consumers decide on what is best by using the market place rather than the courtroom.

gary n. hays

MTC-00009503

From: Carol—
Madsen@ReadersDigest.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:51am

It is time to end the Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse—I support the It is time to end the Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse—I support the Microsoft settlement. The trial squandered taxpayers' money, was a nuisance to consumers and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is time to end this trial and the wasteful spending accompanying it so the industry and the economy can get back on its feet again. A settlement will be good for consumers, the industry and the economy.

Thank you.

MTC-00009504

From: DON CAMPBELL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:54am
Subject: MICROSOFT

Can you imagine the price of computer software had Microsoft not had the innovative touch. Did they have a monopoly, probably yes, only after they provided the innovativeness to succeed in product development. They cannot be nearly as bad as big oil after all their mergers. U.S. broke this up once, do they have to again.

Hit Microsoft with a reasonable penalty, get the states' dollar hungry lawyers off their backs and let them do business in a revised way.

DON CAMPBELL

MTC-00009505

From: Schulze, Bob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 9:02am
Subject: one company for OS-another for apps

The answer is: the company that creates the operating system MUST be separate from those that make the applications for it. Otherwise, the OS can keep changing/shifting on the competitors (making their apps not work as dependably) while catering/designing to the nuances and changes of their own applications.

This has been happening for years and it's only getting worse. AND.....whatever you do, DON'T PUNISH?.. MS BY LETTING THEM FLOOD THE EDUCATION DEPT WITH THEIR OS AND APPS.....to put it politely, that is the complete opposite direction and effect.

Thanks,
Bob
Bob Schulze
Network CAD Specialist
Elcom Services Group
ph: 215-826-6134
fx: 419-793-3814

MTC-00009506

From: Creedy, Rosemary
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 9:02am
Subject: Microsoft judgment

EXCELLENCE AND SECURITY

Excellence and security are what is needed within the IT industry. Microsoft should be restricted because they are not the BEST in all areas. We need to allow free IT growth in a competitive market or we shall all be worse off. Example: There are useful little cars but it would not encourage excellence if they were automatically "included" with a road tax/licence for a vehicle. This would reduce the market share for specialist excellent cars at the top of the range.

Please uphold the court judgment against Microsoft in a manner that will truly stop Microsoft products being forced onto consumers. "Punishing" Microsoft by "allowing" them to donate hundreds of PCs to schools is hardly a way of reducing their encroachment. This method of fining Microsoft should not be allowed. Once their stranglehold is complete they will be free to increase licence fees every year and the world will be held to ransom.

Microsoft has already invaded US government departments and is fast taking over all IT implementations in the UK government. A commercial corporation should not be placed in a position where it can make demands on the governments of countries. There should be a ruling that forces Microsoft to make available the basic code that would allow all docs produced in Microsoft to be used by other software packages. Also Microsoft should not be allowed to build in "planned obsolescence" which forces users into an endless cycle of having to upgrade their software in order to be able to read email attachments from the latest Microsoft product.

What would the motor industry be like if we were forced to upgrade all the electronic components in the car every year in order to be able to continue to use certain major highways?

It could even be said the Microsoft does not sell the goods that it purports to sell as it does not notify the buyer that the full functionality of the product will begin to decrease after about 6 months as it becomes less and less compatible with the newer releases of Microsoft software. If Microsoft did not hold this unacceptable monopoly it would be possible to send older second-hand PC's and software to third world countries for their use. This is not practical when the software becomes obsolete simply because it is no longer compatible with the latest Microsoft offering.

Microsoft is so intent on increasing their market share that they are exposing us to enormous risks from hackers and viruses. Please free us from the tyranny of Microsoft and encourage them to use their considerable resources and expertise to pursue excellence and security. If they are as good as they think they are they should be able to cope with excellent competition and this should serve to spur them on to greater things. Microsoft were found GUILTY — please allow the judgment to be EFFECTIVE in RESTRICTING their monopoly and unacceptable domination of the IT industry.

Rosemary Creedy
Website Administration Officer
Education Department
4th floor
New Town Hall
Wandsworth Borough Council
Wandsworth High Street
London
SW18 2PU
tel. 020 8871-8012
rcreedy@wandsworth.gov.uk

MTC-00009507

From: Kumarjit Ray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir(s), it is great to know that the DoJ has agreed upon a settlement with Microsoft. I am not only a law student, but have been using Microsoft MSDOS since 1986 on an IBM 8088 PC. I know that all the products are not perfect but Microsoft does come up with excellent programs such as Word 97 and Win 95. It would indeed be an overkill to see the company broken up simply because their OS outsold those of others. My fullest support for Microsoft!!

Kumarjit Ray
Calcutta, India

MTC-00009508

From: DeLoY Denning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:06am
Subject: End Clinton Witch Hunt

With all due respect, I would like to see the matter with Microsoft settled without further court action.

I am a Microsoft customer and I find the cries of unfair are not justified. I do not use all of the products supplied with Microsoft and feel that choice to use or not use is up to me, not the courts. Other companies package other programs with their packages, do we go after them next.

I am sure that I do not understand all the parts of this lawsuit, but I know that putting business down does not enhance our economy.

Sincerely,
DeLoY Denning

MTC-00009509

From: Alan Jorgensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:59am
Subject: Give Microsoft hell

I think the consumer will be better served if Microsoft is broken up and Bill Gates goes to jail. Filing an anti-trust law suit against Microsoft is probably the only good thing the Clinton administration did. Of course they fouled that up also. Bill Gates and Microsoft are the same kind of obstacle to progress and free enterprise that Bell telephone was. Maybe worse. Liberty and the consumer are not served when one person or company is able to thwart the development of new technologies that would be good for the consumer. Microsoft is a blatant obstacle to competition and free enterprise. On this issue I strongly disagree with USDOJ.

AWJ
Alan W. Jorgensen
MHTN Architects, Inc.
420 East South Temple, Suite 100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Phone: (801) 595-6700 Fax: (801) 595-6717
www.mhtn.com
alanj@mhtn.com

MTC-00009510

From: barbara hatch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:08am
Subject: suit

The next thing will be complete Socialism by liberals in that they will redistribute all the wealth in the country because "it's not fair". Well, life's not fair, so get a grip and get on with it. You either survive and thrive, or snooze and loose!!! Leave Microsoft alone! Common sense is not so common.

Voltaire

MTC-00009511

From: Clifton Patrick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:09am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement comments
Sirs:

Please review the findings of fact from this case and I believe therefore that the proposed Microsoft Antitrust Settlement as reported in the media is inadequate!

Microsoft has clearly behaved in an anti-consume and predatory manner. Microsoft has inhibited innovative competition by intimidation and acquisition. Microsoft has a poor historical record on the use of personal information in violation of its own published privacy policies. Microsoft has, by its predatory practices, discouraged investment capital in tech industry.

Microsoft has, by its restrictive OEM licensing practices, has intimidated the OEMs from offering non-Microsoft products preinstalled on new computers. Microsoft has a clear history of co-opting open standards into their proprietary standards. Such as instant messaging, JAVA, XML, etc. I am sure that there are many more examples, but as a layman and not a computer expert, these are the ones that I am aware of. Microsoft has decreased entrepreneurs in tech industry because of their ruthless suppression of competing technologies or businesses that they perceive as a threat.

Microsoft has used subterfuge in the guise of technical hype instead of real unbiased technical merit to attack alternative products. Microsoft has so restricted access to their software details as to make it extremely difficult for non-Microsoft products to interact correctly with Microsoft products. As an example of this, they often change the file format of their programs so that third party products can not read data files of these newer versions, thus compelling consumers to buy more Microsoft's software instead of alternates.

The Microsoft offer to supply products to schools further expands their monopoly in the marketplace. It would be more in the spirit of antitrust to give these schools the cash to spend on the products of their choice without the interference of Microsoft!

Microsoft has not complied with the word and spirit of earlier settlements and this should therefore demand the most strict controls in this settlement to enforce compliance!

Respectfully,
Clifton Patrick
Property & Casualty Insurance
119 Brookside Ave.
Route 17M
Chester, NY 10918
Voice and fax 845-469-7645

MTC-00009512

From: Billie Burns
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:09am
Subject: Microsoft investigation
It's time to end the Microsoft investigation. What a waste of taxpayers' money.
Billie Burns
Williams Brothers Construction Co., Inc.
713-522-9821
fax: 713-520-5247

MTC-00009513

From: Bailey S Kurtz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:13am
Subject: Lawsuit

Please end this insane lawsuit against Microsoft. Thank God the Clinton's years are over.

Bailey Kurtz
Lexington, KY

MTC-00009514

From: armen.meguerditchian@us.

pwcglobal.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 9:22am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I am writing in support of further resistance to the proposed national settlement. As part of an organization which implements large software packages to corporate desktops, I find we are often in the situation where Microsoft's divergent support of industry standards (or clear refusal, as in the case of Java) cause us to create functional work-arounds to be able to implement software to the clients.

The impact of this is measured in soft dollars, as it entails hundreds of additional man hours to make these products work together. Armen Meguerditchian

Principal Consultant

Note that these are my own views and not necessarily representative of the entire firm.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

MTC-00009516

From: Terry Price

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 9:21am

Subject: Time to Let it Go

Give up on this. Time to let it go. Few have done as much for this country than has Bill Gates. Stop the pandering to those Clinton era attorneys and dump it.

Terry Price
Reading, Pennsylvania

MTC-00009517

From: jdca@capital.net@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 9:21am

Subject: Feedback on Microsoft Anti-Trust Case <Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>

To whom it may concern:

First of all let me say I'm glad to see that the DOJ has backed off somewhat on the severity of the penalty phase of this ant-trust trial. However, there are many in the software industry that will complain and raise issues no matter what the outcome. In particular I am talking about the Sun's and Oracles of the world. They are, in my opinion, a bunch of whiners. Consumers have a choice in what OS and what apps they put on their desktop. It just so happens that Sun and Oracle are not preferred products for most home users and many businesses. The suite of applications for hte Windows environment is much, much larger than any of the other OS's because it's the most

popular. There is a market in the Windows environment for software developers to create products. Microsoft should not be penalized for this. In addition, as a software developer, Microsoft in no way controls the software development environment for Internet applications. In fact, they are a step behind the Sun's, Oracle's and Unix flavors of the world. One could just as easily build an enterprise on Solaris, Apache and Oracle DBMS applications as it could on Microsoft. A fact that MS realizes ala .NET.

Now that the desktop OS is moving in the direction of just an Internet browser, the playing field is definitely level. If there is to be any punitive damages directed toward Microsoft the focus must be narrowed down to a clear anti-trust issue and not directed at the company as a whole by breaking it up. Breaking the company up is a gross exaggeration of the intent of the anti-trust laws. The anti-trust laws are outdated when it comes to technology and technology companies. What could be considered a monopoly one day may not even exist the next. Just look at Xerox, Apple (as it related to the Apple II), Texas Instruments. All were leaders in their respective industries at one time but are now just minor players in the global industry.

Thanks for taking this feedback.

Sincerely,
Jeff Yates
Albany, NY

MTC-00009518

From: Robert M. Taylor Sr MD

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 9:24am

Subject: Microsoft lawsuit

It appears to be in everyone's interest to settle the Microsoft law suit as quickly as possible. The proposed agreement seems equitable.

MTC-00009519

From: Andrew C. Bairnsfather

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 9:25am

Subject: Conflict of Interest

Conflict of Interest

I don't think you are stupid. On the contrary, but I am still going to try to step through this logically and hopefully not confusingly or insultingly, although I do take a cynical and plodding tone from time to time, please don't take it personally. Thanks. First, a short quote from Steve Ballmer.

From <<http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,5100151,00.html?chkpt=zdnnp1tp01>>:

"We went and said, 'Hey, we have some ideas for an all-purpose box, kind of a PC, kind of a video game machine, kind of a set-top box.' You know what they said? They said, 'Get outta Dodge, we're not going to write software for that thing,'" Ballmer said. I believe I know one of the most significant reasons as to why they said that to Mr. Ballmer's face.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

Microsoft already writes the operating system. AND they also have grown increasingly in control of many software application markets: word processors, spread sheets, presentation applications, databases,

web browsers, and continue to threaten the availability, and usability of many "3rd party" software applications.

Microsoft's control would be nearly total. Third party vendors can write software to Microsoft's X Box API and if they do a good job they can even re-sell some of the code they've written for their own games to other companies to use. This is nothing new I believe. But the problem is when Microsoft takes other people's code and includes it in their system. I don't remember how many years ago it was, but MS did incorporate software for disk compression in their operating system, disk compression software that wasn't theirs. They lost in court, had to pay damages I believe, and had to recall many copies of MS DOS 6 something—I think it was during that version of MS DOS.

Apple also took them to court for stealing parts of QuickTime. Fortunately for Apple, unlike the disk compression incident, the pirated QuickTime code was only in beta copies of the Microsoft software; Microsoft was distributing it, but only to individuals/ organizations writing code (or otherwise joined to them as a developer) for Microsoft's operating systems.

There are three main layers you can think of when dealing with a computer. Even four, but the fourth is created by you.

1. Hardware. Akin to the engine, it's the physical part.

2. Operating System. Provides basic (and advanced ;-) functionality to the applications (windows, menus, buttons, etc...), provides a means to control the hardware (volume, monitor brightness/contrast).

3. Applications. You run these to create and manipulate data.

4. Data you create and/or push around. Since Microsoft has so many operating systems it seems perfectly logical to divide them up in to two companies to divide their conflict of interest: a system software company, and an application vendor. They also have hardware offerings, but I know very little about it. So I don't know what to do with their hardware offerings at this point, to have them go to the OS company or the application company, or have them be their own company if they want. Oh, I left out the part where they also want to own the cable companies that install, and tend the wires to the house from the distribution points. Hmm...I think they already do own a number. And I also shouldn't leave out the part about how they own a broadcasting company it seems, MSNBC. Do I really think I'm going to see objective and continuously fair news items, TV shows, etc... on a station that's owned by Microsoft? No. The content will be influenced. (On a side note I don't believe media outlets should be owned by product vendors.) So let's see, they already own a broadcasting company, they own some cable companies that bring it to your door, they attempted to make a box the cable will connect to, and they write the operating system for the box, and they also write games for the box.

I think even their developers recognized a bad thing when they saw it. Here is the next paragraph of the article where Steve says the Xbox is just the start. "We came back a year later and we said OK, we're going to start by

doing the world's greatest video game machine, and they said OK, let's talk," Ballmer said.

The last paragraph:

"We know we have to succeed, but there is a broader concept there that we will pursue at some point," Ballmer said. "You can say, is it the end of the road or is there a bigger play? And the answer is yeah, there's a bigger play we hope to get over time." Proverbs 20:5, "The purposes of a man's heart are deep waters" (Disclaimer: Am I saying Apple should be immune to being "broken up"? No, at some point it could become necessary to divide Apple along the aforementioned logical parts (hardware, operating system, applications) but Apple is hardly an economic threat to the same number of companies that Microsoft is now.

I saw a commercial when I lived in Alabama. It was a commercial for Microsoft in general, not a product spot light, but just a "warm fuzzy" commercial touting their good deeds in education and such. However they, didn't show many, if any at all, computers running any of their operating systems. They showed Apple hardware and the Macintosh operating system. The advertisement even focused in on children using the computer and interacting with a panoramic photograph of a scene, using QuickTime. They were already caught once stealing actual lines of code from QuickTime and here they are confusing the audience in to believing the panorama was being viewed on a Microsoft operating system. The irony is that you *can* view a QuickTime panorama on Microsoft operating systems, but that's thanks to Apple writing that software, not thanks to Microsoft as the advertisement incorrectly displays.)

I believe my small business in Alabama where I tried to establish myself taking panoramic photographs was impacted negatively by Microsoft. Fortunately for me I now work for a company where I can take panoramic photographs. But I am upset at the thought of Microsoft using its monopoly in operating systems and applications to intimidate and influence hardware manufacturers to perpetuate Microsoft's operating system AND application monopolies. In other words Microsoft can influence hardware vendors not to include QuickTime on the hardware they ship. Apple is not going to go so low as to write software that intentionally crashes, slows down, or wrecks other havoc on the system (MS Word 6 ahem). I guess I'm tired of ranting now. But I still continue to be amazed at the number of people who don't see that there is a huge conflict of interest in the places Microsoft has extended its reaches, and their self-avowed eagerness to pursue it even more.

MTC-00009520

From: Kevin Ramos-Glew
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:31am
Subject: Microsoft

MICROSOFT is great
Leave them alone! It's survival of the fittest.

Bill Gates is helping to bring technology to inner-city classrooms.

Find another cause.

Kevin

MTC-00009521

From: Christian Klein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been unable to locate information regarding the actual penalties Microsoft is being levied. I have heard through the media, that Microsoft will "pay" a penalty by donating software and equipment to schools. Assuming this is the case, this would not actually penalize Microsoft, but would allow them to create a market for their products where one does not currently exist. This market has been one of Apple's few competitive arenas with Microsoft. When updates to "donated" products become available, Microsoft will easily recoup any expenses incurred. Since their initial donation cost will be significantly lower than the sale price of the products, their actual penalty would be lower, allowing them to move into a new market and make a profit in quick time, while appearing to be either coming clean or even generous.

Again, assuming this is the case, I would encourage the DOJ to consider a penalty that would actually penalize the company. Microsoft could be required to provide equipment specified by the school, without regard to the manufacturer. Alternately, Microsoft could be required to provide free software and updates for all products to schools in perpetuity. I don't want to see the DOJ softening and letting Microsoft dictate the terms of their own penalty.

I have been appalled at Microsoft's conduct, and I ask that they be held accountable.

Sincerely,
Christian Klein

MTC-00009522

From: Delores Stafford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft

I respectfully ask that an end be put to the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse on the Microsoft case.

Delores S. Stafford

MTC-00009523

From: David Cooper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs: I am in favor of approval of the Microsoft settlement.

David Cooper
Mullica Hill, NJ

MTC-00009524

From: Jeffrey Houchins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

Greetings,

While admittedly I am no great fan of Microsoft, I believe a free market economy depends on government staying out of the picture as much as possible. As a consumer I believe Microsoft has the right to bundle their products however they see fit. Let the market decide these matters. This situation

reminds me a bit of Wal-Mart going into a rural community and putting all the Ma and Pa stores out of business. There are both good and bad effects to this, but a free market economy depends on freedom. Ultimately, me the consumer decides where to spend my money.

Here is my tale of Microsoft bundling causing me to change from Netscape Navigator to Windows Internet Explorer (IE). My first computer had Navigator on it and I loved it and resisted switching to IE simply because I was used to Netscape and had no reason to change. That is until I bought a microsoft game that required Windows to be the default browser if I wanted to play the game over the internet.

Although I went kicking and screaming, I had no choice but to switch over to Windows IE. Now that I am used to Windows IE I like it just fine. Netscape never made any games, or contributed in any other way to my internet usage. Microsoft has, and I believe that gives them the right to flex their free market muscles from time to time.

Netscape is a fine product, but if they plan on competing with the big boys they will have to depend on innovation and imagination, rather than turning to sniveling and whining to big brother to fight their battles for them. Government interference should be kept to a minimum, not only in this matter, but in all matters. Freedom depends on it.

Jeffrey J Houchins
MPLS MN

MTC-00009525

From: Chris Reade
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
';attorney.general(a)po...
Date: 1/8/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

As a partner in a technology consulting firm I work with the Microsoft products every day. And as a professional in the field I must urge you do more in this settlement. I beleive that Microsoft is a mean-spirited company whose only interest in the consumer's welfare is how much money can be extracted from them.

Given that Microsoft made a mockery of their previous consent decree and is likely to do the same with any conduct remedy I would like to register my support for the following settlement: Force the company to reveal the entire source-code for every release of the operating system. This may sound like a weak penalty, but I think you would find that it is the harshest penalty short of breaking the company up.

Although the company makes a great deal of money from Office and other products, Windows is the core that makes it all tick. It is my belief (and I am in no sense alone here) that Microsoft has code inside of Windows that favors the company's products and enables its programmers to leverage the system to the company's benefit. Further, I beleive that many other trust infractions would be uncovered if the operating system was released open-source. Additionally, it would truly make it possible for third parties to write future software on parity with the company's own software.

Given that conduct remedies are not likely to succeed and that breakup is not on the table, I believe that licensing the source code would have the greatest effect.

Sincerely,
Christopher Reade
Partner
Carrollton Technology Parters
New Orleans—New York—Washington DC
creade@ctpllc.com
<mailto:creade@ctpllc.com>
office: 504-897-3429 cell: 504-616-5589
www.ctpllc.com <http://www.ctpllc.com/>

MTC-00009526

From: Frank Lawrence
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:40am
Subject: J. RENO'S BLUNDER

Let's stop using taxpayers money on stupid deals like this, get back within the constitution, and go after criminals, not businesses trying to make a living for its employees, and a profit for its shareholders. Drop this suit, and get on with good gov't business.

signed by antique frank—they don't make them this good anymore!

MTC-00009527

From: ALSBERG4@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't believe Microsoft has significantly hurt consumers and support the settlement that the DOJ has reached to resolve the litigation.

Sincerely
Eric Alsberg
1430 Voltz Road
Northbrook, Illinois

MTC-00009528

From: Jane Pehl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:47am
Subject: Microsoft

It is time to end the tyranny of the Clinton years! Get out of the life of American business and taxpayers!! Why are you not prosecuting true criminals like the Clintons and their accomplices during their eight year crimes spree?

Jane Pehl
San Antonio, Texas

MTC-00009529

From: Glenda Bowen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support an end to the Microsoft Settlement. It is (in my opinion) an extreme waste of our tax dollars. I firmly believe that there is enough competition in the marketplace. People use Microsoft because it is their choice.

Thank you,
Glenda Bowen
198 Fanning Bridge Road
Fletcher, NC 28732
d.bowen@mindspring.com

MTC-00009530

From: PorterM@gtlaw.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:43am

I want to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse

MTC-00009531

From: MClay70545@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:46am
Subject: anti-trust

Gentlemen, Good morning from Dayton Ohio. I am writing with regard to Bill Clintons anti trust laws he so valiantly defended on good conservative business like Bill Gate at Micro soft. The Liberal Democrats seem to dislike any one or any corporate successes they dont like any one or any bussinesses being successful and getting ahead in life unless its them. Leave the good companies alone let them function under the free enterprize of our great country, dont let the socialist Democrats keep ruining our lives. Thank you for you time. Merrill Clay a concerned American afraid of what Liberal Democrats are doing. Only you people can stop them

MTC-00009532

From: Joan Dambra
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:46am
Subject: MICROSOFT
DEAR GOVERNMENT.
PLEASE*****Just leave this wonderful company ALONE.
JOAN DAMBRA....

MTC-00009533

From: Michael Frawley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
Please know that I am very dissapointed with the settlement the US Government has reached with Microsoft. As far as I'm concerned, the corporate structure (Bundled OS & Applications) that allowed Microsoft to stifle and eliminate competition is still in place. Where is Netscape these days anyway? Do you see anyone using that browser anymore? Their attorneys must be laughing a slapping backs over this one. If you had any MBA compare the remedies that are to be imposed versus continued monopolistic behavior, I can assure you that the latter is the better financial alternative.

We are talking about a company that currently sits on over \$35 billion in cash. Compare that to your remedies. Any small company that wishes to provide PC software applications that compete in anyway with a Microsoft product had better think again. As a casual observer with no ties to the high tech or software industry, I have been alarmed at the predatory practices of Microsoft. It continues to this day. Just try to use a competing application on your PC. You should check out Windows XP and see the contempt they have for you. As a capitalist I admire Microsoft's aggressive and competitive tactics. As an entrepenuer, I am disheartened at the closed opportunities that will lead to the absence of software innovation.

I hope the nine states that are standing firm can help you remember the reasons why the suit was brought in the first place.

Regards,
Michael Frawley

MTC-00009534

From: Tony B
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement worked out between Microsoft, the Federal Government and the states aligned with the government in the anti trust suit. The settlement is good for consumers and the economy and should be approved as written. Moreover, the judge in the case, should pressure the remaining states to accept the settlement terms since the terms maintain competition in the marketplace, encourage innovation, and provide consumers with software choices at some of the most competitive (cheap) prices in the history of our nation. Moreover, the handful of states that are still pressing the anti-trust case are needlessly wasting taxpayer dollars and are engaged in a politically motivated vendata that has no benefit for consumers—their actions only benefit a handful of disgruntled Microsoft competitors who have not been able to effectively compete in the marketplace because of their poor strategies and inferior, overpriced products.

Thank you for listening to a happy consumer!

Sincerely,
Tony Bray

MTC-00009535

From: Michael Urbaldi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:56am
Subject: A Lesson in Laissez-Faire

Having received notice that the DOJ is accepting public comments regarding the Microsoft antitrust situation, I decided to pass along an op-ed I recently ran in a local newsletter.

Impatient creatures we are, we're best off remembering that faith in time-honored institutions will straighten out even the most undesirable situations. Take the free market and personal computing, for instance. There are those of us who use Macintosh. There are those of us who use PC's with a Microsoft Windows operating system (OS). And then there are those of us who use Windows and are not satisfied.

Few PC-based alternatives exist, however, as Microsoft controls over 90% of the PC OS market. The major obstacle preventing a serious challenger to Windows is compatibility. Here's the tidy little paradox: nearly all applications for PC's are coded for Windows; users are unwilling to sacrifice their tools for another OS and decide to stay with Windows; vendors, unable to waste precious capital, cannot design for an OS that no one will use; alternate OS's are left with no programs with which to compete. So nearly all applications (and PC users) stick with Windows. The Clinton Justice Department saw in this an antitrust violation and resolved to gouge a rent in Microsoft for ?competition? to enter. Up went the circus

tents, in paraded the subpoenas and the biased rulings?thankfully, the Bush administration put an end to this nonsense. Down went the circus tents.

Last October, news media were alerted to a new PC operating system called LindowsOS. Unlike any other alternative OS, it will attempt to be compatible with all Windows programs. Appealing to small businesses, it hopes to capitalize on Windows dissatisfaction. A prototype will be marketed to the public by the second quarter of 2002 (<http://www.lindows.com>). As any other enterprise in a free market, Microsoft is vulnerable to perceived negligence; LindowsOS and other spoilers like it will either win PC users over with superior services or else give Microsoft good reasons to reach out to consumers. All this without Washington, D. C.'s meddling. It's overdue vindication for those who know that the best way to solve a simple market problem is to leave the darn thing alone.

(c) Copyright Michael Ubaldi, All Rights Reserved.

Michael Ubaldi

MTC-00009536

From: David Graham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:03am
Subject: Microsoft Suit

Dear overpaid Nazi bureaucrats:

Time to lay off Microsoft and go after the real criminals: Hillary, Bill and all of their theiving, traitorous ilk that started this unnecessary lawsuit in the first place. While you're at it, it is time to scrap the "P.A.T.R.I.O.T." assault on our civil rights. Your disregard of the Bill of Rights is far more of a threat to America than all the terrorists in the world. You can also tell Attorney General Ashcroft I'm sorry I ever supported him. It's a pity his Senate opponent died and he survived.

A most dissatisfied customer,
David Graham
1625 Walnut Ave.
Grand Junction, CO 81501

MTC-00009537

From: Mark Leary
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:58am
Subject: MS settlement

Please settle this matter, further litigation is just a waste of taxpayers money and besides is this not what we as Americans is all about FREEDOM to innovate.

Leave Microsoft alone! They have done so much good for the industry.

Mark J. Leary

MTC-00009538

From: Joyce Nymeyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft Settlement.

I want to end the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse.

Marlene Nymeyer
25508 South Klemme
Crete, Illinois 60417
joyce@nymeyer.com

MTC-00009539

From: Damstar1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. I as a consumer have the right to choose what I want to buy. And I will choose Microsoft products every time. They are superior to their competitors. These competitors should quite their belly aching about Bill Gates and his products. They should get off their dead butts and invent a better product if they want their share of the money. That is the American way. Not crying to government to bring a company down to their inferior level. Thank God that didn't happen with Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, Dodge brothers and all the other great entrepreneurs of America or we would be no better than the third world countries.

Sincerely,
Denise Morningstar
1019 S Division St
Whitehall, MI 49461-1701
email.Damstar1@aol.com

MTC-00009540

From: Dorothy Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I want to register my support for the Microsoft settlement. I believe it is in the best interest of me, the industry and the American economy.

Thank you,
Dorothy Wagner
465 Beach 133rd St.
Belle Harbor, NY 11694

MTC-00009541

From: Arnold Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:18am
Subject: Microsoft

Gentlemen, can we please stop this anti-business, anti-entrepreneurship, anti-anybody getting too far ahead of the masses in this country? It seems to me that our country has been on the slippery slope toward socialism for too long now. It's time to reaffirm that ours is a country of opportunity for all those who are willing to work to reap the benefits of our freedom. Let's stop discouraging Americans to excel by punishing them by taking from their hard-earned gains and redistributing to those with less initiative and drive. Microsoft is an American company providing thousands of good jobs and contributing greatly to our nation's economy. Sure they are competitive. They continue to improve and expand their product line and do it in a way that serves their customers well and favors the wider use of their product line. Why is this a no-no? Can't their competitors do the same? Who's holding them back? Customers have a choice. Microsoft is not shutting others out of the business. I am tired of the whining

competitors who seek the governments' help in their attempts to limit Microsoft's marketing initiatives. If they can't win share from Microsoft on their own, then don't we have the best company with the best products and service out front?

Isn't that the way it's supposed to be in the land of opportunity?

Arnold Davis
Louisville, TN 37777

MTC-00009542

From: Charles Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:33am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Please end this trial and the wasteful spending of our tax dollars. This company did nothing but follow the rules set up by our government and it is being penalized for it. Get the government out of the way of companies that make this country work. Bureaucrats and the courts have no business in this case. Let the competitive nature of this business be the determining factor whether they succeed or fail.

Sincerely,
Charles Wood
2886 Ravenwood Drive
Snellville, GA 30078
770-972-2048
chckwd@bellsouth.net

MTC-00009543

From: JennFrankD@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Your Honor,

As a computer user and lover of technology since the early eighties, I feel compelled to weigh in regarding the recent 'settlement' between Microsoft and the DOJ.

I've used computers since the first Xerox Star, Apple Lisa, and DOS based PC's (before Windows). I also worked for New England Telephone/NYNEX/Bell Atlantic/Verizon until July of this year in our Technology Center in Framingham, MA. This allowed me to see almost every kind of consumer computer available. I was and I am an avid reader of technology magazines and websites. I can distinctly remember in the early nineties, reading about Microsoft's tactics in establishing their monopoly. I wondered even then, how they were getting away with 'borrowing' Apple's look and feel and making exclusionary contracts with OEM's. Through the years, as I read about how they sabotaged DR-DOS, lied to customers about the ability of their software, produced false evidence in their trials, etc. I began to actually hate Microsoft and its executive board.

Since I was in charge of the Macintosh LAN at work, I was able to see firsthand how the Macs were never in need of consistent software patches or prone to the multitude of problems my PC counterpart encountered. It once took 3 technicians and four days of telephone support from Microsoft to get one PC to print properly. I just couldn't believe how any company got anything done using PC computers!!

Because of MS' thumbing of their nose at our free market economy and antitrust laws, we have become a country of billions of

dollars of lost production due to their software which is so unsecure and virus supporting that even the F.B.I. has to investigate it. This is ludicrous when one realizes that there are other options. Unfortunately, even after Windows XP was shown to be the most unsecure OS ever built, MS' stock went up. Why? Because they are such an entrenched monopoly that no company can afford to even think of using an alternative.

MS has so much money they were able to back two bidders in the auction for AT&T's cable business. No company should have that kind of power. I beg of you to stop Microsoft. They should have been broken up into three pieces; one that makes the OS, one that makes the applications like Office, and a browser company. The applications company would have definitely kept making Office for the Macintosh and would've loved to make a version for LINUX. (today, we have the AG's trying to force Microsoft to do what any other competitive company would normally do).

The browser company would have to compete with Netscape for business. The OS company would be forced to build better quality in their OS or else the app developers would build their apps for the most stable platform, which is UNIX based platforms like Mac and LINUX. Read the message forums at ZDnet.com. Even Wintel users are wary of Microsoft's power and this whole PASSPORT, HAILSTORM, .NET initiative that will let Microsoft put their tentacles into every single aspect of our daily lives.

You have the power to literally change and save the world of computing. I beg of you, please dish out the punishment a convicted, predatory, monopolist deserves. Break them up and let other, truly innovative companies rise to the top. You will be doing a great service to people like me who for ten years has seen the world of computing, which I love, languish and be held captive to the beast from Redmond.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,
Frank D'Angeli
57 Pinkert Street
Medford, MA 02155
781 396-5815
jennfrankd@aol.com

MTC-00009544

From: Gerry De Cave
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:37am
Subject: Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse

Please stop squandering taxpayer's money in your pursuit of Microsoft. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to the consumer. The government should not be stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products.

Disgustedly,
Gerry De Cave

MTC-00009545

From: Breton, Mark
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/8/02 10:47am

Subject: I would like to see the case against Microsoft dropped, and for someone to I would like to see the case against Microsoft dropped, and for someone to put a stop to all the money being wasted in that proceeding.

Mark Breton
204 Hillcrest dr
Gallatin TN 37066

MTC-00009546

From: Pearson, Conrad
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 10:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As both a consumer and an IT Professional I have been against the antitrust action against Microsoft from the beginning. In the years that I have been using Microsoft operating systems, starting with MS-DOS 1.1, I have seen the cost of the software come down while the functionality has been greatly enhanced. There is another important consideration as well: standardization. Had I chosen to write this using MS-Word and send it to you as an attachment there is an 86% chance that you would be able to merely open it and read it. This was not the case 10 years ago, and it is because of Microsoft's clout in the industry that this wonderful standardization has taken place.

As a consumer, and as an IT Professional, I have alternative choices in the operating system and application software that I use and/or deploy and I have, in some cases, chosen the alternatives. For the most part, the Microsoft solutions are the best value. The antitrust action against Microsoft is not, in my opinion, in the interest of the consumer, is not in the interest of business in general, and is not in the interest of the computer industry. Perhaps from a standpoint of technical merit Microsoft is guilty, but if you consider the original purpose of existing antitrust laws I do not believe in Microsoft's guilt.

I believe that the role of the DOJ should be to insure that competition remains, but in doing so Microsoft should remain intact and it's history of innovation should not be constrained in any manner.

Conrad Pearson
Manager, Information Systems
Excellon Automation
phone: +1-310-534-6436
fax: +1-310-534-6777

MTC-00009547

From: Debbie Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:53am
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

The only thing accomplished by the lawsuit brought against Microsoft, is the hurting of the tech industry. The only reason 9 states are continuing the lawsuit is because the 9 states are in financial trouble, and I look at the lawsuits as blackmail. Please stop this. Noone is bringing these lawsuits in my name or to help me. All it has done is make me sure that I will NEVER buy anything from the companies that helped bring the lawsuits.

Debbie Davis
Dixon, CA

MTC-00009548

From: Ronald Stone

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 10:53am
Subject: microsoft settlement
Please leave Microsoft alone and let the free market prevail.
Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Stone
N12356 Copenhaver Avenue
Stanley, Wisconsin 54768

MTC-00009549

From: ChuckHlehl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:58am
Subject: microsoft settlement
I think that the Microsoft settlement is fair and just,

MTC-00009550

From: Gerald Rosenberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:59am
Subject: USAGRosenberg—Gerald—1035—0103

Gerald Rosenberg
3530 Mystic Pointe Drive, # 2115
Aventura, FL 33180-4541
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you to voice my opinion in regards to the Microsoft settlement issue. I support the settlement that was reached on November 6th. I feel that this settlement is fair and reasonable, and I am relieved that this issue is resolved.

Due to this settlement, Microsoft has pledged to share more information with other information tech companies, Microsoft will follow procedures to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software and will disclose information about software codes in order to do this, and a Technical Committee (TC) will enforce the provisions at Microsoft's expense.

This settlement will make it easier to compete with Microsoft. I have been a user of Windows since the inception. From a personal standpoint, I want to say that no supplier of software to the computer gives better support to their customers. If you read the on line responses from users around the country you would see that the vast majority of negative comment about Microsoft only comes from their competition. Any one that offers a better program will capture the market. Let me enjoy my computer in peace and let Microsoft be there for me and others.

Sincerely,
Gerald Rosenberg

MTC-00009551

From: Jim Horn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We support the expeditious settlement of the Microsoft case. It is time to STOP the Clinton ERA anti-trust process that stifles fair competition.

James and Christina Horn
jfhorn@innernet.net

MTC-00009552

From: Ted Burgess
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 10:59am

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think it is time to end this Clinton era bashing. Lets stop this effort to hurt successful business enterprises.

Ted Burgess

MTC-00009554

From: Rose Marie Lavelle

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:07am

Subject: for all the people, not the few

Let us move on with the things of today and not the pass, end it now!

ROBERT M.LAVELLE
122 WHISPERING PINE DR.
PALM COAST FL. 32164

MTC-00009555

From: Mary Smith

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/8/02 11:10am

Subject: Microsoft settlement...

I just wanted to ask for a speedy resolution to this settlement. I think that the agreeable compromise that Microsoft is willing to uphold and embraced by 9 states needs to be put through.

I believe in free enterprise, I am discouraged that those who are less innovative are able to take from those freely who are innovative and wise in business...

Get big government out of free enterprise....

Free enterprise works... We the people love Microsoft (#1 software) in the world... why???

Because of Microsoft's strong arm tactics?

NO, but because it's user friendly, excellent

products, what the world is using, excellent

technical support and excellent interface

capabilities.... It's too bad that we live in a

nation where those who don't want to work

so hard and aren't as visionary are able to

whine and complain and hinder the work of

those really great inventors who do work

hard and come up with great ideas, great

products, great results. It's time to tell the

whiners to get a life... If they can't cut the

mustard, get out of the kitchen... They and

our Government are directly responsible for

the downturn that the economy has seen in

the technology industry.... It really makes one

want to jump right in and invent something

wonderful when those who are mediocre can

jump in and tear down the best that there is...

Shame on you!

MTC-00009556

From: russell—ivey@att.net@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:13am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am an electrical and computer systems

engineer who would like to comment on the

ruling against Microsoft. I believe it is in the

best interest of the consumer and the

computer industry if Microsoft be prohibited

from retaliating against an OEM if that OEM

provides software on their machine which

competes against Microsoft, or if the OEM

provides a dual boot system.

I should like to mention a specific case as

an example. The BeOS, created by former

Apple employees among others, represents a

substantial leap in OS technology, but has

been unsuccessful in the commercial market,

largely due to the lack of machines offered

with BeOS as a native OS or dual boot

alternative. BeOS is currently used in computers which are not personal computers, but commercial systems which allow editing of audio and video, and in many cases is the choice of professionals for multimedia work, choosing to write their own software for BeOS rather than use existing software and Microsoft Windows. BeOS has been bought by Palm, Inc. and dissolved, due to it's lack of market success, which I feel is directly related to the policies of Microsoft which kept BeOS from being offered side by side with Windows on PC's.

Please take into consideration the effect of Microsoft on BeOS in your decision. Thank you for your thoughtful diligence in this case.

Russell Ivey

MTC-00009557

From: Cabins519@cs.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:13am

Subject: Settlement

Quit the politics and let all of us move on with life, liberty and a bit of business sense.

MTC-00009558

From: noel harris

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:17am

Please leave Microsoft alone and go after real criminals, the worst of which are elected officials and their underlings.

Noel Harris

MTC-00009559

From: Scald Master

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:16am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

1) MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

2) The Win32 API needs to be available so that BeWine can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

3) The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

4) The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

"God is real, unless declared integer."

Eu apoio a candidatura de Cthulhu a presidencia! Junte-se a campanha! <http://www.cthulhu.org> Parkinson's Fourth Law:

The number of people in any working group tends to increase regardless of the amount of work to be done.

MTC-00009560

From: Gen LaGreca

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:25am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the anti-trust laws are non-objective and unconstitutional. Only coercion can cause a monopoly to form, which means only firms that are run and/or supported by the government can forcibly restrict competition from entering a field and be monopolies (e.g., the US Postal Service, the medallion cabs in New York City). We would not even have a computer industry if it weren't for Microsoft. The government has no means to give us a computer industry, but it thinks it has the power to suppress firms in it at will. I say laissez-faire, leave it alone! Leave Microsoft alone and stop persecuting big business.

Businessmen have a right to life, liberty and property, too, without being regulated out of existence by "Big Brother."

Genevieve LaGreca
405 North Wabash Ave., # 714
Chicago, IL 60611

MTC-00009561

From: Dickie Horn

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:28am

Subject: Microsoft Anti Trust Suit

Dear Sir or Madam:

Lets end this Clinton era fandangle and let Microsoft alone.

Dickie Horn
Bartlesville, Ok

MTC-00009562

From: Keith Fette

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:33am

Subject: Microsoft

2716 Bentley Court
Cincinnati, Ohio 45244
January 7, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to you today to ask for your support in the effort to bring the Microsoft antitrust case to an end. The best way you can do this is to show firm backing of the settlement you have reached with the Microsoft Corporation.

Certain anti-Microsoft special interests may try to derail this settlement or have it withdrawn. That is why this settlement needs your firm backing. These interests would have the public falsely believe that this settlement is too soft on Microsoft but this is not the case. This settlement discloses Microsoft's internal interfaces, a major concession and something that has never been done by a software firm before. This will allow competing firms to create better software to compete with Microsoft. This is just one of the major changes that Microsoft has made to make the IT industry more competitive. Any further continuation of this case will just be a waste of time and resources. A settlement is in the best interests of both parties and the American people.

Microsoft has done immeasurable good for the United States and does not deserve to be harassed in this manner, especially in light of the current depressed state of the

economy. The success of the economy is dependent upon the success of companies such as Microsoft who directly or indirectly employ countless Americans with very good jobs throughout every state of the union.

Sincerely,
Keith Fette

MTC-00009563

From: Tennisscornem@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I support the settlement reached by the Department of Justice and Microsoft several months ago. This decision was reached after a long, hard three year court battle. The settlement imposed a broad series of restrictions and obligations on Microsoft, even extending to products and technologies that were not at issue in the lawsuit. Further, a "Technical Committee" has been established whereby any third party will be free to lodge a complaint. I think Microsoft has more than paid for its success. Bill Gates was simply better, quicker, faster to put his product on the market, incorporating his software into computer technology. Such success breeds jealousy. However, it is over and done. It is time to move on. We need now to concentrate on our economy and one way to do this is to quit rehashing decisions that were made several months ago. Microsoft has contributed mightily to this country's economy, and the world's, and I think Bill Gates should now be allowed to go forward with his business and not be hampered by those who are not as good as Mr. Gates. I might add that Bill Gates has done more for the TYPEWRITER than anyone age 40 or over could ever in their wildest dreams have imagined. I was a Business Education teacher for 20 years, and taught typing, including erasures, corrections, set-up, tabulation, letter preparation, filing, financial statements, and all of those things made so simple by our Bill Gates. Yes, life is more beautiful because of Bill, and I support the settlement. Thank You.

Sincerely
Donald Erskine

MTC-00009564

From: Nick Sayer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:32am
Subject: Reply comments to proposed settlement

Nicholas W. Sayer
2351 Sutter Ave #2
Santa Clara, CA 95050-6640
nsayer@freebds.org
This is my response to the proposed settlement of US v. Microsoft as called for under the Tunney Act.

The proposed settlement is at the least inadequate and at most actually rewards Microsoft and punishes its competitors for its past behavior. It must not be forgotten that

Microsoft has been found guilty of anticompetitive behavior. Any settlement must take into account what has been (it can now be said) proven in a court of law. If one wanted to be charitable and keep the major components of the settlement, one would have to demand that the section that talks about Microsoft being required to open its protocol specifications to certain well-heeled competitors be rerafted to require opening those specifications to everyone. The settlement ratifies Microsoft's monopoly on the desktop and seeks to insure a level playing field elsewhere. The position of open-source operating systems and software would be damaged beyond any possible repair if they were not allowed to participate as equal partners sharing in the same information as commercial entities.

Disclosure of such information would not in any way harm Microsoft (we're not talking about Microsoft's unpublished source code. We're merely talking about specification documentation), and would certainly benefit consumers indirectly by giving them more choices for their backend servers, which would spur Microsoft to insure that their implementations were competitive both in price and quality. But the real pity is that all of the above presumes, as the settlement already does, that Microsoft's monopoly on the desktop is sacrosanct. It should not be. A much better settlement would address the root of the problem—the OEM agreements between Microsoft and major PC manufacturers, for it is the fact that OEMs are actually prevented by Microsoft from providing alternative platforms to consumers that makes alternative platforms unattractive. Such unattractiveness is the fount from which pour like a flood all advantages Microsoft has in the desktop marketplace. The following steps are necessary to address this:

1. OEMs should be required to list the cost of any and all Microsoft software supplied preinstalled on the computer at purchase-time as a separate line item. Customers should be allowed to purchase computers either without any such software at all (should they wish to purchase or otherwise obtain it elsewhere) or by choosing from alternatives offered by the OEMs. Microsoft argues that this would merely encourage piracy of their products. Such an argument completely ignores any possibility that suitable software could be found elsewhere (which clearly is the case despite Microsoft's monopoly). The status quo allows Microsoft to effectively levy a tax on all pre-built computer systems regardless of whether the user intends to actually use the supplied Microsoft software or not. Users who wish to run an alternative operating system are thus required to pay for two of them, one of which they will never use.

2. OEMs should be allowed to offer machines configured with multiple operating systems if they (and the customers) choose. Currently OEMs are barred from doing so by Microsoft. It is possible (indeed, it is a frequent occurrence) for one computer to allow the user to select at boot time from a number of alternative operating systems, giving the user the choice to select the one desired for the task at hand. Requiring the

user to repartition the hard disk (throwing away the preinstalled software provided by the OEM at purchase time) in order to make room for alternative operating systems is a significant hurdle that solidifies Microsoft's death-grip on the desktop marketplace. If the settlement did nothing more than these two things, I believe it would be sufficient to reignite competition in the desktop operating system marketplace. Microsoft would not be punished beyond merely forcing them to be on a level playing field with everyone else. Isn't that the outcome that everyone wants?

Signed,
Nicholas W. Sayer

MTC-00009565

From: Holly Kirchofer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I am a software engineer and I remember well what it was like before Microsoft came along. Computers were very expensive and very difficult to use. Every piece of software required it's own set of cryptic commands, none of it worked very well together, and it was very expensive. Microsoft standardized the PC and made it practical and affordable to own a PC. Some of the things that the Microsoft competitors are whining about are the very innovations that I appreciated from Microsoft. It is so nice to have everything integrated into the operating system; it makes life easier. From a consumer's perspective, Microsoft has had a very positive impact on this industry and has done more to benefit the consumer than all of the other companies put together. It's time to settle this case and let Microsoft once again focus on what they do best. I do use software from other companies beside Microsoft; I have this choice. However, if we want to talk about monopolies, let's talk about Bellsouth. I do not have a choice in the phone line coming into my house and it is a constant source of frustration when using the computer. Bellsouth does not provide hardware capable of supporting DSL or even a 56K modem in my neighborhood.

Sincerely,
Holly Kirchofer
kci4@worldnet.att.net
3105 N. Indian River Dr.
Cocoa, Fl. 32922

MTC-00009566

From: Nancy J. Tate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Department of Justice
RE: Pending Microsoft Settlement

I would like to give you a few comments on why I believe this case needs to be settled as quickly as possible.

1. In the current economic situation, we, the Country, do not need the uncertainty that this case is causing.

2. Many of the claims that have been made are not relative in today's environment. For example, I have the option to use whatever software I choose to on my computer. I am not bound by what is installed when I purchased it (example—I much prefer

Netscape to Internet Explorer.) (Another demonstration of being able to choose although not related to Microsoft—even though AOL comes loaded on my computer, I have the free choice not to use it).

3. Finally, rather than punish Microsoft, we should be thanking them for bringing us into the computer world. Prior to Microsoft, computer software could not talk to each, computers were not compatible with one another, and the list goes on and on. I remember very well when computers were as foreign to the average person as speaking Latin. Today even Grandma and Grandpa are using computers to stay in touch with family. And don't you believe for a second that a lot of this progress wasn't directly due to the work Microsoft did.

Nancy J Tate

MTC-00009567

From: Ken D'Ambrosio

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:36am

Subject: Remedies for Microsoft antitrust suit.

Being as it currently appears that no settlement will occur, I felt it in my, and my industry's, best interests to express my feelings with regards to Microsoft, their actions, and some potential remedies. First and foremost, let me explain that I have been a system administrator for close to 20 years, and have had in-depth experience with most every operating system that Microsoft has released, since and including DOS 2.0 and Windows 1.0. In all that time, I have seen relatively little of the much-vaunted "innovation" that Microsoft claims. For example, it was only when Digital Research's DR-DOS had clearly surpassed DOS 3.x's capabilities (partition size, full-screen editor, etc.) that Microsoft enhanced their own version of DOS (4.01 and 5.0 addressed the two above issues, respectively). It was also during the beta phase of Windows 3.1, however, that they caused DR-DOS' own operating system to crash when attempting to run Windows (1).

While I certainly can't criticize a company for attempting to make money, I can when I believe they are hurting the consumers they purport to help. I have seen Microsoft attempt this, time and again, when Microsoft intentionally obfuscates file formats(2), communications protocols, and API interactions, not to mention the explicit desire to sabotage competition with said practices(3).

Finally, some of their latest legal shenanigans include a case against Linux (www.linux.com), a Linux/Windows hybrid. It contends that Linux infringes on Microsoft's trademark of "Windows"(4). I, personally, find it abhorrent that Windows, a descriptive name if ever I heard one, was able to be trademarked in the first place, and certainly find nothing wrong with combining the first half of the word "Linux" with the second half of the word "Windows": I find it unlikely in the extreme that anyone would become confused in any way about this—certainly no more so than Windows, itself, would become confused with the previously trademarked windowing system for Unix, X Windows(5). So, given a history of

consistent, persistent abuses—many more of which I have failed to discuss (eg. Stac Software vs. Microsoft), but would willingly do so upon request—I humbly submit that only pervasive, unarguable remedies will cause Microsoft to alter its behavior.

—In order for alternative operating systems (eg., Linux, or the now defunct BeOS) to be viable from a price perspective, new computer purchases should have the operating system cost be separated out from the cost of the system as a whole. That way, the consumer is aware of what he is paying for, and what alternatives would truly cost, instead of merely purchasing a bundled system, and having no idea how much money is being spent on software.

—Microsoft uses much that is proprietary in their system, which can then, in turn, lock out competitors from creating competing programs. (The fact that Microsoft has the best-selling operating system, an embedded web browser, and the best-selling office software suite, gives them an almost airtight stranglehold on what is essentially a self-contained system.) Therefore, I recommend that all proprietary formats, protocols, etc., be opened: the API, itself, file formats for all (non-licensed) applications, communications protocols, and anything else that would hinder competitors from being on a level playing field when writing applications for the Windows platform. Being that I am (obviously) a lay person, please forgive my relative ignorance of pertinent law and/or guidelines for submission, but I felt it important that I take the time to comment, and give some background.

Thank you for your time,

Ken D'Ambrosio

Sr. System Administrator,

Xanoptix, Inc. 1) See Caldera vs. Microsoft (<http://www.maxframe.com/DR/Info/lineo1—10—00.html>), which was settled out of court, but which was documented quite well by the respected industry journal "Dr. Dobbs Magazine", as well as "Red Herring" (<http://www.tbtf.com/archive/0159.html#s02>). 2) <http://kt.zork.net/kernel-traffic/kt20001225—99.html#5>, look for paragraph starting "Elsewhere, Jeff V. M. added..." 3) <http://winnetou.lcd.lu/halloween1.html#—Toc427495714> 4) <http://slashdot.org/article.pl?sid=01/12/20/237217&mode=thread> 5) <http://www.x.org/terms.htm>, bottom of page.

MTC-00009568

From: Barker, Philip

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/8/02 11:47am

Subject: Microsoft and litigation

As a computer reseller in metropolitan Detroit, the actions taken by your government organization against Microsoft has had profound changes in the perception of the computer industry with our commercial customers. Prior to the economic declines in August 2000, many companies held off on implementing technology in the workplace that would improve productivity based on the actions of Justice Department actions against Microsoft. These Justice Department actions created an aura of uncertainty in the minds of our commercial customers and postponed any decision on technology

implementations—thus slowing everything down. You really put a stick in the spokes of progress.

I believe these Justice Department actions have jammed up the American economy, jobs and economic livelihood of millions of people and tens of thousands of viable technology companies.

We have been reselling PC computer products since the early 1980's and I can tell you that the wild west frontier of the early 1980 in selling computer products was truly a 'snake oil' environment. Rife with deceptive advertising, 'vaporware' products, products that did not work as advertised, multiple bugs and the list of horrors goes on.

What Microsoft did in the 1980's was develop a 'standardized' platform whereby programmers and computer component manufacturer companies could develop and market products with a relative confidence that the products would work.

Upon this standardized platform, the market for PC computer technology was born along with millions of jobs and taxpaying companies—all working together to move the technology of America forward—increase our standards of living and our place on earth. My firm belief is that the actions of the Justice Department will deal a blow to the concept of 'standardized' platforms—a return the wild west days of 'snake oil' computer solutions full of bugs and a return to vaporware and a disjointed technology industry—a scrambled mess. I recommend the following:

(1) Make your decision soon so America can return to forward momentum

(2) Take into account that Microsoft has developed a Technology industry in America that has created millions of jobs and taxpaying companies

(3) A return to the anarchy and awkward technology business practices of the early 1980's benefits no-one and will drain American productivity

(4) Be fair to the American public and the technology companies that employ them

Sincerely,

Philip T. Barker

Vice President

Web Site: <<http://www.electrosonics.net/>>

E-mail: pbarker@electrosonics.net

Electrosonics, Inc.

17150 15 Mile Road

Fraser, Michigan 48026-3442

Telephone Number: (586) 415-5555

Fax Number: (586) 415-0770

Cell Phone: (586) 764-4718

Business Hours: 8:15am-5pm EST—

Monday—Friday

MTC-00009569

From: Bar-Jac Bar-Jac

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 11:47am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This trial has cost taxpayers dollars that could have been more wisely spent on defense of our country.

Competition has made our country the Great Country that it is today and our government should take a "hands off" policy where business is concerned.

I strongly support the microsoft settlement. Please settle this matter and let's start over,

encouraging business growth and entrepreneurship. Thank you for listening to my opinion.

Sincerely,
Barbara Strickland

MTC-00009570

From: Irving Kaufman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
"1200 Shoreview Drive Lima Ohio 45805"
January 8, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am certainly among the group of people who approve of the Microsoft antitrust case settlement. I believe that the federal government has had more than enough input into this matter and it's time to let Microsoft and the rest of the industry re-focus on business as usual.

The proposed settlement amply satisfies the concerns of Microsoft's competitors. Microsoft will now share information about the internal workings of Windows with its competitors, allowing them to more easily install their own software on Windows-based systems. Also, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against vendors that use or sell non-Microsoft products. All of these terms will be enforced by a technical review committee, created by the settlement, to ensure that Microsoft adheres to the terms of its agreement with the Department of Justice. Further sanctions and restrictions would be unnecessary and counterproductive.

This antitrust case has dragged on for far too long, and the settlement is the best available option to bring it to a swift end. I fully support the settlement, and wish to go on record as doing so.

Sincerely,
Irving Kaufman

MTC-00009571

From: Jerry (038) Jodene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:00pm
End the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse

MTC-00009572

From: Marie Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:03pm
Subject: Lawsuit

It's time to let this irresponsible suit go. I believe this suit was the cause of the fall of the stock market and the recession. Clinton believed in punishing people for their achievements, but I don't. Please drop this lawsuit.

Marie Miller
Cedar City, UT

MTC-00009573

From: Drewski
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 1/8/02 12:06pm
Subject: Microsoft and Anti-Trust

Without real punishment, Microsoft will never change its ways. You only have to look to Windows XP to see this. This lawsuit

never should have been about integrating ONE product into another, but the entire PRACTICE of integration. MS needs to be broken up into three companies—OS, User Applications, Server Applications. Sooner is better than later.

—Drew

MTC-00009574

From: charles schneider
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I support the agreement as fair and in the best interests of America.
Charles Schneider

MTC-00009575

From: Carole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:

I think the Microsoft settlement is good for consumers like me and also that it is in the best interest of the American economy and the computer industry. Any further litigation will not serve the public interest and will only deter from innovation in the industry. I just wanted my voice to be heard on this matter.

Thank you
Carole Lynch Memphis TN

MTC-00009576

From: Steve Sawyer
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft anti-trust case
Greetings,

I have been involved in the IT industry since 1981. I watched Microsoft, Apple and others work their way up the corporate ladder with innovative ideas and hard work. They deserve much of the fruits of their labor.

However, in Microsoft's case, they have been doing much more harm than good to the consumer over the past several years. As a graduate of the University of Oregon School of Business Administration, I have watched with fascination the methods with which Microsoft has eliminated competition and coerced vendors into doing business Microsoft's way. All of this while their own products continue to slide, in terms of quality and technical advancement. The result is a two-edged sword. They spend time and resources wiping out competitive ideas leaving little reason or incentive to improve their own. Then the

Government and the courts comes along and 'endorses' this approach by mandating toothless laws with little or no enforcement. Microsoft is trying to do this with Linux as well as others. Microsoft is a great company. Bill Gates and crew should be applauded for what they have done for technology. However, Microsoft has become a textbook example of why we have rules governing monopolistic practices in this country. When Billy Graham gets caught speeding he receives a ticket for speeding and he pays the fine. Microsoft got caught and it is time to pay the fine.

Do America and Microsoft a favor and put a stop to the dark side of Microsoft.

Thank you...
Steve
Steve Sawyer
Director of Internet Development
Market America, Inc.
steves@morebv.com

MTC-00009577

From: ETBAG1@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:

It is my humble opinion that this is a fair settlement and should go forward. I have never had a problem with Microsoft and believe they have moved us along in the computer age and they have done so with hard work and debtcisation.

Sincerely yours,
Eric T Baggett

MTC-00009578

From: Burkhard Daniel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust case

I do not think it's in the best interest of the public to settle the case out of court.

From my point of view, the suggestion made by Microsoft to set up a funds that sponsors schools in the purchase of software is a "back-door" approach.

Microsoft has nothing to lose from that but a lot to gain. Most schools benefiting from such a funds would (out of gratitude, or simply because Microsoft software is so widespread) purchase Microsoft software. Schools that had no software before now have Microsoft software, which only helps intensify Microsoft' almost-monopoly on software to a new (and promising) market.

It also seems that the change in the political climate (i.e. the election of President Bush) has had some impact on the devotion put behind the case by the DoJ, i.e. that was the one thing that made an out-of-court settlement an option at all (or so it seems to me). Once started, I think political considerations should not be allowed to influence judicial decisions, and that's another reason why I think the case should be tried in court to its conclusion.

Burkhard Dnaie.
Burkhard Daniel * mail@burkhard.net *
http://www.burkhard.net

Our lives are poems sung against the wind, with nothing but our voices to make a difference.

MTC-00009579

From: rquack65@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:35pm
Subject: Dear Sirs:

I want to let you know that I support the
Dear Sirs: I want to let you know that I support the Microsoft settlement as it is.

Robert Quackenbos

MTC-00009580

From: Bert Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am a consumer using MS products, and I don't feel the case against MS is for my protection.

I feel the action is because MS is successful and has a lot of money, that companies that were less successful, could benefit through the legal system. Also different States including Florida want some of MS's money. A form of legal extortion.

As in the tobacco suits, the States got a lot of money, and the tobacco companies raised their prices. This is supposed to protect the end user the same way it will when MS has to raise their prices to pay for this litigation.

Times have changed, since the original suit was filed. Most of the companies that claimed they had been hurt, no longer exist. They have been bought-out or merged with other entities and are doing quite well. AOL is a good example.

Enough is enough, stop any further litigation, that only benefits the legal profession and does nothing for the economy or the consumer.

Respectfully submitted,
Bert J Wood
P.O. Box 15658
Clearwater FL 33766
bwood4@tampabay.rr.com

MTC-00009581

From: howard stein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to inform you of my opinion that the action of the United States Government against Microsoft is unfair and destructive. Microsoft is not anticompetitive; it is the US Government that is anticompetitive.

We can live with Microsoft and live well; the question is whether or not we can live with you.

MTC-00009582

From: Douglas R. White
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:40pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

My comments on the settlement are simple. The Justice Department should have never brought this suit to begin with. In my opinion the antitrust laws were established in an era that could have never envisioned dealing with companies in a dynamic technology market under which Microsoft and many others flourished.

I think this action help precipitate the decline of all technology companies.

Please allow this settlement to stand for the good of the country's economy.

Douglas R. White
545 Watergate Ct
Roswell, GA 30076
dwhite55@mindspring.com

MTC-00009583

From: Tom Gordon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If you cannot open this document, I'll be happy to send it in any format that you need.

Thanks
Tom Gordon
January 8, 2001
Renata B. Hesse

Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Re: Microsoft Settlement

I have been following the Microsoft case for the last number of years, and the proposed settlement disturbs me. Not in the matter that it's too easy on Microsoft, but that it is way too harsh. I have been sickened at the gross waste of money and court time in the proceedings in this case.

I have developed software using Microsoft technology since the early 80's. Their technologies have matured and improved over those years not by strong arm tactics, but by the intelligent application of technology by smart people. The current proposed settlement puts a ball and chain on the operations of that company, which will likely diminish its ability to improve and develop new technologies, ultimately reducing or preventing new, innovative technologies from reaching consumers.

1. Regarding Section III items D and E of the settlement

For one to even hint that Microsoft hides secret technologies from competitors in order to make their applications more efficient is merely competitive jealousy. Of course competitors are not going to say nice things about their chief rival. When I was actively developing software, Microsoft was more than helpful in showing how to make it more efficient and effective. Their staff and support people worked directly with me and my staff to help make our systems better. They continue to openly and frequently train outside developers at multi-day knowledge transfer events all over the world. They reveal the low level intricacies of how their systems function, and how to capitalize on them. Microsoft trains all comers on how to write software to work with their systems! This is done in order to help people write better, more innovative software. Who ultimately defines middleware? Are the government and the courts now in the business of software and operating systems design? Are we going to allow the government to micro-manage the development of products in our economy? This is not what capitalism is about. Why does Microsoft develop such good software? The answer is simple. Their staff has been writing Windows applications for many years. Experience counts when writing complex software. When Windows 3.0 was released, I asked my WordPerfect sales rep if they were going to upgrade their word processing system from DOS so it would work on the new operating system (OS). They indicated they would wait to see if the Windows 3.0 would work out, and that it would only take 6 months to convert their word processor to work on it. Several years later, when the conversion was completed, their word processor was slow, clumsy and a miserable failure (in my opinion). I tried it, erased it, and went back to the old DOS version. When Microsoft came out with Word for Windows, it worked well, and I left it on my machine. As an experienced Windows developer, I knew WordPerfect's problem was in the architecture and design of the

product. It was impossible to efficiently change their product from DOS to Windows without a significant architectural modification. Microsoft's software engineers knew Windows, since they had been writing Windows application code for years. WordPerfect's engineers had not, and faced a steep learning curve.

It takes 2-3 years of writing Windows code to become truly proficient. Tailoring applications to work with modern operating systems is an extremely complex task. The problem is not in what Microsoft tells other developers, it is in the level of experience of their development staff. The concept that Microsoft should reveal 'secret' application interfaces to their operating systems (OS) to help competitors write more efficient code is technically dangerous. I shudder at the thought of any operating system or 'middleware' manufacturer having to reveal the internal systems calls to developers. The result is that when the next version of the OS is released, the internal call might have changed by the OS vendor in order to implement new features, and any application code dependent upon that function call would likely fail. Some will say that the internal OS function calls should not be changed since it would be detrimental to the applications using it, but that's a fallacy, since ALL operating systems have internal function calls that may need to change as the operating system matures and grows. Microsoft has published, and continues to publish huge volumes of internal technical documentation on how to write systems to interact with their software. The books used to be small, but now can't even be contained on one CDROM! Their systems also have 'undocumented' calls, many of which are documented in external publications by other authors, but not condoned by Microsoft. These 'undocumented' calls are for internal operating system use, and can change from version to version of their systems out of necessity. These undocumented calls are used by developers at their own risk. Some choose to use them, but others study how they work and figure ways to leverage what they learned. For Microsoft to officially publish undocumented calls is fraught with risk. Such a publication of the 'undocumented' interfaces ties the hands of Microsoft, making it almost impossible to evolve their operating systems. They will not be able to change them since competitors will be dependent upon them for their systems. When the operating system cannot evolve, technology cannot evolve, and the ultimate consumer loses.

Revelation of internal system calls also creates a severe testing and stability problem of software platforms. If you cannot depend on applications and 'middleware' software (written using the internal OS interfaces) to run from one version to the next of an operating system, the testing burden on industry (those using the software in a commercial environment) and consumers becomes huge. Such testing is necessary to insure stable migration from one version of a system to the next. Without it, corporate information networks could fail, and security could be compromised. With an increased testing burden, new products won't be

implemented rapidly (or at all), and industry as a whole suffers. Developers will not write software to run on platforms that haven't been implemented by their clients.

Many competitors of Microsoft would love to see the internal system function calls documented, since it would ultimately stop the evolution of Windows. Would this be in the best interest of the consumer?

I am not convinced that the language of the agreement is adequate to prevent some software developers from tying the hands of Microsoft, preventing it from improving the operating system due to some specific function call that needs to change. This would be an unnecessary and onerous form of punishment—preventing any evolution of the operating system.

2. Regarding Section III C

One of the amazing things about the Windows platform, from a development perspective, is that you can depend on certain services and, what appears to be called 'middleware', being available for you applications to run. If OEM's and others are allowed to remove portions of Windows in order to customize it to their liking, this will make development of software much more difficult, as one will not be able to depend upon the consistency of the platform. Although there is apparently some language in the agreement to help alleviate this problem, from the development standpoint, the potential instability is disconcerting. Applications will have to be written to the lowest common denominator of technology, making them less attractive to consumers, and less useful.

3. Oversight (Section IV B and C)

In the settlement, there is a section regarding oversight of Microsoft's operations by a group of individuals (The 'TC'), and a Compliance Officer.

Isn't this almost the same thing that just about killed IBM? Economies are no longer national, they are global. To use a group of people to oversee the functions of Microsoft will stifle their ability to develop new systems, ultimately limiting technologies to the consumer. We are in a world economy. Many nations would love to see the demise of Microsoft, so they could take over technical leadership in software. If this is the case, it's not unforeseeable that the United States will ultimately be importing billions of dollars of software from other countries, instead of exporting it.

4. Other issues discussed by individuals (and States) objecting to the settlement:

Monopoly Profits: I find it very difficult, if not impossible, to find where, in any law, it's illegal to optimize profit. It has been taught in business schools from coast to coast for ages. For Microsoft to be admonished for making a profit digs at the heart of capitalism, that is, if the United States still works on a capitalistic economy. Microsoft 'bet the company' on Windows in the 80's and early 90's, and now some say they should be prevented from making a profit. How is this appropriate, fair or even legal? What precedent does this set? If you are innovative, should you move to another country that will let you make a profit? If you make a large financial gamble, you cannot receive gain commensurate with the risk involved?

Microsoft not only competed with other operating systems, but with their own previous versions of Windows and 'free' operating systems software. If Windows was priced too high, people would not adopt it. Customers chose to buy new versions due to a wealth of new features. Restricting those features would kill the market for operating systems.

Microsoft as an 'illegal, abusive monopoly': I realize this has been argued and 'decided' by the courts (and the politicians and the press). It's quite apparent that if define a market narrowly enough, you can create a monopoly out of thin air. In a dynamic, well defined market, there is absolutely no such thing as a monopoly. In the case of the personal computer, if one company is making 'monopoly profits' (in the economic sense, price above the equilibrium price) selling the devices, another company will figure a way to do the same thing, with another type of device, better start making 'monopoly profits' of their own. This is the heart of capitalism. All companies that make a profit make 'monopoly profits.' A competing product may not physically resemble the original, but it meets the same consumer need. The personal computer has just about evolved into a commodity product, and may be relegated to the basement junk yard in 10 years. This occurs as new technologies take over the tasks older technologies have been handling. The market is too dynamic to define a small piece of the pie, and declare it as a monopoly marketplace. The environment and the market are constantly changing.

The only people who complain about a monopoly are the competitors. If there are competitors, then where is the monopoly? If the competitors have a better technology, then they will ultimately win, even if a market dominant firm tries to prevent it. This was appropriately demonstrated when Microsoft achieved a significant market position in small computer operating systems over the likes of IBM, DEC, Wang, Sun, Univac and others. The best and most cost effective system won many of those battles.

Release Microsoft Office On Other Platforms: Some individuals have proposed that to make a 'level playing field', Microsoft should publish their Office software for other operating systems. If this were economically viable, wouldn't someone have already created software that does this? Changing code to run on another operating system is not in the slightest manner a simple task. It may be impossible. It is very much like trying to attach wings to an automobile and calling it an airplane. The fundamental structural concepts between operating systems are usually significantly different, and interchanging applications between them is not a quick, or an easy task. When a feature cannot be implemented on another operating system due to some architectural differences, how do you resolve this?

Release a Stripped Down Version of Windows: Some have proposed Microsoft develop a 'stripped down' version of Windows that others could enhance. Although interesting from a technical and academic standpoint, this would potentially perpetuate multiple non-compatible systems

that could kill the applications software industry. Back when the IBM PC was young, there 3 or 4 different operating systems available (UCSD P-System, CPM-86, MSDOS/PCDOS and a few others.) They were anything but compatible. Once the MSDOS/PCDOS system became prevalent, the industry flourished. Before that, developers had to pick their target operating system, and ignore the others, as they worked differently. This severely hampered the growth of the PC industry.

Releasing the Windows Source Code: Giving away what Microsoft has spent many billions to develop would be tantamount to capital punishment and confiscation. Competitors would love the confiscation of others' private property, but the precedent in our economy would be devastating. No company would ever again be safe from the government taking private property without just compensation, plus the government would be in the situation of picking winners. If another company created something better, and started to obtain a large market share, would the government be obligated to clip their wings to favor the pre-determined winner?

Requiring Microsoft to include competitor's products in Windows: Who would decide what products to be included in Windows? Would the government now be involved with Operating System design? Wouldn't this open a Pandora's Box where everybody would want their software included on the Windows Disk (ultimately, becoming multiple disks)? If the other companies put their software on the Windows disks, who would be responsible for testing and support? Shouldn't Microsoft be compensated for including and distributing the wares of others? What happens when the additional code doesn't pass the necessary tests to be included? Microsoft has 2 testers for every 1 developer in the operating systems group, and that still doesn't produce code that is 100% bug free. Will other companies insure their code is tested to that level? Adding more pieces to the equation increases the testing load exponentially. Insure Microsoft continues to fully support 'industry standards': Who defines the 'industry standards?' Again, are the government and the courts going to become involved with operating system design? Are we to have 'official' operating system standards and a government agency that makes certain standards official? What does that do to competition and consumer choice?

Final Comments: Yes, there were likely some individuals at Microsoft that may have become over-zealous in their marketing areas. That's part of the drive for success within individual product groups. The technology industry is a fierce competitive environment; one has to fight for market share and consumer dollars. To severely punish the entire company for some minor infractions, to ultimately reduce future consumer choice and to confiscate the property of shareholders is tantamount to sentencing a parking offender to capital punishment. Thanks for bearing with my comments.

I'm not a lawyer (which is obvious), but one who has worked in the personal

computer industry since its inception, and one who is very concerned about the long term implications of this case on the technology market, and the economy.

Tom Gordon
President, Framework Deliveries, LLC
2070 Linkside Dr
Alpharetta, GA 30005
tgerdon@mindspring.com

MTC-00009584

From: RMyers007@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

On the matters of Bill Gates and Microsoft corporation, It seems to be a sad day for the United States of America, when the U.S. Government penalizes Microsoft for being enterprising and innovative. Is this not the land of the free? Where you are supposed to have certain rights, including intellectual ones! What Microsoft has done is not illegal, and their only goal was to make the world a smarter and easier place to live and learn in a new way never thought of before. Kudos to Bill Gates and Microsoft!!! Please "Think" before you Judge! Thanks,

Mr. Roy William Myers, Jr.
Winston-Salem, N.C.
RMyers007@aol.com

MTC-00009585

From: philip tuniman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:50pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am disgusted that a bunch of politicians trying to become the governor or senator from Iowa or Connecticut, Massachusetts, California, or the other five states, are costing many retirement funds millions of dollars in lost Microsoft value, while they pretend to be helping the poor. Of course, they are not the only ones feathering their nest at the stock holders expense—the DOJ is pretty good at that too. I recall Anne Bingington (?) who went on to bigger and better things after winning a decision against Microsoft. Then there was her successor, the unlamented Mr. Klein, who was off to a big job (probably in Silicon Valley) before Judge Jackson had given his first interview.

This great country was built by people who were innovators, not by whiners like Oracle's Ellinson, Sun Micro's McNeally, or Steve Case of the biggest monopoly in the country, AOL Time Warner.

The DOJ tried for years to break up IBM before they finally called it off. I grew up hearing the cry, "Break up the Yankees." People who can't cut it, are always trying to knock down the successful ones. Microsoft was responsible for the Technology boom. All of these losers who crying to the Government to breakup Microsoft, should get down on their knees and thank God for Bill Gates. He opened up the field for them.

The Government's settlement was a good deal for everyone—Stop already!!

MTC-00009586

From: Jeffrey Bevelacqua
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
607 Somerset Drive

Green Bay, WI 54301
January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The Justice Department has kept Microsoft in court for more than three years, but thankfully now there is a settlement in this case. I am writing to express concern that this settlement may be in jeopardy, I hope you will support the defend you reached with Microsoft and an end to this case.

Microsoft has worked hard to become a world leader in the software industry. The DOJ suit was meant to allay concerns about the power of Microsoft. This settlement does that by forcing Microsoft to disclose internal interfaces. This allows Microsoft competitors unprecedented access to Microsofts code and operating systems. Lets now end this case and allow Microsoft to get back to doing what it does best, not litigation, but software development and job creation. Your office can make this happen by ensuring the settlement is completed.

Please fight against those that wish to derail this settlement. The faster this case is settled the better off the American information technology sector will perform in this tough economy, and the more time your office will have to dedicate to other priorities.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Bevelacqua
cc: Representative Mark Green

MTC-00009587

From: Richard Rubin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 12:58pm
Subject: One captive users comments re: Microsoft

ONCE AGAIN I must purchase the OVERPRICED Full Install of a Microsoft Windows product (XP) because my previous OEM install of Windows (Me, with "free upgrade to Xp" offered by Compaq, but not yet received) has DEGRADED, despite my cautious grooming and care, to become a WORLD OF MALFUNCTIONS and CRASHES. To "Upgrade", even "for free" would be to import your broken soft-machinery from the past. And the corporate claim is, once again that Xp is more stable than YOUR OWN OLD PRODUCT, which therefore, I infer, had a stability problem? And you have strong-armed your Compaq OEM contract to provide no relief on your DEFECTIVE PRODUCT. Little-Me will let my thoughts be known to appropriate ears in the penalty decisions pending for your creative, but overaggressive and undergenerous corporation.

Richard Rubin
10407 McClellmont Avenue
Tujunga, CA 91042
818-951-0255

MTC-00009588

From: Mars Cheung
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please leave Microsoft alone and move on. The country will benefit from it. Thanks.

MTC-00009589

From: Robert E. Trice, Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Suit

I FOR ONE THINK ITS TIME TO END THIS CASE. ITS STILL A FREE COUNTRY AND I AM A SUPPORTER OF BILL GATES, HE HAS A BETTER MOUSE TRAP AND IF SOMEONE WANTS TO BUY IT, FINE, AND BETTER STILL IF HE WANTS TO ALSO GIVE YOU SOMETHING FREE WITH IT, BETTER STILL. GET OFF HIS BACK AND ON TO SOMETHING WORTHWHILE FOR A CHANGE. QUIT SPENDING TAX PAYERS MONEY ON A DISHONEST ACCUSER ANYHOW. THANK YOU

MTC-00009590

From: Eric Dennis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust case

Isn't it time to get over the misguided suit against Microsoft? there are far more important situations that cost taxpayers and consumers much more than software. The energy and tax dollars spent to pursue a competitive company has been a debacle. Self serving competitors and their legislators have made a mockery of our capitalist system.

Put this to bed and work on things that matter-energy prices, like automotive gasoline for example- talk about collaborative price levels! There you have a monopoly of many, all propping up prices- definitely not supply and demand driven. I don't work for Microsoft nor do any of my relatives.

Eric Dennis
Bothell, WA

MTC-00009591

From: Joe Hegenbart
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 1:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this e-mail as evidence of my strongest support for the "Settlement" that the DOJ has been able to reach with Microsoft. I have the greatest admiration for the Microsoft Corporation, its employees and its products (which are most innovative, practical and most reasonably priced). I could never understand the DOJ's justification for, or their decision to litigate; however, I applaud the Settlement. Please move on to more important matters. Note also, I am so displeased that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has not accepted the settlement. I consider this to be a single issue in the next election.

MTC-00009592

From: Rob Lund
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs:

First let me say that I am a committed user of BeOS for several reasons unique to the BeOS platform—usability, performance, elegance, etc. Most of these are personal preferences. Due to the tactics of Microsoft over the years though, I am even more of a

BeOS enthusiast. I am continually frustrated by Microsoft's strongarm tactics and feel they have pushed smaller companies like Be, Inc. out of the market unfairly. Therefore, I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place. However, there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed, such as open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, making dual-boot options mandatory, etc. Thank you for your commitment to seeing a fair and just resolution to the antitrust case against Microsoft. As a BeOS user, I feel it is my right as a consumer to use the operating system of my own choice, and I know that the DOJ's pursuit of a fair market will ensure the BeOS's existence in the future.

Regards,
Rob

MTC-00009593

From: Frank and Hettie Helder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:10pm
Subject: End Clinton Eara anti Trust actions.

It is unfortunate that so much interference with the free market has occurred and wasted so much time, effort and money. Please do the right thing and bring it to an immediate end.

Frank E. Heidler Sr.

MTC-00009594

From: Don (038) Barb Palmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:02pm
Subject: Anti-trust effort of Clinton Admin.

Dear Justice Dept. of the USA:

I would like the federal government to not continue persecuting our finest businesses such as Microsoft. They do a wonderful job of producing products that make us proud to be an American. We already have terrific trade deficits in competing with companies abroad in the technical areas so lets support our efforts on this side of the oceans...the USA! Thank you for your consideration of this view.

Barbara R. Palmer

MTC-00009595

From: Slotscraps@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough, drop the whole suit and stop wasting gov. money. Can't understand this whole lawsuit, what happened to free enterprise?

MTC-00009596

From: Eric Benedict
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ms. Hesse,

This letter is concerning the proposed DOJ vs. Microsoft settlement. I am an electrical engineer with over 15 years of computer usage and experience including MS-DOS, Windows and UNIX/Linux platforms. This experience includes usage, development and system administration tasks.

I am greatly concerned and troubled about details of the proposed settlement. In particular, I am troubled by the large and

numerous loopholes which are present in the settlement. In particular, Section III, Part J, Paragraph 2 greatly concerns me. This paragraph clearly allows Microsoft to set up several barriers to prevent a third party from obtaining the information which Microsoft is supposed to make available as part of the settlement. Microsoft only has to release the information if Microsoft determines that the third party "meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft of certifying the authenticity and viability of its business". It is quite simple to establish reasonable, objective standards which will exclude virtually any third party which Microsoft doesn't wish to disclose the settlement stipulated information to. Further, should such a third party exist, Microsoft can further impede this party by requiring that the party submit their code "at its own expense ... to third party verification, approved by Microsoft". Thus, should someone make it through the gauntlet of conditions stipulated by Microsoft to have a legitimate need, Microsoft can require that they release their code to a Microsoft approved tester. There are no controls over this third party tester, their relationship with Microsoft, etc. Microsoft can quite easily influence the 'testing fee' to be sufficiently out of the reach of all but the wealthiest entities. It also isn't clear that Microsoft won't be given access to the submitted code information which also would assist Microsoft by allowing them to review their competitor's source code.

Furthermore, I am also troubled that third party middleware can be excluded from invocation if a Microsoft determined functionality is not present. The way the current settlement agreement reads to me, Microsoft can evaluate a third party program, determine a functionality which this program does not provide, arbitrarily decide that this functionality "X" is now "required" and then ship the Microsoft OS version which doesn't allow the third party's program to be launched. The third party then has to ask Microsoft why, Microsoft then responds that they were missing this newly required functionality "X" and that they need to provide it in order to be compatible. Meanwhile the third party has already "missed the boat" and must wait until the next Microsoft release. Of course for the next release, Microsoft can "innovate" some more and determine a new functionality "Y" is now required (amazingly missing from the third party's program) and so yet again, the third party is effectively shut out from being included. This can continue for as long as Microsoft wishes (or until the third party is bankrupt) and so Microsoft can effectively determine what software is allowed and prevent any undesired competition.

These (and the numerous other loop holes which are present) effectively allow Microsoft to continue business as usual, but now *legally*! This will effectively insulate Microsoft from future anti-trust action since they can point to the fact that this agreement allowed them to do those actions! Very good for Microsoft, but not for the consumer!

I am also concerned that the settlement also only provides (nearly non-existent) remedies on future behavior and does not

appear to contain any punishment for prior inappropriate actions. This appears to me akin to allowing a successful but convicted criminal (drug dealer, bank robber, inside trader) to keep all of their ill gotten gains and then telling them to try to be good in the future. Microsoft was determined to be guilty of breaking the law. Where is the punishment?

In an ideal world, I would like to see some punitive measures incorporated into the settlement; however, the world isn't ideal. At the minimum, I would like to see some real restrictions (with out loopholes) on Microsoft's future conduct. Anything less makes me have real strong suspicions of a sell out to Microsoft and that our system of justice is a joke or at least bought and paid for by the highest bidder.

Thank you.

Eric Benedict
175 Lakewood Gardens Lane
Madison, WI 53704
benedict@cae.wisc.edu
eben@zephyr.ece.wisc.edu
CC:benedict@cae.wisc.edu@inetgw

MTC-00009597

From: RG Helms
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
THERASTAT DATA CORPORATION
7512 EAST INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD,
SUITE 103
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA 28227-9412

Phone: (704) 567-4228 ? Fax: (704) 567-8699
January 8, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

After three long years of litigation Microsoft and the Department of Justice have reached a settlement regarding the antitrust suit. I believe that this settlement will be both beneficial and fair not only to the industry as a whole, but also to Microsoft and the federal and state governments. However, for this settlement to be beneficial, it is necessary that it is actually implemented. After the comment period, I urge you to quickly enact the settlement for greater benefit of the slowing economy.

This settlement is fair and reasonable and was arrived at after extensive negotiations with a court-appointed mediator. Not only that, but a settlement such as this will ensure that the industry continues to deliver advanced technology to the market by fostering competition, which in turn fosters new ideas.

This has gone on long enough. All of this action at the federal level must be stopped, so that Microsoft can go to product development, rather than going back to court. Thank you, and best wishes for the New Year.

Sincerely,
R.G. Helms
Senior Developer/Programmer

MTC-00009598

From: Ours, Susanne

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/8/02 1:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to voice my opinion on this subject. I believe it is time to end this pursuit of Microsoft and end this silly law suit against them. Take the settlement and let Microsoft get back to doing what it is good at...making software. The government should leave businesses alone and stop trying to tinker with them. The business world works much better when government stays out.

Thanks,
 Sue
 Susanne Ours
 Divisional Programmer
 Student Affairs/Taylor University
 ssours@tayloru.edu

MTC-00009599

From: Utpizz@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft anti-trust settlement
 104 Whispering Brooke Drive
 Newtown Square, PA 19073
 January 8, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 U.S. Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
 My hope is that this note will help convince you and your department to promote the acceptance of the Microsoft anti-trust settlement proposal. I realize that you support the settlement, but I want to emphasize the necessity of its prompt enactment.

I believe that the proposal is a workable compromise between the needs and desires of the parties involved. Microsoft will retain its corporate integrity and continue to operate as it has before. The company will now have to open itself up to other companies??? software, and Microsoft will need to provide companies with mechanisms to promote non-Microsoft programs. Non-Microsoft software will be utilized in the Windows systems. New Windows systems will be specifically designed to accommodate others' software. In short, it???s a compromise that will benefit all parties in the long term.

Please support this settlement.
 Sincerely,
 Arthur Pizzirani

MTC-00009600

From: Paula Benner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:37pm

I want to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse!

MTC-00009601

From: R Hansen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:48pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Consumers worldwide have benefited from Microsoft. It is in the best interest of consumers, such as myself, to end this case and proceed with settlement.

MTC-00009602

From: susan pizzi
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 1:52pm
 Shut down the case and let America's tech industry get gack to work.

MTC-00009603

From: Keith Hix
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:50pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is more than fair on the DOJ's side. Only problem is the additional nine (9) states holding out.

Thank you.
 Keith Hix
 Annex Systems Inc.
 308B West Millbrook Road
 Raleigh, NC 27609
 Phone 919-846-5406 Fax 919-870-9335
 E-Mail keith.hix@annexsystems.net

MTC-00009604

From: jim(092)va7gpd(092)n7gpd
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:57pm
 Subject: punnishment

microsoft will keep on doing what they have always done unless it is made unprofitable for them to crush and kill off any one that treathens them

just look at the auto map pro program they bought out the company that produced and kill the program off because it was going to be a better product than what they were going to sell and it was cheaper and that is the way that they do business

MTC-00009605

From: Gary Keener
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:59pm
 Subject: Anti-trust Law Abuse

We support ending the Clinton-era anti-trust law abuse!
 Julia & Gary Keener
 Tucson, AZ

MTC-00009606

From: Tom Cooper
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 1:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement—a thoughtful, non-profane comment

Sirs,
 I have been a customer and user of Microsoft's products for more than 16 years. During that time, I have observed them on many occasions do those things for which they have been found guilty. I am thrilled that the court has recognized the Microsoft abuses.

I voted for president Bush and have the highest respect for Attorney General Ashcroft and his integrity, but since the Bush administration entered the picture it appears that the government has backed down on punishing Microsoft for its abuses.

Evidence that Microsoft believes that this is the case can be seen in that they released WindowsXP with many many utilities bundled in the product. This is precisely the sort of thing for which they are being taken to task! Their bundling of Internet Explorer with the OS was clearly for the purpose of killing their competition, and it worked! Netscape has been ineffective for years. It is a non-issue for Microsoft today, as is Novell.

How many more companies have died as a result of Microsoft's predatory tactics? For Microsoft, winning is not the objective. Killing their competition is their objective. Without sever punishment, how many other companies will die? Microsoft's predatory tactics have done in dozens of "partners" and technology suppliers. Microsoft has a long history of: Intentionally writing incompatibilities between their products and those of competitors (DR DOS and Windows 3.1):

Acquiring their competitors, (Visio)
 Re-writing their competitors' tools, (Netscape)
 Stealing their competitors' tools, (Stac)
 Directly attacking the competition with incompatibility, FUD, and in some cases explicitly dishonest advertising. (Novell)
 Time does not permit me to list all of the quantitative abuses that Microsoft has undertaken, and the full scope of their destruction can probably never be known. They have become one of the most successful companies in the world by use of these tactics. In spite of the verdict of abuse of monopoly power, Microsoft shows no remorse for their actions and continues to this day to abuse their power. They are flaunting their capability to bundle products and attack competitors even while this decision is being considered!

The only way that Microsoft can be convinced to change its ways is by radical intervention both in terms of its business practices and punitive measures. I am pleased that the terms of the agreement spell out that Microsoft must no longer abuse their customers, but the decision must go deeper, or the consumers will continue to suffer. To be sure, Microsoft has offered much to the US economy, and has shaped the consumer marketplace in huge ways. Computing today is far more advanced than it was, but are we better off with Microsoft than if it had never come into being? Microsoft's tactics are not innovative, but rather suppress innovation.

In order to provide as equitable a result as possible, Microsoft must at a minimum be forced to split into multiple companies, and must pay substantive penalties for their abuses. They cannot restore Netscape to it's former position, but unless real penalties are assessed, (and I mean in terms of billions of dollars in CASH, not products) they will continue to harm the consumer and the economy.

Talk of a punitive measure of \$1B largely comprised of MS products is frightening. That would serve to further MS hegemony in the PC marketplace, and to suppress alternative technologies. This would occur while actually costing Microsoft very little.

I make my living largely through implementation of Microsoft products. I would prefer not to, but since they own the vast majority of the marketplace, I have little choice. In spite of the fact that MS product implementation provides most of my income, I believe that Microsoft must be punished. Please do not settle for a mere slap on the wrist! Finding suitable punitive measures would allow for more innovation in the marketplace and will be beneficial in the long term for the US and our economy.

Thank you for taking the time to read this message.

Sincerely,
 Thomas R. Cooper
 106 Rawlings Road
 Gaithersburg, MD 20877
 (301)869-6499

MTC-00009607

From: Jeff Powers
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft

I believe that the government has spent enough tax payers money and has caused enough money to be lost by owners of technology stocks and mutual funds to end this nonsense abuse of power. Microsoft was wrong in how they conducted business, but people knew it and have always had a choice of software to use. It may be preloaded, but you don't have to use it. This witch hunt for Microsoft is worst. What is the next business that conducts business in the US will get to big so the government will step in and break it up? The government is to big, break it up instead. Stop and let Microsoft resume business, capitalism to remain, and confidence in technology sector of our economy to resume.

Jeffrey L Powers

MTC-00009608

From: Daphanie M. Mullins
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:20pm
 Subject: Fw: keep fighting Microsoft Original Message
 From: "Henry Sharp" <hsharp@rain.org>
 To: <consumer@mail.wvnet.edu>
 Sent: Monday, January 07, 2002 3:48 PM
 Subject: keep fighting Microsoft

Thanks you for not agreeing to the US proposed Microsoft settlement. Our government has let us down by caving in to Microsoft.

I applaud your action to not accept the agreement and to fight on for strong penalties.

Harriet Sharp
 1165 Harbor Hills Drive
 Santa Barbara, CA 93109
 805/966-7280

MTC-00009609

From: Jessie Conner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:18pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is time for the Federal and State Government to settle the Microsoft case. I believe the current agreement is reasonable and fair given the results of the trial. This agreement will provide reasonable protection for the industry and still permit Microsoft to continue to improve it's products to benefit millions of America consumers.

However, I believe key aspects of the government's case are flat-out wrong, such as the contention that Microsoft holds a monopoly over desktop operating systems. That ignores the resurgent Apple Macintosh and the emergence of new Unix-based competitors, like Linux. Americans can purchase an operating system that cost over a billion dollars to develop for \$89, or they can get a less capable Linux OS free, or buy a MAC. There is no evidence of consumer harm and none was provide in the trial. I see

the case being driven significantly by politics. More specifically political use of the DOJ for special interest (Microsoft's competitors).

Consider Microsoft's competition, Microsoft must convince consumers that it's product at \$89 dollars is better than it's competitor (Linux) at the cost of \$0 (zero). How can Microsoft be considered a monopoly when it has this level of competition? Will the government be happy when a Chinese version of Linux dominates the desktop and tax revenue from hightech industries are lost. Please review this issue carefully as it affects the ability of our nation to compete in the world economy. Please don't undermine the freemarket and hard work of millions of American who invest in Microsoft and other great companies.

Concerned American
 Jessie L Conner
 6550 Point Comfort Lane
 Charlotte, NC 28226

MTC-00009610

From: Michael Farnham, R.
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:22pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is a huge organization and a de-facto monopoly. However in the technology business this is somewhat meaningless and they have traditionally produced some fantastic pieces of software. I work for an organization that sells and supports Microsoft products. One of our biggest vendors (Great Plains) was purchased by Microsoft. Since that has happened they have raised our fees and cut our margins. They have begun to charge for services that had been free. I think the real issue with Microsoft is their predatory business practices. I do not feel that the settlement will keep them from engaging in practices that stifle competition or innovation. The settlement appears to be a temporary fix that actually reinforces their hegemony and has no real staying power to enforce compliance. It appears that they have purchased the right amount of political influence and that the Department of Justice has sold us all out. Hope you all got a lot of money.

R. Michael Farnham
 Business Microvar, Inc.
 Direct: (651) 746-1494
 Fax: (651)746-1495
 Cell: (612) 325-1993

MTC-00009611

From: Larry Stregger
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 WE SUPPORT THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT!!!
 Anne & Larry Stregger
 1405 Kings Row
 Plainview, Texas 79072-9244
 #806-291-8601

MTC-00009612

From: Ruth Lykins
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:39pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft

I wish to express my support for the proposed agreement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. Microsoft has agreed to allow access to various Windows features to computer manufacturers and has agreed to design future versions of Windows easier to install on non-Microsoft software. The government has established an oversight committee to ensure Microsoft compliance in the future. I believe this is more than enough for any firm.

Bill Gates has worked long and hard to make Microsoft successful. A person should not be penalized for being successful. It is time to settle this matter and I believe this has been accomplished through the proposed agreement.

I hope to see the settlement finalized soon and no more action taken against Microsoft. Thank you.

Sincerely,
 Ruth Lykins
 2425 Main Street
 Ashland, Ky 41102

MTC-00009613

From: Christine Keller
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:41pm
 Subject: I SUPPORT THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

AS A TAXPAYING CITIZEN OF THE GREAT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, I SUPPORT THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S SETTLEMENT OF THE MICROSOFT LAWSUIT. LET'S PUT AN END TO THE CLINTON ERA FORM OF ABUSE IN THE FREE MARKET PLACE.

MTC-00009614

From: BBB200@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 2:50pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Taxpayer Employee,

I would like to make you aware of my strong feelings on the Microsoft case. I think it is a case that should be resolved quickly and fairly. I noticed that the stock market decline began about the time of the case, and I know Microsoft is a very important part of the US economy, especially in the area of future growth. I know that Microsoft has helped, not hurt, consumers, and has provided great stimulus to our national economy. As a taxpayer, citizen, and voter, I would like to see this matter resolved so that we can get our economy rolling again, which would help all Americans.

Thanks for considering this. [I have no affiliation with Microsoft].

Bert Brumett
 Shoreline, WA

MTC-00009615

From: Terry Scanlon
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/8/02 2:53pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Renata B. Hesse
 Trial Attorney
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW

Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Ms. Hesse:

Microsoft Corporation has accepted the U.S. government's finding that it engaged in anti-competitive practices in violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. By accepting the terms of the "Proposed Final Judgment" the corporation signals its intent to end the litigation and settle this issue as quickly as possible. It is a mark of Microsoft's statesmanship and good sense that it has accepted the judgment and will abide by the law. The Court has made its decision and all must accept it.

Incredibly, the states opposing this settlement want the Court to define future standards for engineering software in a competitive marketplace.

They want Microsoft to give its source code to competing software developers so that competitors can write new applications that will work off Microsoft's operating system.

They also want Microsoft to rewrite its operating system so that computer manufacturers can put onto Microsoft's system the programs of other companies, such as the Java program produced by Sun Microsystems. In other words, the states invite the Court to anticipate and remedy future and unproven anti-competitive actions by Microsoft even though the development and future uses of software cannot be predicted. The states' remedy-to force additional disclosures beyond those in the Proposed Final Judgment, which the federal government has determined are sufficient to curb the company's anti-competitive practices-confuses aiding the process of competition with aiding specific competitors.

The technology of the information age is rapidly evolving. It is foolhardy for courts or policymakers to attempt to direct the future course of software applications. It is particularly inappropriate for courts to do this on the assumption that one company will act in bad faith and undertake anti-competitive practices in the future. This in effect is what the states advise the Court to do.

Sincerely,

Terrence Scanlon

Chairman, Capital Research Center
and

Former Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission

MTC-00009616

From: Rafiki
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:52pm

Please end clinton era dealings, that draft dodger has hurt the entire country..

MTC-00009617

From: Barbara Uhrig
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:53pm
Subject: Let Microsoft alone

I was thrilled to find an address I could use to let you know that the Microsoft case is the silliest thing I have ever seen. In high school, we studied about breaking up monopolies, and I believed the line that monopolies stifle the market. This may be true in steel production, but not in the idea arena. It

seems that all that happened is that Microsoft spent millions defending itself against the government which spent millions trying to break up the company. The Bell Telephone company was broken up. Friends had to move away after their jobs vanished. Now service (repairs) is not very good and even Ameritech has put on (twice) packages of services that I never ordered. I don't think that breaking up the telephone company facilitated the development of telephones, and I don't think that breaking up Microsoft will facilitate the improvement of computers.

Sincerely,

Barbara L. Uhrig

8718 Jamaica Court

Indianapolis, IN 46219-2505

MTC-00009618

From: TobeyTwo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 2:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing this e-mail to encourage the court to settle the Microsoft suit. I do not believe the public has been damaged by Microsoft's practices. Not being an attorney, I do not understand all the nuisances of the case, but being a private citizen it does seem to me this case is being fueled by Microsoft's competitors. I also will add I am writing this e-mail on an Apple computer. My concern the reason Microsoft is being singled out is because they have not played the political game as well as they might have. I find that a sad commentary on our justice system. In closing I would think it would behoove the justice system to investigate Enron where many have been seriously financially damaged.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Mary Bush

MTC-00009619

From: STEPHEN J BANNON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I totally disagree with the government. Microsoft did not do anything wrong and the law itself should be erased from the books on moral grounds. This is the best example of non-objective law that we have on the books today. In a free country you are free to do anything as long as you don't infringe on anyone rights which Bill Gates didn't do. Capitalism is not based on free competition, it is base on freedom i.e. the freedom to think of any idea and see if the market will buy it Therefore the Justice Department should be doing what it should have been doing all along protecting the rights of its citizens from the likes of bin laden not going after a true American like Bill Gates The justice Department should drop all charges and praise him for his sprit The people around the hate us for this sprit and they want to kill us for our ideas. Govverment just wants to muffle and hurt its citazens with this unjust law. It is a shame that in a country that upholds freedom as its basic tenet that a man can not do business as he pleases.

Stephen Bannon

Garden Grove Ca.

MTC-00009620

From: VicForrest@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:05pm
Subject: Fwd: Microsoft Settement
VICTORIA M. FORREST
P.O. Box 222
Botsford, Connecticut 06404
January 8, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

As a 16-year employee in the technology field and user of Microsoft products and services, I am happy to see that Microsoft will not be broken up by the recent antitrust settlement with the Department of Justice. In fact, I believe that the case never should have been brought against them in the first place.

Over the last decade, Microsoft has done much for the IT industry and the American economy as a whole. They have created jobs, raised performance standards, and led innovation into the 21st century. While Microsoft should have been more open with some of its technology and systems, lawmakers and politicians have no right to penalize them for being the best. if anything, Microsoft should be applauded and given a degree of freedom to innovate.

During our current economic crisis, I believe politicians and lawmakers should be looking out for the best interest of American public by facilitating growth and development in business and not hindering it. They need to put aside their political differences and allow Microsoft and the IT industry to focus on business. I sincerely hope that no further litigation is brought against Microsoft in the future.

Thank you for your time.

Victoria Forrest

MTC-00009622

From: ke4zex@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:31pm
Subject: To Whom It May Concern:

To Whom It May Concern:

I think the ruling of the Court Of Appeals is a fair and just ruling and should STAND for the benefit of every person in our Country. Please lets end this thing.

Sincerely,

William H. Hopkins
22113 Soliel Circle West
Boca Raton, Fl. 33433

MTC-00009623

From: donaldjordan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:35pm
Subject: microsoft lawsuit

Why doesnt the government drop these charges against this company, seems there are more important issues that needs to be adressed at this time.

Thank you.

D. Jordan

MTC-00009624

From: Xia You
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this settlement between Microsoft and DOJ is very good for both the consumer and the national economy.

Regards.

MTC-00009625

From: Bowen, James W
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 3:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
80 Candlelight Drive
Glastonbury, CT 06033
January 8, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to express my support of the recent settlement between the federal government and Microsoft. The terms of the settlement seem fair and reasonable, and further litigation on the federal level must be ended to allow business to resume.

Considering the terms of the agreement, Microsoft must make several significant changes in the way they handle business. The company must now allow its competitors to use interfaces from Windows products to develop more accessible and efficient applications, and cannot face retribution from Microsoft for doing so. A "Technical Committee" will ensure that this happens. This would appear to resolve the concerns raised by the litigants. With the many terms of the agreement, seeking further litigation will be a waste of time and money for not only the taxpayers but the government as well.

Sincerely,
James W. Bowen

MTC-00009626

From: James Robison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:47pm
Subject: Get off Microsoft

Right after the Clinton JD went after Microsoft, stock prices began to go down the tubes. The reason was that investors could see that the federal government was playing favorites. And, if the JD could go after Microsoft to help out Sun, et al, who would be next? Lets get back to equal justice for all: drop the case entirely!

James C. Robison
Edenton, NC

MTC-00009627

From: James L. Niemann, Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:50pm
Subject: End Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse now!

I think it is high time to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse. I consider the Microsoft case simply a witch hunt by a bunch of computer illiterate government representatives. Computers are so much easier to use thanks to Bill Gates and Microsoft and anyone who does not want to use Microsoft products does not have to. You only have a monopoly when their are no options available, such as the United States Postal Service.

Signed:
James and Ruth Ann Niemann

573 Huntleigh Ct.
Farmington, MO 63640-2036
(573) 701-0135

MTC-00009628

From: Pap, Victor III
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 3:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I write to publicly express my opinion that Microsoft Corp. a.) did not have a monopoly but b.) that in the event it did have a monopoly, then the monopoly could only be an actual benefit to consumers. Finally, I strongly believe the legal actions of both the states and the companies are more harmful economically and against the notion of the free market, a principle on which this country is founded.

If there was anything more I could do to support Microsoft, I would.

Victor Pap III
Press Secretary/Legislative Aide
Representative George N. Peterson, Jr.
House Minority Whip
State House, Room 124
Boston, MA 02133
Tel. 617.722.2100

MTC-00009629

From: Pap, Victor III
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 3:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement II

I also forgot to mention that I honestly believe the economic boom of the 90's had more to do with a universal windows platform on which technologies could build and compete with products than either the President or Congress, Democrats or Republicans. The government's suit on Microsoft may have also had a minor effect on the already declining profitability of tech companies' (I'm sure it didn't cause it, but it certainly did not help).

Victor Pap III
Press Secretary/Legislative Aide
Representative George N. Peterson, Jr.
House Minority Whip
State House, Room 124
Boston, MA 02133
Tel. 617.722.2100

MTC-00009630

From: Festival Books
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 3:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed Microsoft settlement should NOT be approved. Microsoft obstructed and prevented fair and legal competition. The proposed settlement fails to achieve the necessary goal of a proper remedy. It fails to halt illegal conduct. It fails to promote competition in the industry. It fails to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains.

Dr. O.F. Rothchild

MTC-00009631

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft
ATR,rremington@webtv.net@inetgw
Date: 1/8/02 4:01pm
Subject: Too Many Chefs . . . Play Action

Recently, a narrowcast cable commercial aired last evening on Monday Night Football featuring a young man picking up his early

morning newspaper while a neighbor was also retrieving his. (I am usually up very early in my neighborhood, retrieving the newspaper before 6 AM in most cases.)

The commercial has a deja vu theme to it as the event is presented twice during the 30 second spot. This commercial first aired after Sunday January 6, 2002. The young man first says, "Hmm, . . . Sunday . . . going to be a good day", as he looks at the cover of the large Sunday edition. The neighbor yells out, "Too many chefs!" The scene is repeated with the comments, "Play Action!", for the neighbor's line.

The message is an explanation/ reinforcement of the multiple "chefs", "so called leaders", and others who are directing the multinational million dollar publicity campaign. Of course, as the sage adage goes, "too many cooks spoil the broth". The original recipe for Quaker Instant Stadium Organist called for this action (similar to the cloning techniques seen in the film "The Boys From Brazil":

Scenario . . .
Secret Government Plan—Dateline 1955 . . . height of the atomic cold war with the Soviet Union . . . Eisenhower/Nixon administration . . . Duck & Cover mentality . . . Fallout Shelters in shopping malls & churches . . . Walt Disney opens Disneyland—Anaheim . . . can social engineering create replacements for our film and music stars?

CAST
Mother: Tennessee Virgin who stops running

Father: Navy veteran who's hard work and blue collar Chicago connections help him climb social and economic ladders.

Mother's unmarried spinster Aunt: Confined to her musical world spinning tunes from her Hammond Organ Novachord. Lives with mother and father in 1950s with extended family. Aunt is about 10 years older than mother, and a favorite friend.

def. Tennessee Virgin . . . sister who can outrun her brother

Take first born male child and move child through many homes, neighborhoods, & school districts including private schools. Use television social programming through broadcast advertising to entice parents to "move up" during the 1960s to larger homes in suburban Chicago. Keep father traveling majority of time in order to continue music preparations for family.

Force oldest child to learn keyboard music via electronic organs & recorded music. Deny college eligible youth to attend college of his choice and educational level. Acquiesce local to community college education. Channel youth to entertain A.C. Nielsen executives in Northbrook, Illinois restaurant, designed to launch replacement for Chicago Blackhawks Hockey Team Stadium Pipe Organist upon retirement. Use private Germanic musical teacher to provide initial instruction and "reference" for A.C. Nielsen / Grove Inn first professional musical performance.

Original Stadium musician performed from about 1930—1972 before first protege became a permanent replacement from 1972—1982. Finally promote best of all of the performing organist youth from the Chicago area to Blackhawk Stadium Organist, firing first

protege in 1982. There were probably 10 restaurants or night clubs developing talent for the Chicago Stadium, like minor league ball clubs & college sports programs. Now . . . I have already documented this in various ways . . . and it's really a weird recipe, but it's true!

The chefs in Washington DC, Texas, California, Chicago, & Redmond, WA have been stalling & salting this recipe without providing me any interesting work, or rights to invest my money in areas of my interest . . . aviation, space technology, and personal fitness. This "recipe" has provided no performing musician interested in performing, and has only stalled justice.

The "creative" Marino neighborhood was designed by one of the Aliso Viejo or Redmond chefs who wanted Buy.com to grow, forcing me into a hostile area. After choosing financial services with a competitor to the Bank of America and fighting a B of A executive decision to intentionally ruin my credit, I fought back.

Later, the local chefs tried to spin a musical performance with the Crystal Cathedral and the Mighty Ducks Hockey Team . . . failing on both attempts, but causing me additional attacks, and assaults by those involved with the nefarious schemes. My recent PR campaign at NBC-Burbank once again brought international chefs who screwed with the recipe . . . fortunately I was in the studio audience when Jay Leno, Wolfgang Puck, & Tim Allen tried to make pizza together!

In between all of the years of performances & musical instruction I have received an education in marketing, finance, aviation & space technology, electronic and digital circuit design, healthcare, legal, and fitness through my own personal interests. Millions of people have benefitted from my innovations, and thousands have personally purchased their computers, and information technology from me!

The TD Waterhouse print and broadcast advertising commercials feature a retired executive relinquishing the "decisions" to their clients via the TD Waterhouse website with a comment, "It's your investment choice". To this very day, in 2002, other family members are "controlling" my earned assets to channel me once again to a musical performance, denying me my rights and earned income through royalties and investments illegally stolen from me. They have schemed with the Crystal Cathedral, Arrowhead Pond, Disney, and the Tonight Show . . . holding me back from a career I have enjoyed and contributed to from 1977 to 2002 in personal electronics, business and network computing systems, and advanced telecommunications.

The assets are in the billions and some of the "bigshots" controlling them have ties to the US Government with bonds, notes, and business transactions. They just don't want to give up this control . . . but, people are replaced everyday . . . for instance . . . The ABC television network replaces their veteran executive, Stu Bloomberg with Susan Lyne and AOL Time Warner adjusts the "goodwill" of the 2001 approved merger by \$60,000,000,000. That's sixty billion dollars, folks . . . that's a sum that could probably

purchase all of Irvine, California and parts of Newport Beach!

Thanks for listening! Please help me obtain control of my assets in order for all of us to improve our Nation and other area of the world.

Robert Remington

MTC-00009632

From: Bob Jackson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:59am
Subject: input on Microsoft
To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to see the unjust action against Microsoft stopped!! Computer users have benefited from the Microsoft Windows. Bill Gates has helped the whole computer using world. The other companies were not looking to improve the computing environment and create user-friendly programs and got left behind with their approach the their operating systems and programs. If the Justice Department continues their unfounded attack on Microsoft the computer users will be the losers.

Thanks for reading my opinion.
Bob Jackson
Irving, Texas

MTC-00009633

From: Barry Stephens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to voice my support for a settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust case. Before we continue to squander more taxpayer dollars, please be done with this process. I never believed the process, and still am angry at the use of countless government resources to hobble an American company involved in the high tech industry. Anti-trust protection is a valid responsibility of the DOJ, and yet it seems that the competitors were directing the case. Any reasonably astute American must know that in the environment in which Microsoft operates, a new and better OS, Browser, or other competitive software could be introduced tomorrow which will render Windows obsolete. As a taxpayer I would prefer that not one more dollar be spent on this waste of money.

Barry D. Stephens
37 Gray Lodge Road,
Kittery, Maine, USA

MTC-00009634

From: Joyce Kerze
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:13pm
Subject:

Joyce R. Kerze
4899 Golf Village Drive
Powell, Ohio 43065
January 5, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

As an avid user of Microsoft products, I would like to express my opinion that legal action against Microsoft should stop. I think you have offered Microsoft a good settlement. I believe that the current settlement will

suffice to allow computer manufacturers new rights to configure systems with access to Windows features.

I urge you to continue on the course of the present settlement, and not get distracted by the critics trying get this settlement withdrawn. This settlement is fair, and will create more competition in the IT industry. This settlement requires Microsoft to open up its code to competitors, so that they will be able to create better software. Furthermore under this agreement a technical committee that includes a government official will watch over Microsoft full time. Your support of this settlement is necessary to bring it to fruition, and that is needed to bring this three-year-old case to an end.

Once again I would like to urge you to put your full support behind the finalization of the settlement you have offered to the Microsoft Corporation. Don't let the anti Microsoft peanut gallery win the day.

Sincerely,
Joyce Kerze

MTC-00009635

From: R. Michael Kasperzak, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to voice my support for the settlement between Microsoft and the United States.

As a former attorney and professional mediator, I have faith in the mediation process and believe that the negotiators for the United States made the best deal they felt they could in light of continuing litigation. I do not believe it is in the public interest for the Judicial branch to second guess the the Executive Branch with respect to the terms of the settlement, and therefore encourage the court to approve the pending settlement.

Very Truly Yours,
R. Michael Kasperzak, Jr.
Dispute Resolution Specialists

MTC-00009636

From: WMickel191@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:46pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Dear Sirs:

I understand that this is the time for public comment on the Microsoft settlement. My feeling is that a settlement is long overdue and should be in favor of Microsoft. Our whole economy is dependent on free enterprise. Ever since this all began our economy has been in decline. It is time to get this over with and get back to the business of business. It is almost impossible to use a computer and not use a Microsoft product. This case has hurt my economic well being. Time to settle.

Thank you,
William N Mickelson

MTC-00009637

From: david tiry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:53pm
Subject: Sirs:

Sirs:
I would like to see an end to Clinton era anti trust abuses!!!!
TODAY!!!!!!!!!!!!

Thanks,
David Tiry

MTC-00009638

From: Sally Detloff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 4:55pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
WOOD APPRECIATE A SWIFT END TO THE JUSTICE DEPT. ACTIONS AGAINST MICROSOFT. KEEP IN MIND THAT THE JUSTICE DEPT'S ACTIONS, SINCE THE BEGINNING, HAVE BEEN DIRECTED TOWARDS THE WELFARE OF A GROUP OF COMPANIES, RATHER THAN FOR THE WELFARE OF THE CONSUMER.
SINCERELY,
GERALD F. DETLOFF
apataki6@earthlink.net

MTC-00009639

From: CA Cobb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:00pm
Subject: I am a citizen who requests an end to the Anti-trust law abuse directed at Microsoft.
There have been many jobs and much money generated by the works of the Microsoft Company and it is time to "get back to business" and quit the "harping" that began in the Clinton-era and persists now. Please stop it and move forward for the good of the Country and the economy.
Sincerely,
Betty J. Cobb
Waco, Texas

MTC-00009640

From: Chuck DeSario
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:04pm
Subject: Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse
To whom this may concern,
As an American tax payer, and business man. I would greatly appreciate the Justice Dept. ending this anti-trust suit with Microsoft. Simply put and in my opinion the action that the D.O.J. took against Microsoft during the Clinton administration has been counter productive, not only has this issue cost the American tax paying public, millions, if not billions of dollars in lost income and corporate and personal income tax it has virtually destroyed our electronics industry single handily.
Please know that I am not pro monopoly, but I am a realist. Microsoft for all it's faults helps create a great economic base for this country. How you might ask does Microsoft contribute to the economy, simple.

1. They employ a large number of employee's who earn incomes which are distributed locally and nationally. Taxes are extruded from their pay checks, which in-turn contribute to the needs of both state and federal governments.

2. Microsoft's software programs are so cluttered with garbage, that the average computer requires huge amounts of memory, (XP, as an example requires your computer to have at least 128mb of memory on board), just to install the program, i.e.: R & D, employees, income, income and corporate taxes, etc. from memory companies.

3. Microsoft's programs also require larger capacity Hard Drives, which in-turn is great

for our Hard Drive industry, (Maxtor, Seagate, Quantum, IBM.) i.e.: R & D, employees, income, income and corporate taxes, etc. Taxes are generated from both corporate, individual earnings, as well as taxes generated from the sale of the items at the retail level.

4. Processors, Intel Processors. Microsoft's programs are so cluttered you have to have a faster processor just to wade through all the garbage, otherwise you'll be sitting for hours just waiting for your computer to pull up the smallest of projects. i.e.: R & D, employees, income, income and corporate federal and state taxes, etc.

Bottom line, destroy, revamp, breakup Microsoft, and you destroy our computer industry. Yes, Microsoft may be a monopoly, WHO CARES! Millions, Billions of dollars, both income and tax dollars are being lost everyday you persist with this Anti—Trust law suit. Enough is Enough, lets get our economy back on track. Microsoft in it's own weird way has contributed to our economy for the last 10yrs. Please for the sake of the nation, cease in the pursuit of all law suites against Microsoft.

Sincerely
Chuck DeSario
Louisville, CO

MTC-00009641

From: Porter Cragin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
12224 Northeast 130th Way
Kirkland, Washington 98034
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to express my opinion on the recent Microsoft antitrust case. After three years it is obvious that the settlement had a great deal of care put into it.

Microsoft has been dealing with this issue for three years and the litigation appears to have stymied business throughout the computer industry. Pursuing further litigation could possibly bring an entire industry to its knees. This company has put out some outstanding products, and now stands to be punished for their innovative thinking. The dedication and efforts shown are what build this country. Do we really want to penalize them for doing a great job in there chosen field of endeavor?

Let's not be the ones to slow down our own progress.

Sincerely,
Porter Cragin
12224 NE 130th Way
Kirkland, WA 98034
portcragin@pcragin.com
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00009642

From: Nikil M
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello I am a member of the community that supports BeOS. I feel that Microsoft's tactics limited BeOS from competing in the

market despite a product that was very competitive. As a remedy I suggest that Microsoft immediately allow dual or triple boot options for computers from the large computer manufacturers like Dell and Compaq without any penalties. There should also be much more documentation on the win32 API so if a developer wishes to create a compatible yet superior product they may. Finally Microsoft should pay I think between 50 and 100 million dollars to either Be Inc or Palm for the damages their tactics cost to the companies. Nikil Mulakken

MTC-00009643

From: Phil Hall
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an Information Technology professional with several years of experience, I watched and read the news about the Microsoft trial with great anxiety. I know full well that if handled improperly the situation would destroy an existent company (Microsoft) for no reason, while at the same time elevating competitors for no reason as well.

Microsoft is like no other company in the history of the world. To liken it to pre-antitrust AT&T, Standard Oil, Alcoa, etc. is a gross underestimation of Microsoft's importance and would do great injustice.

I will freely admit that some actions taken by Microsoft have been potentially anticompetitive; however, if you examine the track records of the competition you will find them in a more stable environment now than the time before Microsoft's improper activities. Without exception, all the competition has benefited from the current situation, and the topic of harm to the consumer is nothing more than a smoke-screen.

Look at what Microsoft has done with the Windows Operating System. It has brought the Internet to the masses in an easily understandable form, it has "leveled the playing field" for software developers and the home user, it has brought into play an entire industry that was non-existent prior to Windows 95 being made available for sale.

Certainly, Microsoft has benefited, as is to be expected. But to claim that the consumer has been unduly harmed is foolish and outright wrong. If Microsoft is to be punished, let the punishment fit the crime. Dissolution is inappropriate, only a fine would be sufficient. A monetary penalty is the only correct solution. This coupled with a probationary oversight on business practices would definitely hinder Microsoft's alleged illegal business practices and would allow the US to recoup any losses from the investigation and would allow for a fostering of the market system to flourish.

I would remind you that Windows is dominant in the marketplace, and to damage that would create undue chaos. It is safer, and wiser, for Microsoft to remain a single unit and to be penalized via monetary fine rather than to take action that in less than 5 years would be inconsequential. The field of Information Technology grows and changes at such a rate that any decision made now would seem foolhardy within 5 years.

Make certain to understand that to promote competition for the mere sake of competition

can be detrimental to what is actually in the best interest of the people. The Law doesn't make that distinction.

Thank you,
Phil Hall
1230 Dundee Avenue
Waterloo, IA 50701

MTC-00009644

From: Ben Hughes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:11pm
Subject: Clinton Era

I would like to see the end of the Clinton era abuse of anti-trust legislation and court action.

Microsoft has provided jobs to multitudes of people and made millionaires of another group who started out as workers.

Thank you,
Sue & Ben Hughes
Lindale, Texas

MTC-00009645

From: Shayned@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ: I am alarmed that the Microsoft case may be reopened. It seems to me that the litigation simply punished a company that innovated, created jobs and wealth, and was successful. I was happy to see the case settled and would not want that settlement derailed. I notice that since the DOJ began litigation against Microsoft, its stock price has declined. Is that what you call "the public interest?" My retirement mutual funds probably own Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Shayna Alterman

MTC-00009646

From: vera feingold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:16pm
CC: hlfein@juno.com@inetgw
To Bill Gates

No good deed should go unpunished. If you and your Company would have failed, you would be entitled to tax breaks and other assistance from the government. Since you do not need any assistance from the Government, the government seeks revenge. Hell hath no fury like a bureaucrat scorned.

As a volunteer teacher for SeniorNet, I want to thank you for your generous on-going contributions of software for the centers and for the teachers.

Vera Feingold

MTC-00009647

From: zxxx xxx
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

- open Office file formats,
- Win32 APIs,
- make dual-boot options mandatory.

P.S. Sorry for my english. I'm writing from Greece

Regards

Lambros S.

MTC-00009648

From: Paul Moncznik
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is important for both the industry and the economy that this settlement quickly get passed. This a tough settlement, and a fair one for Microsoft, its competitors, and for consumers. And besides, how could anyone be against a settlement which provides computers for thousands of the country's neediest schools?

MTC-00009649

From: Ivory M Bassett-Bishop
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:32pm

To Whom It May Concern:

I am extremely happy that this issue with Microsoft is being resolved. I was very pleased when the suit came about because of personal experiences trying to use other browsers, i.e. Netscape as well as IE.

The MS os would shut down and I would have to manually shut down my pc. This was not only damaging my hard drive but was causing great frustration. I was investigating all potential OS (operating systems) but everyone of them lacked. I felt trapped unless I chose Apple. Which I did for my then college daughter. Nevertheless, she soon found it too cumbersome to convert and download the materials she needed for her studies and by her junior year in nursing she brought a unit that came with a Microsoft OS. I always felt trapped in the MS no-alternative bag. In fact I just purchased a new computer last Sept. 2001, it came with ME already loaded and I would receive an automatic XP upgrade when it came out in Oct. Without knowing anything about the XP I began to investigate its attributes and pits. I found out it literally has the potential to see who is using their software, who is sharing it (I personally believe when I buy something its mine and I should be able to do with it whatever I please—that includes giving it to whomever I please, using it as I please—I PAID FOR THAT PRIVILEGE.)and if need be shutting down your system. They have since sent me the software with no info on these ramifications only mildly informing ME, the consumer, of the enhancements. If I really want to get more out of it I guess I could by one of Microsofts XP learning books or software packages. I am still in a quandary as to whether or not to install this product.

Anyway I am glad this issue has been bought out and has been resolved to some degree. I hope the consumers can now be given the opportunity to have a choice of products. As you can see Microsoft has given me one benefit I hold dear, that is HOTMAIL.

Thank You
Ivory Bishop

MTC-00009650

From: Graham—d
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs

I am what I think is a 'standard user' meaning I use Microsoft products for my

work and at home. I work in a bank which has standardized on Microsoft products and from a user's perspective they work, they talk to each other and we rely on Microsoft to sort out problems of compatibility.

Breaking up the company or charging massive fines is simply not right and will have a negative impact on a company that helps keep America ahead of the world. Can you imagine the French doing this? I think that sometimes we do not realize what we have here. The settlement in my view is totally fair and I question the motives of those seeking to overturn it.

Apart from being a user of their products I have no involvement in the company and do not own any shares or have any financial interest in the ultimate decision.

Graham Doubtfire
graham—d@msn.com

MTC-00009651

From: B.L. Doern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 5:40pm
Subject: Drop it already!

Microsoft is a big player in our economy. Please finish this case as soon as possible so that we can get it behind us and move on to economic recovery.

BettyLou Doern
Modesto, California

MTC-00009652

From: Becky Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust law

MTC-00009653

From: Helene (038) Ken Hickey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As provided in the Tunney Act, I wish to indicate my full support for the proposed settlement with Microsoft.

I have reviewed the documents relating to this settlement

Kenneth T. Hickey
58 Longmeadows Road
Wilton, CT 068971-101

MTC-00009654

From: LPeterson2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the proposed settlement is adequate. Please put this issue to rest so that we can move forward on other more pressing issues and matters confronting our nation. Microsoft is not the enemy! Thank you.

MTC-00009655

From: econrad@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has decent products at reasonable prices, that is why they are the largest software vendor. However they are not the only one. I can think of three other operating systems and a couple other office suites just off hand and I am not in the computer industry, there could easily be more that I am un aware of. Very often I can

find share ware or even free ware that does the job for me and use these types of programs all the time.

I think it is a mistake to try to disassemble Microsoft. The goal of intergrating programs to work better together is the way we should be headed not tearing them down.

E S Conrad, Jr.
1400 Talisman Circle
Virginia Beach, Va. 23464

MTC-00009656

From: Lawrence York
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:25pm
Subject: Regarding the MSFT Settlement

I am a Microsoft Business user, Portfolio Manager and Consumer. I strongly feel that it is time to get the Microsoft case settled and I believe the terms and conditions reached by the Federal Government are fair and reasonable. I believe that the hold-out states are politically motivated due to their tech constituencies who seek more to distract a successful competitor than than to see justice served.

I think it is a disservice to the public to spend additional taxpayer money on this case and I think reaching a settlement will greatly improve the prospects for the tech sector. This in turn should benefit the government by helping the industry recover from its deep recession eventually returning it to profitability.

A lot of time has elapsed. Microsoft and the Government have reached a settlement that strikes a balance for the public good. Please now, lets focus on rebuilding and growth not political agenda and distruction. America needs this now more than ever.

Lawrence York
Portfolio Manager,
The WWW Funds

MTC-00009657

From: Jean Saylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I believe that the Microsoft Settlement is fair and just, and would urge you to ensure that it is not changed. I believe it is crucial for the future of the industry that Microsoft be allowed to continue their innovative work. I feel that it is particularly important for additional features to be integrated into the existing operating system. Any computer user can attest to the extensive compatibility problems which exist when trying to integrate software from various manufacturers. For many users, just the thought of having to install various pieces of software, whether or not from multiple manufacturers, is deterrent enough to prevent them from getting the most out of their computers, or even from attempting to use a computer. If computers are ever going to be useful to those of us in the general population who do not have extensive technical backgrounds, then simpler, integrated solutions are necessary. I believe Microsoft is one of the best at providing this. I would certainly like to see more companies also attempting to provide a fully-integrated solution, but prohibiting our leading

company from participating is ludicrous. And certainly, your role should not be to punish success.

Thank you for your consideration to this point of view.

Jean Saylor

MTC-00009658

From: G. B.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:39pm
Subject: comment

Dear Sr. or Madam:

I am an electrical engineer and It is my opinion that in the US best interest Microsoft has to remaine strong and united but in the other hand I think the US Government has to regulate Microsoft activities because they really take advantage of there monopoly position and a good example is my last experience: I bought a new computer with Windows XP home edition and I connected it to my home LAN only to find out that this new version has no privacy, I can not put a password to any file, resource or carpet so I can not have my information available in any computer of my house and at the same time prevent my kids of seeing that information in other computer of the LAN.

In previews versions of Windows (95, 98 and Millenium) this was possible so Microsoft took out some functions and now if you want those functions you have to buy the XP professional version (at a higher price, of course). To make things worst, if you assume that the new home version will have at least all the functions that the last one had (a good assumption because this is the case with manufacturers in a normal market and not in a monopoly) and buy it there is no upgrade to the professional version paying only the difference so if I want my privacy in my LAN I need to buy a XP professional as if I did not have the XP home edition.

This is just one example of the kind of abuses that Microsoft Monopoly make and that is why I think that the US Government has to regulate Microsoft in a way that this kind of practices will be avoided.

Many thanks for your attention.
Gregorio Beitman

MTC-00009659

From: Ralph Sickinger (R2)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:51pm
Subject: Proposal for Resolution to United States v. Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

I respectfully submit the following proposal as a possible penalty against Microsoft: My proposal is quite simple: Microsoft should be compelled to release the complete source code for Windows 98 to the public domain. This proposal has the following benefits:

(1) It is simple and inexpensive to implement. It would be far less "traumatic" or difficult to implement than (for example) splitting up the company.
(2) It would benefit the public: one of the most significant injuries to the consumer as a result of Microsoft's actions is the lack of stability in the Windows OS. By comparison, Linux, which is open source, is VERY stable, because there is a large developer community

that works at fixing bugs that appear. The Windows community could benefit greatly from having an open-source version of the Windows OS available.

(3) It would be reasonable: Windows 98 is now 3 year-old technology; it is significantly behind Windows 2000 and Windows XP in terms of it's development. Also, it is a major iteration behind Windows 2000/XP; as a result, any competitor desiring to compete against Microsoft, would not be able to compete directly against Windows without some significant effort. At the same time, Windows 98 is still (just barely) current enough to not be worthless to the public.

Microsoft has not had to focus on the consumer, or be responsive to the consumer, since it does not face any significant competition in the OS segment. A public domain version of Windows 98 (or a variation of the OS further developed by a corporation) would provide consumers with another choice for an operating system that could still run the current generation of Windows software packages.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Ralph P. Sickinger
15735 Erwin Ct
Bowie, MD 20716
ralph@sickinger.net

MTC-00009660

From: Randall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 6:56pm
Subject: I want to end Clinton era Anti trust law abuse against Microsoft!

The whole thing with Microsoft has been insane. Leave Microsoft alone, and get on with the business of running the country. If people want to compete with Microsoft, then they need to get their brains in gear!!! We want the handful of people who have pursued this to get on with life.

Thanks
Tracey Sigle
Lincoln, NE

MTC-00009661

From: root@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,antitrust@ftc.gov@inetgw,Ralph@essen...
Date: 1/8/02 7:00pm
Subject: 21st Century Civilization
CC:letters@latimes.com@inetgw,letters@sjmercury.com@i...

MTC-00009662

From: Eduard and Carol Prets
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:05pm
Subject: Get off your ass and leave Microsoft alone

At a time like this when everything is going to hell, why are you wasting your time and money chasing after a company like Microsoft. Microsoft's secret is not illegal. They have a product that works—it's that simple. Other companies products either don't work, or they are not easy to use.

So, suck it up. Take a loss. You've wasted enough of our money. Tell all the other internet companies that are paying you that they need to get a life.

Sincerely,
A Tax Paying Citizen of Washington State

MTC-00009663

From: David Larman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
 I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: examples: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs and make dual-boot options mandatory.

Regards,
 David Larman

MTC-00009664

From: MOLITUO@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:14pm
 Subject: Wal-Mart vs Kmart

Dear DOJ:
 Rather than allow this endless pursuit of Microsoft whose products do NOT harm consumers, how about getting on Walmart's back for a change? Walmart has put hundreds of thousands of small vendors out of business, in addition to large chains like Caldor, Bradlee's, Jamesway, etc.! It looks like Kmart may be next!

I recently visited our local Kmart; and I found more cashiers on duty than there were customers in the store! Today, I made a purchase of one item at our local Walmart; and I had to wait about 20 minutes in a cashier's line because there were a multitude of customers and only about 5 cashiers on duty! The trick for Walmart seems to be this: After opening a new store, spoil your customers at first; then when they have been trained to frequent Walmart, lighten up on customer service! As a monopoly, you don't have to be good to your customers anymore! After all, the competition has for the most part gone out of business!

I'm being forced more and more to shop at Walmart, as their competitors "fade away!" DOJ should send a few agents incognito to some of their stores; and verify or disprove my complaint.

An intriguing observation: "How May I Help You?" is imprinted on the back of Walmart's employees' workjackets. Why on the back, I always wondered. I often find myself hurrying after one or another Walmart employee for help, as the "How May I Help You?" logo recedes rapidly into the distance, like a Doppler Effect! Racing after the offer of help, so to speak!

I wish something can be done to protect the few competitors that still survive!

Thank you,
 Nicholas S. Molinari
 31 Whitman Street
 Brick, NJ 08724-2448
 732-458-8485

MTC-00009665

From: William Stella
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/8/02 7:16pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear United States Department of Justice and U.S. District Court Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly: I am just a simple carpenter, (who also happens to be very close in age to Judge

Kollar-Kotelly—I will be 58 soon and our world-perspective is likely to be fundamentally somewhat similar), but I have some very real concerns regarding the Microsoft lawsuits from both the federal DOJ and state AGs. Basically, I think that none of you are acting in the best interests of the vast majority of Americans. My deep feelings of patriotism—and this is a very real patriotism issue—come from having served in the 7th Special Forces Group and the 82nd Airborne Division from 1961 through 1964, AND my consequent understanding that "all that is necessary for the forces of evil to prevail in the world is for enough good people to do nothing". I actually suspect—especially in the situation regarding the various state AGs gathering together and 'joining' in this legal action—that there are very strong questions about the constitutionality of said activity. Representatives from a number of states began to conspire and try to force the federal government to take certain kinds of actions in the past. A notable example was eventually thwarted by a guy—a President, if you will—named Abe Lincoln. I wrote a rather blunt letter to Judge Stanley Sporkin several years ago about the same basic issues involved with the DOJ, et al. Some of the cast-culprits from the competition have changed or been added, but their motives and behavior are just as scum-bag-greedy as ever! Here it is below, for your edification, entertainment and hopeful enlightenment:

(Note: I no longer live at the address shown in the letter. My current address is: 14424 North Creek Drive % 1126 Mill Creek, Washington 98012)

March 2, 1995

U.S. District Court Judge Stanley Sporkin
 The District Court for the District of
 Columbia
 United States Court House
 333 Constitution Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20001

Dear Judge Sporkin:

I am just a simple carpenter.

Perhaps you will help renew my faith in humanity and find it in your heart to take a little time to pay attention to a nobody like me. After all, you probably spend most of your day listening to lawyers—and I'll bet that my views are much more honest and fun. (I must admit that, thirty-some years ago, I gave only slightly more than a passing fancy to the notion that I might want to go to law school myself.) (I looked around at the company I'd be keeping and realized—your honor excepted, of course—that I might soon feel like Diogenes of Sinope—but picture him standing stark-naked on a minuscule ice floe floating in the Arctic Ocean in mid-December and having had F. Lee Bailey skip blithely across the water and r-r-r-r-r-r-rip his lantern from his hand, then trying to cover the faint flicker of his tiny now-substituting candle flame in the midst of an horrendous, howling, horrible, hailing, raging, ravaging, roaring, fierce, ferocious, furious, snowing, sleeting, multiplying savage storm!—rather than living his ideal, natural life of sitting in a tub and occasionally venturing-out, searching the daylight.) Whew! Dat be de long sentence. It's with considerable interest that I've been reading a great deal about your recent involvement in the Microsoft anti-trust

maybe/maybe not settlement. In addition to actually working for a living—I eagerly await a brief lay-off ending work-call from my union, Carpenters' Local 131, at this very moment—I've used microcomputers, at home and in several workplace situations, since the early Eighties.

And, I'm writing to you, Judge Sporkin, because I simply cannot believe that virtually all the press reports I've read have misquoted you and misunderstood you. (It is kinda nifty to read our local press folks. I am a Seattle Times subscriber and get exposed to excellent reporting from the likes of Steve Dunphy and Paul Andrews, fairly good reporting from Michele Matassa Flores—plus awful, inane, and inept garbage from our very own version of what can best be described as "Clueless in Seattle", O. Casey Corr. This nincompoop has just got to be the publisher's nephew or something!)

I read Hard Drive back when it was hot off the presses. Most of the personal and business behavior described in the Wallace/Erickson book seems nasty. It also seems pretty typical. The authors indicate that Bill Gates does not possess even the most basic or fundamental sense of ethics—whether it's having sex "with the wife of one of Osborne Computer's overseas executives" or stealing trade secrets from guileless prospective acquisition partners who've told Gates, or his confederates, too much. It may be that some of those stories are actually true hey, stranger things have happened! It may be that, at worst, Bill Gates is essentially amoral. Or, at best, he may be brash, arrogant, slick, sneaky, heavy-handed, and business-brutal. So fucking what? (Remember, I'm an unsophisticated tradesman. You will please excuse my lack of knowledge regarding proper judge-letter decorum. Throughout, I intend no disrespect to you or your institution.) (I must admit here that I would direct my personal admiration toward the likes of Arthur Ashe—I hope you've read his last book—rather than Bill Gates. And, perhaps, someday Gates will develop Ashe-like aspirations? Hope springs . . .)

What's the point of all this corporation meddling/oversight? Whimpy-assed also-rans and potential once-weres from their own silly ignorance and stupidity? Is it to protect some What IS Microsoft's competition doing? You know, Judge, it's almost as though all these wonderful, mega-bucks, ersatz business 'giants'—the CEOs at Apple, IBM, Motorola, Borland, Novell, and now, today, America Online, CompuServe, and Prodigy, decided to get together in a big circle and created some weird new-age ritual wherein they watched each other cut off their own balls! What a bunch of prissy little twits! Take a look at the marketplace. Really take a look. I mean, never mind those whining little suck-butts who have poor market savvy. Let me give you my own anecdotal example—it's pretty straight-forward:

1. I recently ordered, on February 17th, a Micron P100PCI Millennium PC. Micron, also an exceptionally talented company, has some sort of an agreement with Microsoft which provides Micron with Microsoft Office Professional 4.3/Microsoft Bookshelf on CD-ROM to bundle with its high-end PCs. I like that. (I would be quite surprised to learn that

Micron is a Reback silent partner—quite surprised, indeed.) IMPORTANT NOTE: Please understand, that if I choose, I may completely ignore ALL the software on my new computer, write all my own code using a wide variety of computer languages and operating systems on different sectors of my one-gigabyte hard drive, and develop any utility or application programs I dream up. My machine is fundamentally nothing more than a mass of potentially incredibly well-coordinated electronic impulses, just chomping at the bit, waiting for me to provide it with lucid instructions. This machine makes no demands on me, but offers me the tacit agreement that it will dance all over itself with zero/one delightfulness once I give it the proper zeros and ones. Hence, GIGO. (And this garbage-in-garbage-out concept could apply to lawsuits too—ya know what I mean, Verne?) We could get real anthropomorphic about it, but, it is just a fancy box of wires and wafers. So, what's left for me to do is to look around for some entity to take the aforementioned potential, and direct it better than I. N'est pas?

2. If you'd followed the development of PC software and hardware more closely, you would understand that this is a company, Microsoft, which produces excellent products—at a very reasonable price, with exceptional features which enable users to make very efficient use of their time and energy. (You'll notice that I didn't say "perfect" products, or even the "best" products. We have yet to see those—and it may not be Microsoft providing them!

3. Suppose I decide that I want to switch to Novell's PerfectOffice Professional software. I would run out to Egghead Software and buy it for \$550. That's a lot of money. But, when you look at most businesses—even quite small home businesses—that amount of money isn't going to make or break you. And, now you'd own both sets of office software! (You could do the same thing with Lotus SmartSuite for \$460.)

4. You could buy an Apple computer with an entirely different operating system, along with its own pretty handy software. Millions have. Why haven't millions more?

5. The number of software companies is growing remarkably fast, NOT SHRINKING—to a great extent because of Microsoft's enormous success and its continuing efforts to generate greater interest and involvement with personal computers. The old "bandwagon effect:"

6. Is the world rushing to IBM and their operating system, O/S 2 Warp? Why not? Could you, Judge Stanley Sporkin, decide to write your very own operating system, market it, and make tons of moolah? You, if you really know what you're doing, bet your sweet behind you could! SO, WHERE'S THE MONOPOLY? WHAT'S THE BIG DEAL?

And all this crap about "vaporware" and the "smoking gun". Gimme a break. Microsoft lawyers lied to you? Do lawyers lie? Do bears dump ordure in the woods? You see, it isn't just the knowledge that ALL software companies—and most hardware companies, like maybe IBM, (surely, in my humble opinion, one of lawyer Reback's clients), have been doing this "vapor" stuff

for forty years or more. By the way, so have the car makers, appliance companies, chemical companies, etc.

This is a very complex and challenging world into which you've fallen. The players inventors, developers, publishers, manufacturers, and customers—form a group unlike any you've ever imagined. The level of sophistication may be higher, especially that of the customers, than any other single societal element. And this fact is very important—even critical to you and your task. My hope is that you have some sort of "warp-speed" learning curve, since I don't believe, frankly, that you really know what's happening here. You have got to be damned sure that you are looking at victims.

Hey, help me out here. Is it possible that you may be thinking about putting some Rehnquist-like gold bands around your robes or something? I mean, I've picked-up this thing and perused it for years, from inside and out, top and bottom, at every imagined angle. I've squinted at it with a tilt, a lilt, and felt its temperature in all sorts of weather—and, mixing metaphors with complete abandon, you still look like a wild-ass bull in a fragile china shop to me.

Historically, the real damage done to society and our environments—both natural and competitive—has been visited upon us when large businesses or governmental agencies have colluded, not faced-off. (Oil companies, meat packers, railroads, the literally criminal behavior of General Motors and Standard Oil as they conspired to eliminate the trolley-car system in L.A., the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the Vietnam War, (I served in the 7th Special Forces Group and the 82d Abn. Div. from '61—'64, and have some first-hand knowledge of how and what our government did secretly—like Special Forces psych-warfare and sabotage teams operating, clandestinely, in North Vietnam during the late '50s and early '60s and the subsequent huge increase in manpower allocations following President Kennedy's visit to Fort Bragg and his viewing of our razzle-dazzle "sneaky pete" demonstrations—jet-pack-flying-soldiers bullshit and all. From your experience with the C.I.A. and the S.E.C., you understand the fundamental differences between groups-which-do-battle-amongst-themselves and groups-which-secretly-manipulate,-collude,-and-cooperate-while-publicly-portraying-themselves-as-rivals. The former may be rough all 'round as they behave in classic Darwinian fashion—providing more fit survivors. The latter gouges and rapes citizens and consumers. And denies all of us access to the better and best which life has to offer.

I'm convinced that you are having much trouble in gaining a clear picture of the issues involved in this case. (Yeah, I know that sounds rather smart-ass of me. But just try to consider some of what I have to say, in an open-minded manner, then worry about tone later.) Part of your difficulty lies in your lack of exposure to, and genuine familiarity with, the use and history of PCs and their software. Hard Drive presents only a small portion of that history, and it has a very narrow view to boot. Sources are all around you.

Scientific American has followed computers for many years now. The

September '94 issue has an excellent article, "Software's Chronic Crisis", you will find quite valuable. In fact, Scientific American has computer-related articles in nearly every issue, including the current March, '95 and many of them deal with business and software together.

And maybe give some thought to having a talk with people like George Fisher—who had a totally different approach to some of these same technology competition issues while he was the CEO at Motorola several years ago—and former Congressman, Secretary of Defense, White House Chief of Staff, and an accomplished businessman, Don Rumsfeld. They are just a couple of the sources available to you to get a realistic sense of the actual market forces at work.

Lastly, I want to mention, in general, some of the global market factors involved. As you know, millions of dollars are stolen from many U.S. software companies every year. Software developers are using more and more foreign sources for their work all the time. You run the risk of, once again, killing another American golden-egg-laying goose. If you want to drive all of Microsoft's operations, not just some of them, to India, Bulgaria, and who knows where—keep pounding away. A zippy little reality check shows that Gates could run his corporation from just about anywhere—all Microsoft facilities could be re-located to Halmahera, Jabalpur, or even Kumbukkan, whilst he and his gang of top bananas stroll the halls of their Puget Sound mansions, occasionally tapping a few keys in Microsoft Office Professional 4.3 to check-up on things.

What's happened to the American television and electronics industry? Autos? Book publishing? The point is, if you try to gain power and fame by bludgeoning world-class American corporations like Microsoft—in the misguided belief that they have a monopoly—you may actually provide even more opportunities for far less competent, ethical, and competitive software providers—and end-up destroying the enormous good side of our business environment for American companies. Frankly, foreign companies love the way our courts stomp on our businesses. (I'm not talking about real concerns like health and safety rules—I mean the very methods you seem so upset about. The exclusive license agreements which build powerful ties between Microsoft and its partners, and even other trade so-called 'questionable' practices.) Let the companies who complain and try to coerce the Justice Department, move their cause to civil courts with actual violations of law. Let 'em make their case with better products and prices in the marketplace. Let 'em go door-to-door, if necessary, with excellent products.

A year ago today, I turned fifty. I read Mr. Ashe's book and felt terrific for it. Today, on my fifty-first birthday, you, you lucky dog, are the recipient of my efforts at trying to make a small, positive difference. It may surprise you to learn that I don't own Microsoft stock, but I know several carpenters who do—they've done well and acted wisely. I hope you will too.

Sincerely,

William S. Stella

8615 238th Street, S.W., G302

Edmonds, Washington 98026
(206) 775-0550

P.S. Rest assured that I would certainly enjoy having the opportunity to meet you or talk with you at any time. If you ever visit the Seattle area, please give me a call and I'll treat you to Harry Nagamatsu's Atlantic Street Pizza—"Garlic Gulch" for sure. Maybe Willy Windows will join us, and then you can really pummel him.

P.P.S. Obviously, this is a personal letter. I don't represent anyone—not my union, Microsoft, the late and great Arthur Ashe—except simple ol' me.

C.C. Stephen H. Dunphy—Seattle Times Business Columnist Bill Gates—Microsoft Corporation

MTC-00009666

From: TBurTREE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft Settlement. Glad to see an end to the Clinton era of anti trust lawsuits.

Sincerely, Terry Burnett
Phx, AZ.

CC:tburtree@earthlink.net@inetgw

MTC-00009667

From: Bob (038) Caryl Horstmeier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:17pm
Subject: GOVT. SHAKEDOWN OF MICROSOFT

DEAR WHO EVER AT JUSTICE DEPT;
I BELIEVE THAT MICRO SOFT DOES NOT RATE A SHAKE DOWN BY THE GOVT. JUST BECAUSE MICROSOFT DID NOT CONTRIBUTE TO SLICK WILLY. THE REST OF THE WORLD IS WONDERING WHY WE SHAKE DOWN OUR BEST ACHIEVERS.

ROBERT HORSTMEIER, 112 STANTON STREET, DAVIS ILLINOIS, 61019-0183
randchorst@stateline-isp.com

MTC-00009668

From: brede
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the States and the Justice Dept should leave Microsoft alone. What a bunch of envious second rate people you've become. Hatred of the good for being good is not an American ideal any longer.

Eternal Vigilance,
Lorelei Brede

MTC-00009669

From: Thomas LaRusso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:38pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
THE REMEDY THE GOVERNMENT PROPOSED SHOULD BE SETTLED ON. NO FURTHER STATE ACTION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

TOM LARUSSO

MTC-00009670

From: Dale Fester
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

DOJ: I support the settlement, even though I feel it is unfair to Microsoft. I feel that Microsoft has never been a problem for consumers. It is my belief that they have been tough competitors, but that is what free enterprise is all about. The Justice Department should never have taken the side of the losing competitors. I believe it was the DOJ, Sun Microsystems, Netscape, and the predudicial judge who were responsible for starting the economy into its downturn. I certainly don't thank you for that! The complaining states should be sent packing. All they are interested in is trying to get money from Microsoft, who has in no way hurt consumers. I thank Microsoft for an excellent product that they market for a fair price. If it hadn't been for Microsoft developing a universal software for us computer users, we would be in a lot of trouble trying to link across an innumerable variety of computer operating systems. Leave them alone. When I worked for a large aerospace company, we were always trying to beat the others and we had no love or compassion for them. That's the definition of free enterprise, which is based on survival of the best competitors.

Dale Fester
2916 South Fenton St.
Denver, Colorado 80227
Tel: 303-985-5678

MTC-00009671

From: Carol Adams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:50pm
Subject: microsoft anti-trust suit
TO: US Dept of Justice
From: Carol C. Adams
Atlanta, GA

Please close the case against Microsoft and therefore end the abuse of our anti trust laws. Microsoft is a fine competitive company that is successful and should be a model for other emerging companies.

Yours truly,
Carol Adams

MTC-00009672

From: cphatcher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
The Microsoft trial has squandered taxpayers' dollars. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Competition should be in the marketplace not the courtroom. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. This whole mess is the result of the aggressive lobbying efforts of a few of Microsoft's competitors.

Now that the federal government and nine states have finally reached a comprehensive agreement with Microsoft to address the reduced liability found in the Court of Appeals ruling. It's time to put this to rest.

This settlement is tough, but seems reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I agree this settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy. I support the Microsoft settlement.

Clarence Hatcher
3268 F 3/10 Road
Clifton, CO 81520

MTC-00009673

From: Clark Cox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:52pm
Subject: Anti-Trust Case

There is no way DOJ can prove consumers are worse off due to Microsoft's actions. Maybe their competitors are worse off, but that is the nature of business. Personal computer use soared in this country due to standardization, and that standardization is due to the success of Microsoft's products. Please stop wasting our tax dollars with the pursuit of Microsoft, there are much better uses of these dollars than frivolous litigation.

MTC-00009674

From: Wanda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:57pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I support settling the Microsoft case. I think it would be in the best interests of the public to do so. I do think, however, that Bill Gates abused his company's position by creating software that requires everything to be built on it's base and holding smaller companies hostage by requiring them to use Microsoft's products in order to market their own.

Wanda Simonson

MTC-00009675

From: rosalie mcGhie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:58pm
Subject: microsoft comment

MTC-00009676

From: Merle Steffenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm sure getting tired of reading and hearing about this! Let's quit wasting my tax money and dispose of this case. It looks like you're running interference for Microsoft's competitors (who, in many cases, probably wouldn't even exist if it weren't for Microsoft). Get it settled and get the holdout states in line. I'm from Iowa and I'm ashamed to see the AG trying to get into Microsoft's pockets. Get more from the Web.'

MTC-00009677

From: Harry Crowell
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/8/02 8:21pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe the U S economy has suffered enough with this wasteful and foolish witchunt of a series of expensive lawsuits. Please stop harming our fragile economy. All this lawsuit mess is doing is creating a lot of wealth for a bunch of lawyers and for sure it is not reducing the cost of computing.

MTC-00009678

From: The Fosters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 8:13pm
Subject: GIVE UP ON microsoft

The settlements already given are enough. Please DUMP the case as this is only left over

from Clinton years. Lets get back to helping industry.

Gifford Foster

MTC-00009679

From: Walter B. Mills

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:14pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Members of the Department of Justice:

If Microsoft is satisfied with the present government judgement agreed to by nine state attorney generals, then I recommend ending future litigations. My personal view of this court case against Microsoft is: "it never should have happened"! Microsoft "Windows" isn't a finished product. The competitors who sought government protection are simply not competitive.

The American Public is extremely fortunate that Microsoft invented "Windows" before a foreign nation developed it. Billions of dollars have flowed to America that otherwise could have been lost. Consumers of Microsoft products have excellent products at affordable prices thanks to competition the American way. I certainly do not wish to see Bill Gates and his company penalized for producing better products (a better mouse trap as the old saying goes).

As a consumer of Microsoft products, I have not been overcharged as might happen with a monopoly. However, I have lost financially when Microsoft stock prices dropped severely due to this court case.

Do not penalize Microsoft for success. Encourage the competition to do better! The government must not dictate to Microsoft how to design computer software. That would be a disaster and America would lose it's inventive edge!

Respectfully,

Walter B. Mills

20070 Park Ridge Lane

Sedro Woolley, WA 98284-7601

Email: ettbert@cnw.com

MTC-00009680

From: Douglas Matheson

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:20pm

Subject: judgement

I happen to use Microsoft products for the Macintosh. I like them, but I can't stand the grassroots propaganda the MS uses to get their way. They were wrong in the way they conducted business for the last 15 years (at least). Don't let them give software, make them give real dollars and let the receivers decide where to spend it.

Douglas W. Matheson Ph.D

Dept. of Psychology

University of the Pacific

Stockton, CA USA

MTC-00009681

From: Billy Colwell

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:29pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

P.O. Box 35

Roxton, Texas 75477

January 8, 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 you today to express to you my sincere delight at the resolution of the long drawn out antitrust lawsuit filed against Microsoft. The resolution that was reached is a long overdue end to this debacle. Terms of this settlement are quite extensive and cover every parties needs, I believe. For the competitor software companies, there are provisions that give them access to the interface information so that their software can work more smoothly in Microsoft's Windows operating system. For the computer manufacturers, there are provisions that would prevent Microsoft from retaliating against them should they promote software from Microsoft's competitors. For the consumers, there are provisions that stimulate competition, which subsequently keeps prices down. There is no part that this settlement does not cover; it truly is all encompassing. There is no reason to litigate this further. A settlement has been reached, and its time to let this issue rest. I hope you will hear the opinion of people like me and agree to the settlement that was reached. I thank you for your time today.

Sincerely,

Billy Colwell

MTC-00009682

From: Richard Gillmann

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:33pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The terms proposed are tough but fair. It's time to settle this case and let American business get back to doing what it does best—making the best products in the world.

Richard Gillmann

4150—187th Ave SE

Issaquah, WA 98027 (USA)

(425)641-5136

<http://www.nwlink.com/rxg/>

richard@folkradio.org

-or-

rxg@nwlink.com

MTC-00009683

From: H. Hoffman

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:43pm

Subject: Justice Department Members: I

believe that it is past time to end the

Clinton era Anti-trust law

Justice Department Members: I believe that it is past time to end the Clinton era Anti-trust law abuse. It is a sad state of affairs when men and women aren't allowed to achieve what they are able to achieve legally because someone who isn't able to achieve as much yells "foul". I'm tired of all these petty lawsuits that make lawyers wealthy and naturally competitive persons want to give up on the American dream of making wealth through hard work and ingenuity. This is the kind of thing that will bring America down if allowed to continue. PLEASE, PUT A STOP TO IT!

Helen Hoffman

4805 Serena Court.

Carmichael, Ca. 95608-4240

MTC-00009684

From: JewisonP@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/8/02 8:58pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General John Ashcroft

United States Department of Justice

Let me first note that I am a longtime Microsoft (MS) product user. I started with Apple, played with Unix and LINUX and naturally gravitated to the MS platform due to business needs and productivity.

I preface this so as you know that when I am writing you today to voice my support for the settlement that was reached on November 6, 2001, between MS and the government, you represent, my request and opinion is based not on pure emotion but on experience.

Productivity is the issue. MS provides it. You (the court, politicians, special interests and unsuccessful competitors) have conspired to come against MS, each for your own reasons. If the competitors had as good a product as MS, they would be where MS is and not seeking to steal their profits or destroy MS by use of greedy and unethical lawyers. Netscape Navigator is a perfect example of this. If it wasn't prone to crashing, I would probably still be using Netscape today. I discontinued using it several years ago due to its unreliability factor.

Let you think me bias, may I acknowledge that I have and am still using several third party products (both software and hardware) on top of the MS platform without conflict or bugs. So, again, where is the problem? Where is this monopoly that MS is supposed to have? As an American consumer I can still pick and choose to acquire the software that I desire. Yes, I may have to initiate contact or search for a separate vender to acquire something made by MS but doesn't have the features that I desire, but you and I do that every day when we buy groceries or other products. One store may not have the cookies I like, so although they may have several different types of cookies on hand, I will make my purchases there and on the way home stop off at another store that has the cookies I like. And if the first store is giving away their cookies free with, say, the purchase of milk, fine, but I'm not prevented from going to the other store on my way home and buying the cookies I like. It just means that I now have two cookies. One I will eat and the other thrown away or given to the dog.

I like many in America do not understand your "Monopoly" issue. It doesn't exist as far as I can see. What exists is political greed and lack of moral character. The politicians found that they could gain some extra cash (it would be called extortion or racketeering if it were done by the common man) and votes by pretending to support the little guy. It always looks good when you have stand up for the little guy and slap down the "rich" capitalist. It's the mentality we suffer with these days because the government has taught us all to be victims. How better to succeed, by everybody having nothing. We all share the same misery. It's killing America, not only business but also the social structure and fabric of this great country. The courts/lawyers jumped into the fray, because that's what vultures do. They prey on the vulnerable. Mr. Gates and MS were going about their business. Clinton and

his cronies were not getting political kick backs from this ingrate. Seagate was a friend and made huge contributions. They, however, were being beaten up in the marketplace by someone who was producing a better product and marketing it better. Clinton was having his own problems and saw an opportunity to deflect a little heat and pay back a political debt. And, Viola! Enter the courts.

Besides who stands to profit. Look at the huge sums that are being collected by both the prosecution and defense attorneys. In the end, its the litigation attorneys who will walk away from this with their pockets full. The consumer will again suffer the disadvantage by paying more for less. MS will have to put the breaks on innovation, which in their industry may be the death knell.

This case was political from the beginning. It's time to settle this thing. The offers have been made and accepted, except by a few greedy State Attorneys. Let them go back to their casinos and constituent for their State's needs. Leave Microsoft alone. They and we the consumer do not owe them a thing. Because they have increased their state's spending by 63% (according to America Legislative Exchange Council) over the decade of the 90's is not Microsoft's fault. These local politicians need to either cut spending or seek the deficiencies from their own constituencies. They should not seek to balance their budgets upon the back of MS. MS sells a good product. Do not punish them further with this injustice.

You have exacted the penalty. Microsoft is willing to suffer the "penalty". Let them get back to what they do. Making a quality product that puts productivity in American business which has put us ahead of the world. To further delay or seek greater damages is only to deter and prolong the injustice. The US court was out to find a scapegoat for a previous administration. That administration is now gone. The court is supposed to be a separate branch of the government, not a Brown Shirt for the Executive Branch. This case should have never come before the courts. Accept this settlement as is and clear your calendar for real crimes and criminals. Thank you for suffering through this diatribe, but may I state for the record that I support this settlement and believe it will have a broad positive impact on the state of our economy at the present time.

Sincerely,
Patric J. Jewison
a registered voter from Billings, Montana

MTC-00009685

From: NancyLfp@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:04pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe microsoft has done nothing wrong to warrant punishment by DOJ. They have simply been fierce competitors in a business where there are many options for those using computers in areas where microsoft leads. They could lose their lead at any time. DOJ would do well to focus on real problems in this country and Bill Gates is not one of them.

Nancy Prestopino

MTC-00009686

From: Cosmo S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft
I urge you to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse aimed at Microsoft.
Sincerely,
Cosmo Stallone

MTC-00009687

From: PHarris711@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:
Please settle the Microsoft case. It is in the public interest to do so!!! If this continues only the lawyers will win.
Grace Harris
234 East Rocks Road
Norwalk, CT 06851

MTC-00009688

From: John (038) Marty Trueblood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:34pm
Subject: Micro-soft Settlement
I believe that the Anti-Trust Suit against Micro-soft should end now, today. Competition is necessary and should be the challenge, not the call to punish a successful company. It is time for all to let go of this unfair law suit and to let the other Companies get on with their business, develop better products and compete in the open market.
John A. Trueblood
8916 196 th. Street
McAlpin, Florida 32062
(386) 364-5316

MTC-00009689

From: Sandi Wilke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 9:36pm
Subject: Drop the trial against Microsoft. The settlement is good. Let's get on with America and free enterprise. Let Americans spend their money the way they feel is best for them.
Thank you.
sandiw@turbonet.com

MTC-00009690

From: tomkeplar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 7:50pm
Subject: Drop the Microsoft case
I believe the Justice Dept. should make the Microsoft case disappear. We are all free to choose our computer items. Let it be a thing of the past. There is so many terrible things that are going on, so look to the future. For one, the environmental groups, Sierra, Friends, Greens, etc are all trying to take over the plant, it is time to investigate their expensive offices and things they use their money for. I sort of believe they are UN-American.

MTC-00009692

From: Lynn Handy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Do not remove Java from Windows—there are many valuable websites that depend on this programming to provide their services. One such site is wetbusters.com, which provides a valuable source of support and info to children and adults with enuresis—I know of now other such site available, and as a health care provider, I need to be sure my patients can have ongoing access to this superb support site.

Thank you.
Lynn Handy, ARNP

MTC-00009693

From: Benjam(00ED)n Mu(00F1)oz Mateu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MTC-00009694

From: Lyn Monahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MTC-00009695

From: Charles Lyons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:48pm
Subject: Anti-trust NO!
The time has come for DOJ to put a merciful end to the Clinton-era attack on one of the most successful companies in the long history of the United States. In America's fight for survival of a free system of government against a system of terrorism, we need strong and innovative organizations dedicated to communicating the message of freedom to peoples around the world.
Charles E. Lyons

MTC-00009696

From: slclark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust Issue
Good Morning—
Please in the interests of the citizens of our great country drop the case against Microsoft. It has been dragging on for the last several years and is costing the tax payer many millions of dollars and really making a mess of the economy while making the lawyers very rich.
Have a good day,
(Mr & Mrs) Sharon L & Joyce M Clark
CC:slclark

MTC-00009697

From: slclark
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 10:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust Issue
Good Morning—
Please in the interests of the citizens of our great country drop the case against Microsoft. It has been dragging on for the last several years and is costing the tax payer many millions of dollars and really making a mess of the economy while making the lawyers very rich.
Have a good day,
(Mr & Mrs) Sharon L & Joyce M Clark
CC:slclark

MTC-00009698

From: Francois Vincent

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed:

1—MS Office needs to be opened, so that developers interested in porting it or understanding the document formats can do so either in form of a source code licence or an allowance to see it, check it and "clone libraries", so that applications on non-Windows OSs can read and write MS Office formats for flawless interaction with Windows users.

2—The Win32 API needs to be made available (incl. undocumented APIs) so that WINE can be successfully ported not only to BeOS but other OS too.

3—The file system needs to be opened, so that BeOS users can continue to access files on non-BFS partitions.

4—The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with HAS to "dual-boot" an alternative operating system, in this case BeOS, in order to remedy the damage MS has done to BeOS in the past.

What Microsoft did and still does doesn't respect at all the freedom of expression that USA defends. People have the right to know that exists other Operating System than Windows and to choose which one is better.

Thank you very much and I hope that justice will be made.

Francois Vincent
www.bug-mg.org

MTC-00009699

From: Sandy Alto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:23pm
Subject: PLEASE GET OFF MICROSOFT'S BACK!

It's utterly insane that a bunch of state governments are allowed to play politics in this economy with technology companies. Microsoft is not a monopoly, creates outstanding products that have made my life incredibly better and easier, AND WILDLY ECONOMICAL.

Technology advances must be made for our economy to grow. We need to leave Microsoft alone and let them compete in the marketplace as they have in the past. The best company that offers the best service will win, but with so many needs that have to be met, it's unlikely that one company will ever be able to be all things to all consumers.

Stop trying to regulate this industry by penalizing Microsoft. Let the marketplace drive demand, service, and quality.

Thank you,
Sandra Alto
19012 90th Pl. N.E.
Bothell, WA 98011

MTC-00009700

From: Tom (038) Carolyn Burke
To: US Dept of Justice-Microsoft anti-trust comments
Date: 1/8/02 11:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Settlement

This is not punishment for breaking a law it is a reward. This "settlement" is a terrible, terrible dis-service to the American people. This settlement allows microsoft to further their monopolistic ways in a most insidious way by allowing them greater access to our most valuable assets, our children. Further, it shows our children that breaking laws will be rewarded, rather than punished, by our highest courts. How can this be justice? How will our children be able to determine right from wrong when the wrong-doers are rewarded and not truly punished? This is one of the worlds greatest travesties of justice of all times! Please there must be some way to control this great corporation that will show them that they too are subject to the rules and regulations of our great country.

Carolyn Burke,
tburke1@qwest.net

MTC-00009701

From: Marion Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:26pm
Subject: stop abuse

Please stop abusing a hard-working entrepreneur for his success!

Marlene Parker
1901 N. Thompson St.
Conroe TX 77301-1241
mk_parker@bigfoot.com
936-441-7503

MTC-00009702

From: Tom O'Hern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/8/02 11:35pm
Subject: A slap on the hand is not enough

To whom it may concern,

As a resident of Seattle I find my self very close to the root of the problem with the case of Microsoft. I am very involved in the computer industry and have for the last 15 years spent a good deal of time watching Microsoft. I have watched first hand in the industry how Microsoft has gained the upper hand not by producing a superior product but by buying out competitors and using the legal system to drain their rivals.

In the computer industry there are many competing products. I have found though, that preferential treatment is given to Microsoft products. Why? Even though IT managers know that other products are superior/compatible/cheaper it would be insane to go any other route because Microsoft will put an end to that copetition sooner or later and anyone who has built a business on those other products will have to pay absurd amounts of money to switch over their entire division.

You might think Microsoft would do well to incorporate those ideas in to their own products but they rarely do. They know what power they have and the corporation has become an entity of its own. It answers to stock holders and board members (who usually have their hands in MS's pockets more than the stockholders), not to ethical practices.

I could go on but I am sure there are many others that will in my place. Many people are speaking out but with out *their* governments backing no justice will be served. Free trade must be established. A

simple slap on Microsoft's hand will not achieve anything. At the least the company must be broken up. Please.

Tom O'Hern
tom@ohern.net
3415 NW 71st St.
Seattle, WA 98117
206-782-2820

MTC-00009703

From: Jon Fulfer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jon Fulfer
24 Indian Trail
Lake Dallas, Texas 75065
January 8, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am absolutely opposed to having the Microsoft Corporation broken up, and I am worried that if the litigation against them is carried any further, that is exactly what may happen. As you know, a resolution was finally reached last fall in regards to this issue. It was a resolution that should please all parties, and there is no reason to pursue this issue any further. The provisions within this settlement provide the smaller software companies with protection from Microsoft. They have pricing guarantees, retaliation protection, contractual restrictions, and the list goes on. The resolution as it now stands is as restrictive as can be without preventing competition, which is basic to our economy.

The next step in further litigation can only be the breakup of one of the pioneers in the information technology era. This would absolutely devastating, and I do not want to see it happen. Do not alter the settlement; leave it as is.

Sincerely,
Jon Fulfer
cc: Representative Richard Armey
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00009704

From: Carlos Santellanes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:01am
Subject: Justice please

In late 1998 and early 1999, the United States District Court found that Microsoft had violated both sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. 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. 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.

End Note:

The recent attempt by Microsoft to Hijack the penalty phase of this court proceedings shouldn't be allowed to stand a minute of contemplation, the remedy must be fair and blind to partisanship. By giving into the Microsoft remedy you would be basically giving the 'Hen house to the wolves'. By Flooding the educational market with 'FREE' Microsoft products would only serve to fatten an already fat giant. I beg you to please impose REAL punishment onto the REAL criminals of this case. Anything else would be punishing the unprotected and innocent buying public.

Sincerely,
Carlos Santellanes
Los Angeles, California
nrrique@earthlink.net

MTC-00009705

From: Anatoly Volynets
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 1:00am
Subject: Monopoly hearts!
To:

Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney
Suite 1200, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530;
From: Anatoly Volynets
1121 Village Dr. #9
Belmont, CA 94002

Dear Renata Hesse:

I would like to make some comments on Microsoft case.

1. I came in US from the former USSR. It is my understanding that communist country is that one of absolute monopoly in all areas of our life: culture, industry, media, education, etc. I feel "by skin" all humiliating impact of monopoly on "small" people. I also understand how monopoly slows down any progress in a society, how badly it affects science, technology, education, health care, everything. That is why US antitrust laws make me personally happy. It may sound funny, but I do feel this way. So my opinion in general is following: any monopoly must be fought and limited AS

MUCH AS POSSIBLE for people, society and country sake.

2. One may say that some monopolists do not behave badly, do not really harm public, are honest in their attitude toward people and state, produce goods and services of high quality, keep fair prices, create jobs, represent economic power of the country, etc. Maybe such monopolists do exist, but this is not about Microsoft Corporation. Whatever I know about their products and conduct is of the worst quality and impact possible. They always were the same as they are exposed in the movie "Pirates of Silicon Valley". Consider just one issue: security holes in Windows OS and Windows based applications caused and entirely responsible for the "crackerism" as such. All world wide spread viruses exploit Windows weak points.

3. I cannot understand how the proposed settlement may solve problems caused by Microsoft activities. So I came out with my own proposition.

4. I am not a lawyer so my propositions may not be 100% legitimate, but I developed them based on my general knowledge. Once again, people, society and country always benefit from competition and suffer from monopoly. This is true in general terms and nothing tells us against this in particular Microsoft case.

5. So I believe, the only considerable results in the case may be achieved by breaking Microsoft. I do not think it will work if we break it in 2. OS developing company has no reason to compete with Application developing company. I think it must be divided at least by 12:

2 OS developers,
2 Office application developers,
2 Internet application developers
2 Media application developers
2 ISP providers
2 ASP providers, so that the least competition occurred within each pair.

I do not know if such action be enough regarding financial means accumulated by Microsoft so far.

5. Looking into situation on market I think it would be necessary to apply additional taxation on all Windows related products and services, including education. Additional taxes should be used to create public funds to support competition, especially Free Software development.

6. Addressing low quality of MS products and dangerous security issues, their products and services must be treated the same way as tobacco ones: No advertisement allowed; Each product and service must be labeled accordingly by independent experts, to let people know what they pay for.

7. Addressing Microsoft's past monopoly power abuses, there must be heavy financial penalties applied, and collected funds to be used to support Free Software development.

Sincerely,
Anatoly Volynets

MTC-00009706

From: Charles Preacher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 1:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The suit should be settled. It should not have been filed in the first place. Bill Gates

might be a nerd, but he is a genius nerd. The technological developments we has masterminded are among the most significant the world has ever seen. Leave him and Microsoft alone.

Charles B. Preacher

MTC-00009707

From: Doug Siebert
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to submit my comments on the proposed settlement between the US DOJ and Microsoft. My name is Douglas Siebert, I am an independant consultant who does enterprise computing work, and have been a professional in the field for ten years. I hold a Masters in Computer Science in addition to an MBA from the University of Iowa. I feel that I have a much greater understanding of these matters than most people from a technical perspective, and have been in the field for a long enough time that I know the history behind all the various aspects of the case.

I have followed the case with great interest as I have become more and more concerned over the years about Microsoft's domination of the industry, and its negative effects. The explosive growth of the industry and its resultant effect on the economy has allowed Microsoft's abuses to go on for far too long. I think a lot of people had a "if it ain't broke don't fix it" attitude about this. While I can understand that, I think the industry would even more strong, creative and dynamic if Microsoft did not hold such a totally dominant position over such a large and ever increasing portion of it.

I feel the proposed settlement is totally inadequate. It does not punish Microsoft at all for its past abuses, nor is there any real change put into force to either prevent them from future abuses or make it more attractive financially or legally to avoid these abuses on its own. The US Court of Appeals ruled unanimously that Microsoft is a monopoly, and has stated the remedy for their illegal conduct in maintaining this monopoly must "seek 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.'" As it does none of these things, it must be scrapped, and unless a far stronger deal can be struck, I feel the Court must direct the proceedings to continue.

The DOJ has entered into deals with Microsoft before, and the result was a larger and stronger monopoly, with monopoly profits accorded to its top officers as a reward for their illegal and unethical behavior. This remedy will be equally ineffective, with loopholes to strengthen Microsoft's position riddling the terms. As a simple example, the requirement for Microsoft to disclose its APIs allows them an out for anything relating to security (in today's Internet, nearly anything can be determined to be security critical, and if not it can be altered so that it is) It also allows Microsoft to only disclose these APIs to companies whom Microsoft deems as having a "viable business plan". Nevermind

possible abuses of this in connection with for-profit companies having financial difficulties, it is an out for them in connection with their only real competition in the operating system market today, so-called "open source" systems such as Linux. Since their works are essentially in the public domain, Microsoft obviously crafted this requirement as a way to prevent giving the critical API information to what they feel is the biggest threat to their current monopoly.

The nine states (including my home state of Iowa) who have intelligently declined to be a part of this one-sided settlement have proposed a somewhat modified version. While better, that version is still missing some key aspects of the picture. The requirement to make source code for Microsoft's Internet Explorer browser will obviously be a deal killer from Microsoft's perspective. The taking of their intellectual property is something the Court is likely to be loathe to do as well. But the worst thing about this is that it wouldn't really do anything substantial as far as changing the competitive landscape. It would certainly be more than a slap on the wrist to Microsoft, and something that may give them pause before they continue on to future abuses of their monopoly, but it is not particularly constructive.

However, I do not wish to simply criticize the settlement. I do have some suggestions for a remedy I'd like to see considered in whole or in part. I have noted my reasoning behind these points as well.

1) Disallow Microsoft from the purchase of or investment in any new companies. Microsoft has historically used its monopoly profits as a way of extending its monopoly by buying out the competition to kill it or integrate it into their product portfolios. They have lately been using strategic investments with their huge cash reserve to take equity positions in other companies, as a way to push their technology onto these companies when they otherwise would not have freely chosen it.

2) Disallow Microsoft from entering into any new exclusive licensing deals with any companies or individuals for any of their products or intellectual property. This would prevent them from one of their favorite avenues for further abuses, since anything Microsoft licensed would still be available to others to license as well and use to compete fairly with Microsoft in the marketplace.

3) Make all deals, contracts, etc. Microsoft enters into a matter of public record. In addition, any existing deals would have to be entered into the public record within a reasonable period of time after the final judgement is made. This would give Microsoft (or those who have entered into deals or contracts with them) an opportunity to extricate themselves from any deals they would rather not have publicly disclosed for any reason.

4) Require Microsoft to disclose all APIs, network protocols, file formats, etc. for all its software in any market where they have more than 50% share. This would extend to any new markets where they currently don't have 50% share if they achieve it during the lifetime of the settlement's terms. These APIs

would be made freely available in the public domain with no restriction on their use. All required information must be available before any product using them is available for retail sale or for preinstallation by its OEM partners. In addition, any changes to these APIs caused by changes to its software due to patches, fixes, service packs and such would also need to be disclosed prior to the release of said fixes. The only exception would be for critical security fixes, due to the timeliness requirement for these fixes, that Microsoft be allowed two weeks after the release of these fixes before disclosure is required. This is the biggest change as far as potentially restoring competition to the marketplace. Armed with the ability to interoperate with Microsoft software in a 100% compatible way, competition would spring up in many places, both from commercial competitors as well as "open source" freely available programs. The marketplace could freely choose based on features, price, support, etc. without the current worries that Microsoft will make changes that will render the software inoperable with Microsoft's overnight. Microsoft's huge size and vast army of employees would still give them a sizeable advantage, but if nothing else, having to compete fairly would cause Microsoft to put its resources back towards giving consumers what they want, rather than what Microsoft requires in order to insure the continuation of its monopoly.

This solution would be far superior to the nine states' solution of forcing Microsoft to put their intellectual property in the public domain (in the form of the source code to their Internet Explorer browser) since it would create competition across the board (end user operating systems, server operating systems, Office suite, Internet browser) rather than possibly only in a narrowly targeted area. It would also avoid setting a precedent the Court would probably rather not set. Microsoft would have a much harder time arguing against the unfairness of a solution that merely puts its competition on the same footing as them versus the taking of their property.

Finally, I would like to suggest that the proposed settlement's terms for the "compliance committee" are woefully inadequate. I do not believe that Microsoft should have any say in the membership of this committee. Instead, Microsoft should be required to provide some of the staffing for this committee so they can expedite the process of locating and securing necessary documents, information, and access to Microsoft personnel. The committee will have their hands full monitoring Microsoft's compliance, even if they are not deliberately obstructed along the way. Having one committee member coming from Microsoft and another that Microsoft would have to agree on almost guarantees attempted abuses by Microsoft with attempts to obstruct the committee's ability to function effectively in its role.

I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to contribute my thoughts on this, and I hope my comments do receive serious consideration. I realize that you will probably receive many thousands of

comments on this proposed settlement, and even after discarding those that are incoherent, profane, or obviously cut-and-pasted from prepared propaganda from one side or the other you will still have a large number to read and comprehend. I hope that the time I have taken in investigating this case and collecting and writing my thoughts will be rewarded.

Douglas Siebert
712 Rundell St
Iowa City, IA 52240
Douglas Siebert douglas-siebert@uiowa.edu

MTC-00009708

From: Ralph Kemperdick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:53am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

MTC-00009709

From: Yaka St.Aise
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello, as a longtime IT professional, I had many opportunities to witness and/or be affected by Microsoft peculiar business practices. It seems of the utmost importance to many players in the IT industry, as well as for the public interest, that whatever settlement is offered to Microsoft by the DoJ and the government strongly emphasizes on remedies to what is the worst effect of Microsoft strong-arm methods, based on its monopoly, namely: preventing competition and creativity.

Be Inc. is one of the better examples of how companies that offer any innovative products on markets under Microsoft influence are both vulnerable and actively endangered and often put out of business.

BeOS is a good example of the danger Microsoft presents for competition and innovation, for it was one of the few commercial attempts on the ground of Microsoft flagship product, and was led as well as could be.

Microsoft monopoly is not a question anymore, since the DoJ established it, and it would be cause for no alarm if Microsoft owed said monopoly to its ability to offer better, cheaper products to the market.

But the fact is, it isn't the case, MS products are of lesser value than many competing products, and the company also leverages its dominant position to overprice its products. Furthermore, MS practices tend to harm innovation and competition by spending more time and money at hampering competitors than actually develop new/better products and technologies. Every new technology from other companies that blips on MS radar is either outright bought (often with the sole intent of preventing its success, and no plans to ever bring it to the market) or actively discouraged to exist out of MS influence.

So what is needed now, is to acknowledge the fact that while one of free market's bigger strength is to foster progress and innovation through competition, Microsoft has become so powerful that it now has the weight to negate this strength, and can stop free market to play its role in the consumer electronics industry.

Since Microsoft has the power to force its rules to apply to the industry as a whole, there is little choice but acknowledge it and turn a de-facto standard into a standard : make Microsoft products public!

- Microsoft can retain the property of the Windows code and technology, but it should be made so that third-party companies can create products Microsoft compatible with or without Microsoft approval.
- License agreements between Microsoft and users, Microsoft and resellers or manufacturers should be revised and controlled in the perspective of fairness.
- Public standards and generally non Microsoft-owned standards Microsoft claims to be compliant with should be enforced.
- De-facto standards, like Microsoft Office file formats should be documented and published.
- In the same fashion, source code for dominant technologies from Microsoft should be published and documented (it doesn't prevent Microsoft from retaining property of said source code), so to ensure third party manufacturers and developers can design compatible products without depending on Microsoft "goodwill". This would also help smaller company to gain rights on "borrowed" software...
- All Windows APIs and low-level subsystems should be documented as well as technologies such as DirectX. The best way to ensure such documentation is kept full and up to date would be to separate some software divisions of Microsoft from the core company, as spinoffs, and have them gain knowledge of the documentation via a third party organization (funded by Microsoft on a congress-sized allocation?), comprising industry actors as well as government experts.
- Give the highest attention to Microsoft business practices in the future and realistically adapt fines and financial penalties to the profits of Microsoft (at some point in the Netscape case, penalties applied to Microsoft where of one million dollars when profits for the same period were of eleven million, which led one Microsoft executive to state Microsoft can afford it.)

Below is an example relation of how the OEM license and other common business practices of Microsoft can in fact hamper innovation and competition.

Be Inc is the maker of BeOS, a desktop operating system that runs on the same personal computers that Windows does.

Be Inc. is going out of business just now, because of Microsoft "innovation-fostering" business practices.

There is an initiative led by BeOS users to bring back the BeOS to the market, as a non-profit software, which tells enough about the quality of the product.

Yet, this initiative has no hope of success if Microsoft is left free to conduce anti-competitive business practices as it did up to this point.

Let me summarize how Microsoft did prevent BeOS from gaining foot on the market and eventually drove out of business a company whose products were of

undisputed great value. BeOS, like BSD or Linux can be installed on a given computer alongside with others operating systems, giving the user the ability to decide what system to run at the time it starts his/her machine.

Since Microsoft doesn't built said computers, one would assume that it's out of MS hands to prevent any reseller or OEM to sell computers ready to run with more than one system installed. The fact is, Microsoft can do just that, and took the necessary steps to make sure nothing like BeOS can actually reach the mainstream user.

Microsoft licensing model for its software prevents computers manufacturers and resellers from installing a non Microsoft boot manager on computers shipping with an OEM licensed copy of Windows. The boot manager is the piece of software that allows the user to select his/her operating system of choice among those installed on the computer at startup type. MS boot manager is obviously not designed to accommodate non-MS operating systems...

With margins on personal computers averaging in the 6-12% range, a difference of a couple hundred dollars on pricing can be the difference between selling for a profit and selling at loss, which makes the OEM license mandatory if one wants to sell computers including Windows. The OEM license allows manufacturers to get any version of Windows for next-to-nothing compared to the cost of a stand alone copy of the same software (even at bulk rates). By virtues of a market dominance reaching to monopoly, not including Microsoft Windows in your computers is not an option for most manufacturers.

Furthermore, while the OEM licenses are supposed to be granted on a per-product basis, it is an established fact that Microsoft threatened some manufacturers to refuse this license unless they do ship Windows on every of their machines. That leaves the manufacturer/reseller with little options. Either go the Windows-only way, or sell at loss or non-competitive prices. Simple as that.

Since BeOS, contrary to Linux or BSD is the product of a private company, it depends on the company revenues to exist. Those revenues, in turn, are based on sales of the operating system and deals with hardware manufacturers.

For an operating system to gain momentum, it has to be able to accommodate hardware and applications. Here again, Microsoft proved able to discourage some software and hardware manufacturers to support BeOS, less they lose the "goodwill" of Microsoft. In the end, there is no point in developing software or hardware for an operating system only a few use, unless this platform can gain momentum and you grow with it, in the hope of becoming a big player.

And only a few, those who were willing and able to install another system on their computers by themselves, in a market where every element of the food chain is led to believe and forced to act as if nothing could exist unless endorsed by Microsoft, did actually experience how a better, cheaper product may look and feel like.

Best viewed with your glasses.

MTC-00009710

From: Ed A.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a computer consultant and programmer for well over ten years. In that time, I have seen Microsoft become increasingly more arrogant and unconcerned for the benefit of its customer base, including consumers and developers.

Instead of competing fairly with its competition, Microsoft has attempted to use its dominance to force other companies out of business. An example being Netscape Corporation. While Netscape was an early innovator in the graphical web browser, Microsoft decided that it needed to dominate the web browser market. Netscape sold their Navigator browser for a nominal fee while Microsoft developed Internet Explorer much after Netscape became the most popular choice in browsers. Instead of fairly competing with Netscape pricing, Microsoft gave away their Internet Explorer browser free of charge with the apparent intention of destroying its competitor's paying customer base, thus causing serious financial difficulty for both the consumer and developer. The consumer was left with no viable choices in a web browser. Microsoft's intention was to eventually control the Internet and its related services first by making Internet Explorer the primary way and only way of accessing the World Wide Web. Developers experienced problems with Microsoft's non-adherence to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) standards. Creating web pages was now becoming a frustrating effort, since much of the standard coding was not compatible with Microsoft's browser. This was also a detriment to the consumer, since it made it difficult or impossible to access certain web sites. As the dominance of Internet Explorer increased, many developers started creating web pages based on Microsoft's non-standard. The result being that anyone using a browser other than Microsoft's Internet Explorer was not able to even access certain web sites.

A related situation is currently occurring with the new Microsoft Xbox game system. I have read that Microsoft loses approximately \$100 for each Xbox system they sell. They are essentially selling at a loss to establish a dominance in this field with the intention of eventually driving out their competition.

I've seen instances where Microsoft has attempted to discredit a competitor's existing product with the intention of replacing that product with their own not yet developed or perfected inferior alternative. An example being Sun Microsystems's Java programming language. Microsoft saw that Java had the emerging capability to become an important language for developing the next generation of Internet and consumer electronic software applications. Their response to this was their ActiveX development environment. Due to blatant security oversights and security problems with ActiveX, Java became the more popular choice and ActiveX faded away. Microsoft then attempted to subvert the Java language by creating their own non-

standard or unauthorized extensions to the Java language. Their intention was to “splinter” the Java language into many non compatible versions and essentially dilute its effectiveness as defacto standard. Since Microsoft now has a dominance with their browser, the idea was to get the developer to use the Microsoft unauthorized version of Java for web applications in an attempt to subvert the Sun Microsystems’s version. Even though Microsoft had no alternative to Java at the time, they attempted to destroy its usefulness and future potential to the consumer. Microsoft is currently attempting to promote their new .NET development environment as an alternative to the Java based applications and related Sun Microsystems solutions. Their .NET however, is not yet past the beta or testing stages, but Microsoft has been promoting it for well over a year. Again, their intention is to use their market dominance to convince corporate customers to adopt their nonexistent “solution” over a competitor’s mature alternative. This has the effect of creating a “let’s wait for Microsoft” mentality in those responsible for corporate IT spending. The result hurts both Microsoft’s competition and the consumer because innovative solutions and projects are postponed. An even more serious problem is occurring regarding Microsoft’s lack of quality control and security within their server, email and browser products. There have been numerous reports in the press of very serious security problems in Microsoft products that could easily allow a computer system using these products to be accessed by unauthorized individuals that can destroy corporate, government and military data and even take total control of a computer system remotely. Microsoft’s desire to increase profits by releasing potentially dangerous software that is not ready for public use, has obvious negative consequences to our economy and public safety.

It is my opinion that Microsoft needs to be kept from controlling the industry, and appropriate remedies must be imposed by the court to prevent these anti-competitive and illegal activities from occurring in the future.

Edward M. Arszyla
 Manager
 NECOM, LLC
 CC:steven.rutstein@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009711

From: Anthony D. Minkoff
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 3:50am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 INTRODUCTION

My name is Anthony D. Minkoff. I am a professional software engineer. I am not a direct party to this lawsuit, nor do I have any business relationships with any party to this lawsuit, except as a customer. I do use Microsoft software in my home and in my work, and my job consists of developing application software that runs on Microsoft’s “Windows” family of operating systems. I am a citizen of the United States of America.

I claim no expertise in relevant legal or economic issues. My only claims to expertise in relevant technical issues are those that are

described above? that I am a professional developer of software applications for Microsoft operating systems and a user of Microsoft products. My interest in the case follows from the same considerations, and from the fact that I am a citizen of the United States of America. I’ll briefly describe my personal opinion of the proposed settlement, and then offer a proposal of my own for consideration.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT DUBIOUS EFFECTIVENESS

One concern that I have is that the proposed settlement would be ineffectual in curbing future monopolistic behavior by Microsoft. This concern has been expressed by others who are undoubtedly more knowledgeable and eloquent than I, so I recommend that the reader refer to other available comments and briefs for detailed analysis of this point. I mention it merely to convey that I share the concern.

LACK OF PUNITIVE PROVISIONS

Another concern I have is the apparent lack of any punitive provisions in the settlement. As I have stated, I am not knowledgeable of the legal issues, and don’t know whether the law calls for punitive remedies, but as a consumer and a citizen I am concerned about their absence. It seems to me that, when laws have been violated, it is essential that the remedies do not leave the violator better off for having committed the violation. The remedy must either prevent the violator enjoying the benefits of the transgressions already committed, or impose punishments that exceed the benefits.

In this case, it has been found that Microsoft’s current monopoly power is at least partly a result of past monopolistic abuses. So, even assuming that the proposed settlement would successfully prevent future monopolistic abuses by Microsoft, it seems insufficient. I think it’s also necessary that Microsoft be punished for, or denied the benefits of, the abuses that it has already committed.

A PROPOSAL

The proposal that I am about to describe would, I believe, protect the interests of consumers and competitors, while at the same time protecting Microsoft’s rights to innovate, to compete, to profit according to the value of its production, and even to continue to dominate the industry. I will describe the proposal, and then describe why I believe it would be beneficial to consumers and competitors while protecting for Microsoft the legitimate benefits of its production. Despite my expressed concerns about the lack of punitive provisions in the existing settlement, this proposal is not punitive in intent. The harm to Microsoft would be moderate, and would consist essentially of fostering competition where Microsoft has historically enjoyed a lack of competition. I would like the parties to consider the ideas contained in this proposal, and consider incorporating them into a revised settlement. I would like the court to consider the ideas contained in this proposal when fashioning court-ordered remedies.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is that, in areas in which Microsoft has been found to have abused monopoly power, its software come under a

“Delayed Open Source License” (“DOSL”). The relevant areas certainly include operating systems, internet browsers, and Microsoft’s “Office” software, and possibly others as well.

In a DOSL, software would become open source four years from its date of publication.¹ For example, “Windows NT 4, Windows 98,” and earlier versions of Windows would become open source immediately; “Windows 2000” some time in late 2003 or early 2004; “Windows Millennium Edition” in 2004; “Windows XP” in 2005; and future versions of Windows four years from the dates of their initial publication.

When a product becomes open source under this rule, its source code (including internal documentation, test plans, etc.) would be made available to the public for free or for nominal cost.² Under the terms of the DOSL, other parties would be permitted to create and publish derivative works; any such derivative works would also fall under DOSL? that is, four years from the publication of the derivative work, the derivative work becomes open source, etc.

HOW CUSTOMERS AND COMPETITORS

BENEFIT FROM THE PROPOSAL

Microsoft currently enjoys barriers to competition that can be conservatively described as enormous, and fairly described as insurmountable.

There is a vast library of software available that runs on Windows operating systems. (I have participated in the development of a number of such applications myself.) Many web sites are compatible only with Microsoft’s “Internet Explorer” browser, and many are compatible only with browsers running on Windows.

A similar phenomenon affects “wetware”. Millions of technicians have expertise in diagnosing, maintaining, and repairing systems running Windows or other Microsoft software. Developers have experience developing software to run on Microsoft’s operating systems and developing web sites to work well with Microsoft’s browsers. Hundreds of millions of users worldwide have experience using Microsoft software.

Only Microsoft is in any position to take advantage of all the software and expertise that has been created around Microsoft’s products. This is the “positive feedback loop” that is partly described in the Findings of Fact.

As part of a remedy for the monopolistic behavior, therefore, we want to give potential competitors a chance to enter that loop. The ability to base development on older versions of Windows (or Internet Explorer, Office, etc.) creates that possibility. It will make it possible to develop software that can take advantage of third-party products that work with Microsoft products, of technicians’ expertise with Microsoft products, and of users’ experience with Microsoft products.

When other parties have an opportunity to enter the loop, Microsoft will be unable to wield its exclusive position as a weapon. For example, one of the abuses found in this case is Microsoft’s threat to devastate Apple by refusing to continue to develop Office for Apple’s “Mac OS” operating system. Under this proposal, Apple would be able to

respond to such a threat by continuing to develop Office itself, basing its own development on the source code of "Office 98"³. The existence of this viable alternative for Apple would prevent Microsoft from exacting draconian terms as a condition of the continued development of Office for Mac OS. It would also protect Apple in the event that Microsoft's continued development of Office for Mac OS is of poor quality.

Customers would benefit directly from this increased competition, since competing offerings would increase customer choice. Furthermore, if a third party develops a competing version of a Microsoft product with features that prove popular, Microsoft will have an opportunity to incorporate similar features into future versions of its own offerings, potentially leading to better quality products from Microsoft.

Other customer benefits of open source software have been extensively discussed, and I refer the reader to <http://www.opensource.org> for papers on this topic. HOW THE PROPOSAL PROTECTS

MICROSOFT'S RIGHT TO PROFIT FROM ITS PRODUCTION

An important quality of any remedy is fairness to Microsoft, and this proposal is fair. Consider, as an example, Windows XP, which Microsoft advertises as a dramatic improvement over earlier versions of Windows. For the sake of this discussion, we assume that Microsoft's claim in this regard is accurate.

Since Windows XP is a dramatic improvement over earlier versions of Windows, demand for it should withstand the open source release of Windows NT 4 and Windows 98. A free copy of Windows NT 4 or Windows 98 is not an effective substitute for Windows XP. A third-party developer may be able to use the Windows NT 4 source code as a basis from which to develop its own operating system to compete with Windows XP, or may wait for Windows 2000 to become open source and use that as the basis for development. However, it took Microsoft two years to develop Windows XP from Windows 2000, despite employing the very individuals who had created Windows 2000 in the first place and who therefore understood its source code and architecture better than anyone. (Starting from Windows NT 4, it took more than five years to develop Windows XP.) Presumably, a competing developer, beginning at a similar starting point after the publication of Windows 2000's source code, would require a similar amount of time to develop a product capable of competing in the market against Windows XP. By that time, given the historical rate of development of operating systems, Microsoft will have released a successor to Windows XP, and perhaps even a second successor. If the successor is a significant improvement over Windows XP, then the successor should enjoy success in the marketplace against a competing product that has only just become able to compete with XP. As another example, consider the possibility, as described above, of Apple creating its own version of Office based on the source code from Office 98. Apple's offering in this regard would be four years behind what Microsoft is able to develop, so

it would clearly be in Apple's interests to negotiate for continued development of the software by Microsoft. Apple would resort to developing its own version only if (1) it is unable to negotiate fair terms with Microsoft, (2) Microsoft fails to demonstrate a commitment to quality in continued development of Office, or (3) Apple simply feels that it can do a much better job than Microsoft despite Microsoft's four-year head start. In any case, so long as Microsoft continues to develop and sell Office for Mac OS; so long as it continues to add value to the product, Apple's competing version shouldn't be much of a threat to Microsoft's version.

This same line of reasoning applies to all of the product areas under consideration. As long as Microsoft continues to add value to its products, it will be able to continue selling current products, even while old versions of the products are available for free. As long as it continues to develop these improvements with reasonable efficiency, a four-year developmental head start will ensure Microsoft's ability to stay ahead of competing developers and to continue to dominate the industry.

However, a remedy incorporating the ideas of this proposal would weaken Microsoft's ability to dominate the industry simply by virtue of exclusive compatibility with the technology and knowledge that others have built around Microsoft software. That is, Microsoft won't be able to depend on its monopolistic position to lock out competition altogether. While Microsoft would undoubtedly feel harmed by this, it is clearly not undue harm. It is fair, and consistent with the intent of the antitrust laws.

MTC-00009712

From: Ed A.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
CC: steven.rutstein@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009713

From: ARTHUR HUPP
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:17am
Subject: E-Mail Settlement
Enough is Enough!!!! Let's let Microsoft get on with being a successful company and quit wasting the taxpayers money!!!!
Art Hupp

MTC-00009714

From: Randy Williams 10
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:08am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Dept. of Justice:
I find it strange that the dept. of Justice is asking for public opinion to consider the Microsoft settlement. I thought the law was the law, not mob rule. Microsoft has done this world more good than any other business that comes to mind. The Liberal attacks against there success was uncalled for, and I expect better from this administration.
An American Patriot.
Randy Williams
521 Sandal Ct.
Altamonte Springs

Fl. 32714

MTC-00009715

From: sue ryan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:23am
Subject: END CLINTON ERA ABUSE
END THE ABUSE CLINTON ERA
CREATED. LET AMERICA AND AMERICAN COMPANIES DO THEIR THING. STAY OUT OF WHERE WE DON'T BELONG. GATES HAS DONE MANY WONDERFUL THINGS FOR AMERICA. SPEND YOUR TIME AND EFFORT GOING AFTER THE REAL LAW BREAKERS.. STOP CLINTON ABUSE.
THANKS
SUE RYAN

MTC-00009716

From: Sherry Roberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:42am
Subject: end anti-trust law abuse
Briefly—and to the point—end the anti-trust law abuse that began during Clinton's "reign". It's a new era, let's remove the taint of past mistakes and start over.
PS91,
Sherry Roberts

MTC-00009717

From: DeBois Family
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Good Morning,
I am writing you concerning the Microsoft Settlement and the law (officially called the Tunney Act) requires a public comment period between now and January 28th. I say it's high time that this ridiculous litigation nonsense by nine dissenting states be stopped. The settlement that was reached between the USDOJ and nine states clearly is fair to all parties concerned. I think it's high time to close these issues against Microsoft and move on.
If you need further information from me, please feel free to e-mail me.
Thank you,
Dean DeBois

MTC-00009718

From: Michael Kuncaitis Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:02am
Subject: microsoft settlement
I say hurray for free enterprise. Yes, there are problems—no matter what you do. It is time we considered also the good people and companies do, not just the bad.
I AM SO SICK OF JEALOUS, GET YOUR OWN COMPANY, PEOPLE WHO CANNOT STAND TO SEE OTHERS WIN AND SUCCEED.
BILL GATES IS VERY RICH AND I THINK HE DID GREAT (AND DID SOME WRONG MISTAKES). I WOULD VOTE FOR HIM NO MATTER WHAT OFFICE HE RAN FOR—BECAUSE HE CAN GET THE JOB DONE AND DONE!
GIVE HIM A PARADE AND LEAVE HIM ALONE. COMPETITION IS GREAT..
Thanks,
Mike K.

MTC-00009719

From: Charles Stout
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 8:10am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope that the nine renegade states are not able to unduly influence the Federal Settlement with Microsoft. Microsoft is a great company that tries to serve its customers. Microsoft should obey antitrust law where it is reasonably interpreted. I believe Microsoft helps its customers, including me, and gives them products that are a good value.

Thank You
 Charles Stout

MTC-00009720

From: Dane Vertefay
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 8:18am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice Representative,
 The short opinion— Yes, I feel that the settlement is in the best interest of the American people and that it is fair. Please finalize this issue by the current terms. Further—I believe that bringing closure to this issue through reasonable terms is the right thing for the consumers and our economy, and I am happy to see an end to this dispute. It is understandable that some of the large corporate competitors will push their states to continue this issue, but I feel that finalizing this issue under the terms set forth is the best for the consumers and businesses as well.

I believe that the standardization of my computer desktop programs has helped my company communicate internally with our four offices and even more importantly with my customers and suppliers as well. The fact that a standard platform for the desktop happened through the 1980's & '90's and has significantly contributed to the growth of many industries is the primary benefit, the fact that that company is called "Microsoft" is by the consumers choice from the products available at the time those decisions were originally made.

Note—I have used computers since 1981(Apple) switched to IBM Compatible with Microsoft in the early '90's (24 Gateway PC's currently) and feel that I understand the issue very well, although I did not see all the case evidence presented by either side.

Thank you for taking the time to "hear" my opinion.

Sincerely,
 Dane Vertefeuille
 Raleigh, NC

MTC-00009721

From: Pybus, Keith
 To: "microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov"
 Date: 1/9/02 8:31am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

18 Brookside Lane
 Vernon Rockville, Connecticut 06066
 January 8, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

This letter is to express my opinion and to also go on record about the proposed

settlement to the antitrust suit between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I am pleased that a settlement has been reached, and I am glad that both sides made out well.

The settlement is fair and reasonable to all parties involved, even though some of the restrictions are too harsh on Microsoft. In fact, some restrictions have been applied to technologies and products that were not even an issue in the lawsuit.

However, the time has come to put this messy issue behind us and move on. In my profession I provide desktop instruction to employees at the world's largest casino, and Microsoft has made what I do much easier. The integration that Microsoft has provided makes everyone more efficient at what they do.

I am in favor of the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice, and hope to see the conclusion of this saga soon.

Sincerely,
 Keith E. Pybus
 Mashantucket Pequot Academy
 Phone:ext. 21021 (860-312-1021)
 Fax:ext. 20133 (860-312-1033)

MTC-00009722

From: Ivan Ivanov
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 8:43am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
 This email is my modest attempt to support Microsoft in the case.

As an IT professional I would like to express bitter disappointment from the damage this case has caused the IT companies and the whole IT industry.

Hope DOJ will find reasonable settlement for the case which so far was only a backup for for Microsoft arrogant competitors.

Best Regards,
 Ivan Ivanov
 Software Engineer

MTC-00009723

From: Alex Hulse
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 8:44am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam
 I am a user of a wide variety of OSes on my PCs, which I use for business and pleasure. I have used the full range of Microsoft Windows OSes and several 'alternative' OSes including Linux distributions, BeOS 5 and QNX.

I have been informed that you seek out the views of people as to what they feel is important in the final settlement in the case against Microsoft. My feeling is that the field has to be levelled regarding dual booting. Microsoft forbids the option to boot any other OS other than Windows on their OEM's machines. This is unfair. Microsoft should allow their competitors equal rights to the machine, to allow OEMs to choose the OS that suits the machine best, or allow their customers to make that decision themselves. Even if Windows is still required, it allows the user to see that there is an option of another OS, and that in some ways they can be better at different jobs; BeOS's media skills jump immediately to mind.

I hope that you find my thoughts useful and that they can help towards making the

OEM PC industry a fairer place for companies others than Microsoft.

Yours Faithfully
 Alexander Hulse

MTC-00009724

From: Bill Schmidt
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:14am
 Subject: Tunney Act proposed Microsoft settlement comment

Gentlemen:

Per the provisions of the Tunney Act of 1974, I'd like to register my dismay and strong disagreement to the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. It is a clear triumph of politics over law and makes a travesty of the legal process.

Microsoft was found guilty of abuse of its monopoly powers and that decision was affirmed on appeal. The proposed settlement is a slap on the wrist for a company whose predatory practices and continue to this day. Microsoft's defence appears to be based on the fact that to punish it would stifle innovation yet the bulk of its products, going back to the original MSDOS, were lifted from the work of others. If the Department of Justice were truly interested in upholding the law it would be seeking effective remedies such as the release of the Windows source code and/or the breakup of the company. For shame!

Bill Schmidt
 billsch@ix.netcom.com
 CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009725

From: Gary Pigg
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:24am
 Subject: End the attack on Microsoft.

MTC-00009726

From: Ed (038) Cathy Sweeney
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:25am
 Subject: Let go of the Microsoft debacle!

It is time to put this case to an end once and for all! In a country where Free Enterprise is a cornerstone to our history, and our current culture, why is the Justice Department continuing to pursue this ridiculous persecution of a company whose only crime is being the first to come up with the idea of contracting with computer manufacturers, and making a better product? If Microsoft does not have a better product the public will discover it and the better product will survive!

Edward Sweeney

MTC-00009727

From: Freddy (038) Dana Yates
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:30am
 Subject: Clinton-era anti-trust abuse

Drop the microsoft case and quit prosecuting Clinton era anti-trust cases. We have more important issues to prosecute. Corporations make jobs and we need this right now. Bill Clinton done more against the justice system than Microsoft ever did.

Thank you.
 Joseph F. Yates
 4411 Beechland Rd
 Springfield, Ky 40069

MTC-00009728

From: NaHess120@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:41am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft Settlement should be upheld and that all should get on with work as usual ASAP. I do not understand the whole thing as this is the United States of America where free enterprise is supposed to be encouraged. If one has a superior product, his competitors must come up with something better. If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen—as the saying goes.

MTC-00009729

From: John P. Williams
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 10:11am
 Subject: Microsoft antitrust

I am an extremely busy person but I thought it sufficiently important to stop all my meetings this morning to allow myself time to comment on the task before the justice department.

Microsoft has since its inception co-opted, coerced and colluded with various manufacturers, both software and hardware, to not only dominate but decimate the marketplace. This is seen most clearly in the case of my operating system of choice, the Macintosh but applies equally well to Sun, Unix, Linux and others.

Without the Mac none of you today would use a mouse, a graphical user interface (GUI) or even be discussing this topic because it would not exist. Microsoft quite clearly stole the OS design from Apple and although their lawyers were better than Apple's in defending their case, nothing can change the fact that Windows in any flavor did NOT exist prior to the Macintosh. Since that time, Microsoft has gone on to co-opt every area that is available starting of course with business world. To be sure when this process started there was no a priori reason to believe that Microsoft would prevail and had they not procured the GUI, their market dominance would never be what it is today.

I must say that I find it interesting that we speak in this country of diversity and how each of us needs to look for and nourish diversity wherever and whenever we can find it. Indeed the very basis of this country is diversity, EXCEPT where it comes to computer OS's it seems. There we must cherish uniformity, mediocrity and domination. How does this jive with the constitutional basis of our nation? How does one justify basically telling me what system I will or will not use in my home? Oh, I am sure you will say that this does not happen but it does! Our school is a classic example. By using market dominance in business, Microsoft has coerced the University to become a Windows only shop. Now if I want to access certain information from home I must use a Windows computer or I cannot do my job. Is this what our country really wants? To be tied permanently and completely to one system? Especially if that system is riddled with security flaws and holes? I hope not. Why is this relevant to the current recommendation? As you can see, the ability of Microsoft to compel users to them is

governed in a major way by how they can distribute their product. If you act to make that distribution easier, you doom all of us to a certain future in the hands of one, not so responsive, company. We as a nation would not tolerate one electric company, one public water company, one public sewer, trash, etc, why will we tolerate this?

Further, when do we decide that my decision to use Linux or Unix or the Mac is any different than my choice of religion. Oh I can hear you, this is ridiculous as an analogy, but it actually works quite well. Religions are faith based, certainly in this case you are putting your work, your life in a very real sense, in the hands of the computer company with which you do business. If that religion or OS fails you, that is probably the end of your relationship; unless of course there is no other religion to choose . . . Religions are also chosen, most commonly by prior association but also quite commonly by the individual making a conscious decision to select the religion that most closely matches their world view. We consider religion to be a sacrosanct virtue in this country and protect and guard it closely. Should it be any different for our OS choice? Is it really in our country's best interest to decrease the number of choices for religions? They tried that in Afghanistan . . .

One might well ask how the current proposal will effect these changes? By making it very easy for Microsoft to enter into an arena where they have not traditionally dominated, education, one knocks down the last barrier to choice left in this country. The Apple proposal is wholly more sensible. Allowing schools to use the money donated by Microsoft in any manner that they see fit, allows true choice to continue and preserves the multi-ethnic character of our computer world.

Indeed one could easily take the stand that to truly preserve the multi-ethnicity of our computer world we need affirmative action. That is we need to actually insist that some businesses be given special incentives to use OTHER computer OS's in order to cause this multi-ethnicity to flourish. How can it be that we seek to do good in one area of our country while doing harm in another?

In closing I would make one other analogy, this one quite close to home. There are many reasons why diversity is valued in a culture but it is also valued in nature. Indeed the very essence of nature is diversity. I do not think it is too much of a stretch to imagine what happens when one seeks to shrink the gene pool. There are numerous examples of how treacherous that coastline is...we need only think back on the 20th century to see what can happen when this type of thought process is allowed to roam free.

More importantly, what would happen to group of people that were closely related and interbred when a new disease enters that group. If the group is sensitive to the infective organism, their culture is decimated. Look at what happened to the native Americans or islanders soon after the arrival of Europeans. With no natural immunity to smallpox, they were eradicated just as surely as if that had been a conscious and willful act. Do we really wish to place ourselves in this same position with our computers, our knowledge, our lives . . .

I urge you to reject the current proposal for Microsoft at all costs. It is a dangerous and crumbling cornice on which we do not need to stand. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

Sincerely yours
 John P Williams, MD
 Interim Chair
 UPP Dept. of Anesthesiology
 A-1305 Scaife Hall
 3550 Terrace St.
 Pittsburgh, PA 15261
 Voice 412-648-9624
 FAX412-648-1887

MTC-00009730

From: Mary Powell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 10:17am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is getting ridiculous. Will you please stop wasting the taxpayers money already? The public has always had a right to choose what they want. If I go to the store I have choices. They may not be a lot of choices but then again, I haven't seen any other products out there that are as efficient and user-friendly. All these companies need to stop complaining and come out with a good, reliable product that consumer would want. If they had worked as hard as they are fighting against Microsoft they would have a good product by now!

What kind of country have we become when we go after people that are only trying to improve our technology and benefit the world? Instead of wasting your time with this ludicrous pursuit you should all be looking for Bin Laden and his people and stop harassing valued and outstanding citizens like Mr. Gates and his employees.

Sincerely,
 Satisfied Microsoft Consumer

MTC-00009731

From: Rep.Jensen
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/9/02 10:22am
 Subject: Attn: Renata Hesse

MTC-00009732

From: David Brookes
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 10:32am
 Subject: USG vs. MSFT
 Dave Brookes
 2220 Montgomery Avenue
 Cardiff, CA 92007
 January 8, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

During this time of economic strain, it is sad to see the government holding back on issues that would obviously be beneficial to our economy. The recent Microsoft settlement was reached after three years of well thought out negotiations, and with the benefit of our entire IT sector in mind.

Well, now that it is ready to move forward and get things rolling, there still seems to be those who want to drag it through the mud. Not only has Microsoft agreed to reconfigure licensing and marketing terms, but also it has agreed to redesign various formats of

Windows in order to facilitate easier use of non-Microsoft software. These concessions, along with many others have been agreed upon in order to get the IT sector to move forward in this global market. Now that all parties are ready to move, why can't we get back to business?

Please help support this settlement, and all of the well thought out concessions that have been made. Let us not be the ones to hold back our economy.

Is it not time for Washington to do something for the people? Have we not paid for all the mistake Washington makes? Why are we always fighting for ourselves? Why does Washington continue to harm it's tax paying, voting citizen?

Sincerely,
Dave Brookes

MTC-00009733

From: Cameron Purdy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:31am
Subject: Proposed Settlement

To: Renata Hesse, Trial Attorney I am submitting my comments as per the instructions in the Federal Register in regards to the pending case brought by states and the US Department of Justice against Microsoft.

1. I have read the findings of fact from the case, as penned by Judge Penfield Jackson, I have read the Final Judgment, as proposed by the United States and Microsoft, and I have read the proposed remedies from the nine states that rejected the United States/ Microsoft proposed Final Judgment.

2. I concur that the proposed Final Judgment could potentially limit certain actions that Microsoft has historically employed against computer OEMs.

3. I find no other relationship between the known and accepted transgressions of Microsoft against antitrust law as presented and proved at trial, and the proposed Final Judgment.

It is my opinion that the proposed Final Judgment does not address most of Microsoft's illegal behaviors that were clearly documented at trial: It does not submit that such behaviors have taken place; it does not attempt to correct the past wrongs; it does not include any punitive measures; and lastly it does not attempt to prevent future transgressions.

On the other hand, the nine states' proposals are based on the conclusion that Microsoft has transgressed, that there must be actions taken to correct those transgressions, that punitive measures may be appropriate for those transgressions, and that it is necessary to provide a means to prevent or address future transgressions. While arguably flawed, the proposals are at least based on the known and proven transgressions, and at least attempt to respond to those transgressions. How could it be that the proposed Final Judgment negotiated by the US Department of Justice does not take the same approach? One must question where the proposed Final Judgment originated, since it certainly cannot have originated from the findings of the trial known as the United States of America v. Microsoft Corporation that many of us have so closely watched.

I submit that it would be far better for the United States to altogether drop the proposed Final Judgment and request dismissal of the case than to enter such a flawed and pointless document as a final judgment. The proposed Final Judgment does not provide any sense or form of justice; rather it represents an absolute mockery of our government's will to enforce the law and lends credence to the growing chorus of voices that lament the influence of money and politics over those appointed to protect the interests of the people of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,
Cameron Purdy, President
Tangosol Inc.
402A Highland Ave
Somerville MA 02144 USA

MTC-00009734

From: Craig Madsen
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 10:32am
Subject: FW: Microsoft Antitrust Case
From: Craig Madsen
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2002 4:42 PM
To: 'attorney.general@po.state.ct.us'
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Case
Dear DOJ, etc.,

I am writing to put my 2 cents worth about the antitrust case against Microsoft Corp.

I feel like Microsoft is using their OS dominance to stifle every bit of competition possible. I totally agree with the 9 states that are fighting this thing to the bitter end. I also don't agree with the current settlement at all. For Microsoft to spend a bunch of money for the schools does absolutely nothing to stop them from continuing to do what they have been doing for years—except try to catch up with Apple, Inc. in the school battles!! I also don't mind spending my tax dollars to do whatever is necessary to make them pay for what they have already done.

We watched them 'give away' a browser and all but kill a competitor(s). Tomorrow they start giving away databases, and before long, who knows? If there was a competitor to the government, they would buy them, reduce the price on whatever they were selling to nothing and kill them off too. Once dead, they can raise the price back to whatever they need to.

Do I want Microsoft dead? Probably not, however, I want them to have to use the same playing field as the rest of the businesses in america that don't control 90% of the operating system business. Break them up. Make them give out their source code to anyone, so we could all make products as quickly as them!

p.s. I was trying to send this to: microsoft.atr@usdoj as well, but my e-mail package didn't like this. Do you know how I can get a copy of this to them?

Thanks,
Craig Madsen
(801)-961-3045
155 North 400 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84103-1111

MTC-00009735

From: Donald Bosshart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:42am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been using computers since 1966, have read the proposed settlement and think that it is very fair. MS has made computing simple and very very productive. I use MS products to operate my business.

While some would like to distroy MS, they are motivated by greed and anger. The punishment should fit the crime and the current settlement goes way beyond the crime. Let us move beyond this case and move forward to new innovations. Settle it now!

Donald A. Bosshart, Ed. D.
315 Elmwood Drive
Kent OH 44240

MTC-00009736

From: Richard Buckley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:52am
Subject: For cryin out loud.

The Clinton era bashed these For cryin out loud. The Clinton era bashed these people to no end. This has gone on long enough. I am from the old school "if you build a better mouse trap they will come." All these competitors and Attorney Generals who are crying over Microsoft's success is just sour grapes.

They have created more jobs and more entrepreneurs, (sic), in this country than any single company in existence. Why bash them about their success? I do not own any Microsoft stock nor have I ever owned any but I can tell when jealous come into play and that is all this is. If you want to beat them in the marketplace then make a better product. I will buy it. It is that simple.

MTC-00009737

From: steve parsons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There is no settlement of any kind that can be considered fair for Microsoft. All aspects of the DOJ case against Microsoft are so unjust that I could sit here and generate a book, rather than a simple email message (I'll save the book for a later time). Instead, I would rather express what I believe is one of the key reasons why any settlement of any kind is unjust for Microsoft Corp.

AOL, which has been a key Internet Service Provider (ISP) for years, has held the largest market share within the industry, more than any other ISP, including MSN (the Microsoft Network). Yet AOL went whining to the government that they were being monopolized by Microsoft, and now Microsoft is having unjust legalities imposed upon them, not because they are a monopoly, but because there is the ?potential? that one day they ?may become? a monopoly.

Several years ago, I was a CompuServe user. Then (before AOL ever went running to the government) I switched to AOL. I installed their product on my computer and used AOL as my ISP for just over a month. They frequently advertised about being the most user-friendly ISP around. A month is all I could stand. They were awful. Their software always blew up on my computer and their tech support service was nearly incompetent. For example, 3 of their techs

said the problem was my computer, not their software. So I bought another computer and installed the AOL software again. The same problems. After trying NetZero and AT&T, I eventually found MSN to be superior to them all.

Microsoft is a serious company and a serious competitor. As the old saying goes, 'if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen'. But apparently, today's new saying is, 'if you can't stand the heat, go running to the government?'. AOL whining is what brought this situation to where it is today. Microsoft faces these settlements, not because it was being an unfair competitor, but because they are a competitor in the truest sense. Hopefully the government won't eventually 'break the back' of one of the greatest technology corporations this world has ever seen, cause if they do, then we might get stuck with crap like AOL.

MTC-00009738

From: Jason of Sedona
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer consultant I believe I have a fair understanding of the case and it's impact on the industry. I understand the role of Microsoft, the participating State A.G.s and the role that Netscape and the competition plays. Considering that the case has gone this far, it is my belief that the case needs to be settled as quickly and fairly as possible.

For eighteen years I have been working with Microsoft products. I have been hoping to build a successful company and create a niche in the market myself. If I were lead to believe that this travesty of justice could happen to me upon becoming successful then I would be less likely to even try. To have the Justice Department and the Attorney Generals be against me because my competition is jealous of my success and has lobbied to slow my success is appalling. There is no question in my mind. Microsoft has moved this industry and this great country into a computing era that allows ALL of us to succeed. Netscape, AOL, and Yahoo who, if NOT for Microsoft, would not be here to complain about how much is their share of the market. Please settle this in Microsoft's favor because that in turn will benefit me, and my business, and my customers, and my Country.

Thank you.
Jason Tamm
Jason Tamm Consulting
Sedona, AZ 86351

MTC-00009739

From: larsue2@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have followed this law suit for some time now and want to express my opinion on the matter. I would ask that the settlement with Microsoft be accepted and let's get on with the business of rebuilding our country's economy. This has gone on long enough and needs to be settled and placed behind us as we are attempting to accomplish more important things.

Lawrence L. Pomeroy

MTC-00009740

From: jem@hpesjem.fc.hp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,jem@fc.hp.com@inetgw
Date: 1/9/02 11:20am
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: I work in the tech industry designing CPU's. I have been extensively involved in the use and design of computer hardware and software for years. It is probably also worth noting that I do not work for a company that competes with Microsoft.

I would like to state my strong opposition to the proposed Microsoft settlement based on the following grounds:

(1) The proposed settlement does not forceably correct the problem of illegal anti-competitive behavior which the courts ruled Microsoft has engaged in.

(2) The proposed settlement does not even give Microsoft much of an incentive to correct the illegal anti-competitive behavior.

(3) This anti-competitive behavior has caused and continues to cause enormous harm to consumers and the economy.

The proposed settlement does not forceably correct the problem of illegal anti-competitive behavior which the courts ruled Microsoft has engaged in. The settlement only asks for some very limited behavior modification and does very little to ensure that even these limited behavior modifications can be enforced. Microsoft's history clearly demonstrates it's ability to be creative in it's anti-competitive behavior. Microsoft's history further demonstrates it's willingness to break laws and violate agreements if it thinks it can get away with it. This case, which is about violation of a previous consent decree and of our nations anti-trust laws, clearly demonstrates this. Any successful remedy must be enforceable and comprehensive.

The proposed settlement does not even give Microsoft much of an incentive to correct the illegal anti-competitive behavior. Take Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior in the browser market, for example. Microsoft behaved in an illegal, anti-competitive manner because it was concerned that the browser platform could threaten or replace it's business and consumer desktop software platform monopoly. It's behavior made sure that this threat was eliminated. The proposed settlement would slap Microsoft with a few minor unenforceable behavior restrictions. If you set aside ethics and morality, that looks like a pretty good return on investment. This is not lost on Microsoft.

The anti-competitive behavior has caused and continues to cause enormous harm to consumers and the economy. This is one of the least understood and most important aspects of this case. Clearly, the government wants to protect the economy. Protecting the economy is a noble goal, but they are misguided in trying to do so by protecting Microsoft. The fundamental driving force of capitalism is competition. Microsoft would argue that it is only being punished for being a ruthless competitor. However, throughout the history of our country, there have been many examples of monopolistic, anti-competitive behavior causing harm to the

economy. Many times and in many ways, the government has stepped in with rules which provide a level competitive playing field on which competition may flourish. There are rules against cornering commodities markets. There are accounting rules. There are truth in advertising rules. There are rules against fraud. There are rules against selling defective products.—And, there are rules against leveraging a monopoly to eliminate competition. Breaking any of these rules could be portrayed as just being a ruthless competitor, but our economy will not function very well at all if these rules are not enforced. I could go on and on giving examples of how Microsoft's illegal anti-competitive behavior has harmed the competition, but any and all examples can be disputed (because we can't replay history) if one does not believe that leveraging a monopoly to thwart competition fundamentally harms consumers and the economy. If one does believe this, then examples are not hard to come by. (Although understanding the examples usually requires a fair amount of technical competence and understanding of the industry—always a difficult aspect of this case.)

Sincerely,
James McCormick
james_mccormick@yahoo.com
P.S. The opinions expressed in this letter are mine alone. They do not in any way represent any positions taken by my employer.

MTC-00009741

From: Mike Hall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:22am
Subject: The let em oof free deal

I wish to express my concerns for the reported deal between Microsoft and States and Gov. It is the type of deal that lawyers such as those of microsoft hire can work around on a daily basis without even a hitch in their daily operations as they intended them to be anyway. This deal does nothing to remedy the fact they have stolen from the public in many ways including monetary and products that could have been, but were squashed by this unruly giant.

On the subject of fines, I certainly think a very large fine would make sense, considering their financial status which is also coming under eyes.

I certainly hope that the gov. would rejoin the nine states that have held out and put some controls on this runaway, unruly, money hungry, corporation.

Mike Hall

MTC-00009742

From: Trish Mercer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:22am
Subject: Please End This Travisty

I have been shocked at this lawsuit from the very beginning. It only continues to HURT out economy and citizens savings plans. PLEASE end this outrage! I have yet to see any good coming from this.

Trish Mercer
PO Box 8825
Columbus, GA 31908

MTC-00009743

From: Theodore Saari
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:24am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I received a mass-mailing email from Microsoft that requested we send our views on the proposed settlement to you "Whatever your view of the settlement." Just before this "unbiased" request for comments, Microsoft said: "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."

I have received NO solicitations from any person or group in any form that asked me to voice my opinion on this settlement. It appears to me that Microsoft is the one waging a campaign to get public response to the proposed settlement. The wording of their request clearly suggests the type of response they desire.

Microsoft's claim that "only a few wealthy competitors" will benefit from prolonged litigation is amazing. Microsoft is one of the wealthiest companies in the world. Bill Gates is reported to be the wealthiest person in the world. Many of Microsoft's executives are extremely wealthy. Microsoft and its executives are the ones who will benefit most from a quick settlement, especially one where they have dictated the terms of it. The wealth acquired by Microsoft, Bill Gates, and the executives is the result of a monopolistic and coercive business environment. Microsoft's restrictions on competitors and their use of proprietary "undocumented features" of their operating systems has handicapped any competition for years. Their restrictions and bullying of OEMs has made the MS operating systems the de facto standard for many years. There are virtually no competitors to their operating systems.

Microsoft's proposal as part of the settlement to "donate" \$1 billion in hardware and software to the poorest public schools is one of the best (and cheapest) advertising gimmicks they could get from this settlement. Not only will the schools be teaching and supporting MS products, Microsoft will be able to take a tax deduction on this advertising. They will reap extreme benefits from this punishment.

I support the nine states that have not accepted this proposed settlement and urge the US Government to reject it.

Theodore C Saari
 7917 Orchard Ave N
 Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-2414
 763-585-6578

MTC-00009744

From: MRaddie@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:26am
 Subject: Microsoft

Let us settle this matter as proposed and get it behind us. The case was originally tainted with the bias of the Clinton Administration and wealthy competitors who tried to profit from Microsoft's litigation LET US STOP THIS TYPE OF EXTORTION.

Microsoft has contributed mightily to the American economy and has suffered enough.
 M. Raddie

MTC-00009745

From: Connie Gipson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:26am
 Subject: STOP THE ABUSE

Leave Microsoft alone, they have helped millions of people.

Sincerely,
 Connie Gipson

MTC-00009746

From: Elvin Keiver
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 2:36pm
 Subject: MS

Do not let them get away with it!!!

MTC-00009747

From: Crumpdd@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:39am
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 Attn. DOJ:

Please accept this comment as a citizen request to let the Tunney Act become the final prosecution of Microsoft. I encourage you not to yield to special interests who would continue to bring lawsuit after lawsuit of Microsoft into the courts.

Dick Crump
 (crumpdd@aol.com)

MTC-00009748

From: Bill Thomson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:45am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in support of the current proposed settlement of the Microsoft antitrust law suite.

I have been involved with building computer based information systems since the early 1970's one of the most notable being the Lexis/Nexis information system used by Lawyers and Business professionals. I have been involved with personal computers since the introduction of the IBM PC in the early 1980's and have not always been in agreement with Microsoft's Windows based strategies in that in the early years they pushed the limits of the desktop hardware systems they ran on making the development of telecommunication applications more difficult. The introduction of Windows 95 with the integration of the TCP/IP protocol within the operating system changed that perspective completely.

It is clear to me as one who has experienced it—that Microsoft has been driven by a vision of what personal computers could be in terms of knowledge access and manipulation tools. The result of that vision is that my grandchildren can now routinely sit down at a \$1,500 PC system equipped with a Word Processor that came with the system and perform activity that was not possible to do in any manner on a \$12 million dollar computer in 1975. On that same computer with the Internet Explorer software suite that came with it and a \$19.99 a month subscription to the internet my grandchildren in the United States and my

grandchildren in Brussels Belgium routinely have video conferences to share what is going on their lives use a free service at the Microsoft Network web site.

Microsoft could have at many times during the past 20 years chosen to take an easier path to profits but instead it has consistently invested in innovations that have made the things I listed above a reality that almost all Americans can access if they choose to regardless of their economic status.

It is my sense that this entire law suite was based upon claims made by companies who wanted to take that easy route or bet on the fact that Microsoft would not be able to deliver their vision and lost. Everyone of them has had the opportunity to deliver the products they now criticize Microsoft for producing and chose a different path. Many in a sense had the monopoly and chose to use it rather than spend on the product development costs create what the market wanted.

I hope this matter can be settled as proposed in a timely manner.

Sincerely Yours,
 William K. Thomson
 4425 Lac Lamen Drive
 Centerville, OH 45458-5403
 wkthomson@att.net

MTC-00009749

From: trebor iksrazal
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 11:48am
 Subject: In short, why I am against the settlement

Competition is the key to open, productive markets. It has been ruled that Microsoft has used its monopoly in several sectors to wipe out competition in others. I have been a computer programmer for six years, my first four of which were exclusively on Microsoft operating systems. I have been programming in Java for the last two years on Windows, linux, and Sun Solaris. I think that the file formats to Office, Visual Studio, Windows Media Player, and numerous others should be submitted to standards committees such as ANSI.

The proposal suggested by California and eight other states to reveal the source code behind Microsoft Internet Explorer browser and include support for Sun Microsystems' Java in Windows is also good. As it stands, my professional livelihood is threatened by Microsoft, due to proprietary lock-in to its products. Simply put, Microsoft has tried to destroy Java and is in an open war with Linux.

I am constantly sent proprietary Microsoft files while I am programming on non-Microsoft products. How will the proposed settlement address these grievances? Clearly to me, they were not intended to. I would like Microsoft to win me over to their products, not eliminate the competition as it has largely done to Netscape.

It is clear that Microsoft is at war with end user self-determination.

Look now how Microsoft is using Windows Media Player to destroy Realplayer, look now how Internet Explorer insists on using Microsoft's proprietary Visual Basic Scripting engine while viewing web pages that do not use it.

Look now how Microsoft is manipulating this case to actually increase its dominance by getting itself into schools.

In short, Microsoft products only work with other Microsoft products. There is a need to open up their file formats to standards committees. There is a need to open the source code to Internet Explorer so it is possible to view the entire web without a Microsoft Operating System.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,
Robert Lazarski
8193 Centrebridge
Niwot, Colorado 80503

MTC-00009750

From: GRANPA71TX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:51am
Subject: RE:MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Seymour Beitscher
41 Cypress Point
Abilene, Texas 79606
915-692-1561 [Fax:915-692-1561]
January 9, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I take this opportunity to express my views regarding your wise decision to end the government's antitrust litigation against Microsoft. I, too, am a business owner and, as such, have always tried to stay ahead of my competition by utilizing new and unique methods. Some of those methods met with severe criticisms from my competitors, no matter how innocuous to fair and equitable business procedures they were. Competitors always cry 'foul' when they are surpassed by the competition. In essence, that is what I think occurred in this matter.

However, I do believe the giant [Microsoft] did flex its muscle a bit too much. Microsoft did not get out of this dilemma easy. Microsoft has agreed to make available information regarding its internal structure of Windows, which now allows its competitors to compete. I do not understand this reasoning since I would not supply my competitors with any procedure I deem proprietary and beneficial to me.

In conclusion, I think that if the government moves against Microsoft again it will be nothing more than harassment. Who is to say the severe decline in the "tech" section of the economy was not precipitated by the government's legal stance against Microsoft? Our economy now, more than ever, needs stability.

The economy, and the administration, needs to keep Microsoft out of the muck and mire it has been stuck in these past three years. Helping Microsoft weather this storm will be successful in stimulating the economy over a broad span in the future.

Sincerely,
Seymour Beitscher

MTC-00009751

From: Duane Tackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:49am
Subject: Opposition to the proposed

Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may Concern:

I would like to take the opportunity to voice my opposition to the comparatively weak settlement offered by the DOJ against Microsoft. I feel that more should be done to prevent Microsoft from extending its monopoly, including opening up its software so that consummate professionals can review it and fix the numerous security flaws that are inherent in its code. If MS is allowed to proceed with "business as usual" then the result will be more bug ridden software with higher prices.

Please, help restore competition by making Microsoft more accountable to the people who use their software every day. Thank you in advance for considering this tract.

Duane Tackett
Network Administrator
Linux Enthusiast

MTC-00009752

From: Bob Agnew
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 11:53am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

The vast majority of the national news media, let alone the American citizenry, has not understood the ramifications of the anti-trust case against Microsoft, let alone the "settlement" offered therefrom.

We are rapidly moving to a position, as a nation, where the vast majority of major large corporations as well as small businesses are becoming dependent on Microsoft and the Windows operating system and associated products (Office, Internet Explorer).

This is not merely the old "ta vs. VHS" argument, but the complete obviating of all corporate responsibility to Microsoft. Microsoft has shown complete contempt for the U.S. Government and people of the United States. Witness the latest changes to the cost of licensing Microsoft products. Once they've got all the operating system and desktop application business in their court, they'll be able to make any changes to the software and/or pricing they so desire—completely relieving corporate America of any fiduciary responsibility to shareholders, employees or customers.

Microsoft didn't "invent" Windows or the use of the mouse as a graphic-input device, yet it has a defacto monopoly of the desktop operating system. We've seen how, in the absence of innovation by Microsoft, they purchase companies that actually do innovate—then proceed to bastardize the acquired product/company until the end-user no longer remembers when a product used to be good. (The Windows XP operating system is a good example: it now includes a rudimentary raster image processing/editing tool for the digital photographer, which will naturally prevent the sales of better software by highly specialized companies—since XP is including the barely passable version for free.)

Inevitably, Microsoft will be able to monitor the desktops of corporate America and perhaps even use "push" technology to advance its own agenda. In other words, Microsoft will eventually control our economy and the majority of our lifestyle based on the whims of Mr. Gates & Co. I don't

wish to sound alarmist, but even in its heyday, IBM couldn't be blamed for trying to control as much of the American economy and lifestyle as Microsoft eventually will.

The settlement of having Microsoft provide software and hardware to school districts actually plays right into the hands of Microsoft—at the expense of Apple, which has done a much better job of courting the school-age computer users. What better way to encourage the uninterrupted continuation of the Microsoft monopoly than by getting them "hooked" at a young age in the schools? I am neither a proponent nor an opponent of the PC or the Mac. I just wish someone, somewhere would realize what all the fuss was about in the first place: Microsoft stifles competition and innovation. That's the truth. And just 'cause Microsoft sells Windows, Word, Access, Internet Explorer—doesn't mean those are the best products. They're just the cheapest and the easiest for the vast majority of average Americans to operate. Henry Ford performed a similar "service" with the automobile in the early years of that industry—but he didn't stifle competition and buy out competitors just to put them out of business. The American Public wouldn't have stood for that.

Robert M. Agnew
Sr. GIS Analyst—Administrator
City of Las Vegas
(702) 229-6049

MTC-00009753

From: kouryab
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:56am
Subject: Anti-trust settlement

I think the so-called settlement with Microsoft will do nothing except insure that they will increase their monopoly. If they are allowed to give schools old computers and software to run them all this will do is make sure that these schools will have to update their systems with Microsoft software. Most old computers will not run anything new as far as current operating systems. What should be done is to make Microsoft pay the settlement amount in cash and then allow the schools to buy what they need and not be restricted to old and out dated equipment and operating systems.

Al Koury

MTC-00009754

From: Exers30x@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want it be said I do not agree with prolonging this settlement. It is meant only to benefit a few and try to stop great innovation on Microsofts part. Microsoft is responsible for making home and office computer accessible to all and with out it we would be up a creek. I say enough is enough get off of Microsofts back and get on with improving our lives like Microsoft has done so well.

Nancy Simpson
Indianapolis

MTC-00009755

From: Dr. Arthur C. Sucsy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Case

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

More than a year and a half ago I wrote the following e-mail to Texas Federal Senators. It basically gives a layman's point-of-view on the Federal Antitrust Prosecution of Microsoft at that time. You may wish only to scan the contents at this time.

"Dear Senators,

My understanding of the Federal Anti-trust Laws is that they were intended to protect the general public from any economic or physical harm, which may be caused by collusion among individuals and companies on product price or product availability.

When Judge Thomas Jackson ruled last November that Microsoft violated Federal Antitrust Laws, he gave no indication that Microsoft had in any way harmed the public. This seems to me to have missed the first test on application of the law. In fact, there are many of us (public) who believe that Microsoft has made a tremendous contribution to the public through the process of establishing a workable system of communication through the Internet. There is no doubt that Microsoft has harmed its competitors through the competitors' inability to compete strongly. But this is a clear indication that the purpose of the Anti-trust Laws is functioning; i.e. fierce competition.

If Microsoft had driven its competitors out of business and then raised prices beyond reasonable limits or limited product availability, that would be a different matter. But, they have not done that. If I were a Microsoft competitor, I would be much tempted to be in court claiming "foul", because that is the easiest way to gain an advantage. I don't know what motivated Judge Jackson to his conclusion, but if he was influenced by competitors' claims of pain, he should have had one more reason to recognize that no anti-trust violation existed.

We might also consider the matter of "bundling", which has been a "red herring" in this whole situation. I recently bought a Cadillac Deville and wanted the Convenience Package. However, the "bundle" included a compass, which I didn't want. Was I hurt, when I took the "bundle"? Yes. Did I have an option to not take the "bundle"? Yes. Can I expect that the Federal Justice Department will soon be suing General Motors for infringement of Anti-trust Laws? You may want to answer that one.

Some have said that present Anti-trust Laws are out-moded and need to be brought up to date. I do not believe that is so. Violation of the present law is a serious matter. As in most categories of civil or criminal violation, a violation is committed by an individual or a group of individuals, who have seriously damaged the public. The retribution for such damage is jail time, with the ancillary advantage of discouraging future potential violators from similar action. Have Bill Gates and perhaps other members of Microsoft violated Federal Antitrust Laws? If so, they should get jail time. If jail time seems inappropriate, one should then re-ask whether there has been a violation.

Human beings tend to enjoy positions of power and authority, and Federal Prosecutors are no exception. What better way is there for a Federal Prosecutor to obtain recognition

than to prosecute one of the largest corporations in the world? If we can't get Bill Gates directly, we'll get him indirectly, even if we can't prove our case to the extent to give him jail time.

Such action by the Justice Department is not prosecution. It is persecution and should not be permitted. We have already seen the difficulties caused by the Spanish Inquisition. The purpose of government is to establish and maintain a reasonably fair playing field. When there is a winner, it is not government's role to take away the prize because other contenders did not have the capability to compete. If government does that, it is meddling.

We now have 19 states and others, for a total of 28 organizations, also suing Microsoft for anti-trust violations. One must ask whether these are legitimate suits or whether because of our litigious society these appendages are using the previous good reputation of the Federal Government to obtain windfalls in damage settlements.

Dear Senators, I have earlier said that I believe the present Anti-trust Laws are satisfactory for today's society. However, with subsequent sociological changes in our society since the establishment of those laws, it is probably appropriate for Congress in general and the Senate in particular to more specifically define these laws in order to avoid persecution by aggressive career seekers in the Justice Department.

Through Justice Department persecution, Microsoft is being seriously hurt financially and in their ability to concentrate on continued innovation to further develop the Internet and related communication devices. This is a disadvantage to the general public, and you may want to consider some form of specific intervention to bring this matter to a quick conclusion. The law enforcement people are obviously confused, and I humbly suggest that it is up to Congress to show leadership.

Dr. Arthur C. Sucsy
4203 96th Street
Lubbock, TX 79423
Ph: 806-794-1381
4203 96th Street
Lubbock, Texas 79423"

I recently had a phone call from a Microsoft employee. He had a hazy knowledge concerning the above e-mail. While Microsoft was not copied, and I do not know how that e-mail came to his attention, it was not private. The Microsoft employee advised me that part of the recent agreement between Microsoft and the Federal Department of Justice required a time period for the public to comment. The Microsoft employee indirectly asked me to comment to you on their behalf. In fact, he had drafted a letter for my approval and signature, and which I chose not to use.

I am pleased that this case is being concluded. In retrospect, I believe a Justice Department investigation should have been initiated, but a case should not have been filed.

My experience with commercial matters has led me to conclude that Microsoft was aggressive in their business practices but not illegal and in no way damaged the public.

I have been advised that Microsoft will design future versions of Windows to provide

a mechanism to make it easy for computer makers, consumers and software developers (competitors) to promote non-Microsoft software within Windows. The mechanism will make it easy to add or remove access to features built into Windows or into non-Microsoft software. Consumers will have the freedom to choose to change their configuration at any time.

Such concession on the part of Microsoft goes well beyond what I consider a reasonable settlement. Consumers have always had the option to use non-Microsoft software. They have used Microsoft, because it is better than competitive offerings.

Let's finish up the Agreement, close down the case, let Microsoft take its unjust penalties, and get on with our business of building a better country.

For those who may suspect that I have an ulterior motive in writing this e-mail, let me say that I receive no special benefit from Microsoft, have never worked for the Company, have no friends or family that have ever worked for the Company, and that less than 2% of my stock portfolio is in Microsoft stock.

Respectfully yours,
Arthur C. Sucsy
4203 96th Street
Lubbock, TX 79423
806-794-1381
CC:Sucsy D & P,Sucsy Dr. Robert

W.,Woodward Karen,Suc...

MTC-00009756

From: Greg Mader
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 12:04pm
Subject: I disagree with the proposed
microsoft anti-trust settlement

Dear DOJ,

I respectfully disagree with the proposed settlement with Microsoft, as it allows them to continue to "embrace and extend" open protocols with their own proprietary extensions, and, eventually, stomp out competition. Notice the pattern of RTF for word processing, PPTP for Virtual Private Networks, and Kerberos for authentication. In all of these cases, Microsoft, while claiming to embrace an open standard, remove access and interoperability features, and refuse to release their changes. I recommend that they be allowed to continue as a company, but make mandatory disclosures, or "Open Source" their technology, supervised by a review board. Please do not punish users of other operating systems by allowing Microsoft to push them into oblivion. Instead, encourage Microsoft to release specifications or source code necessary to interoperate with their software.

Thank You,
Greg Mader
Chicago, IL

MTC-00009758

From: DICKROSS5@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Letter was sent to Attorney General
Ashcroft and Sen. Rick Santorum
Richard Ross

MTC-00009759

From: John Heuerman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 12:20pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 18419 79th Place West
 Edmonds, Washington 98026
 January 5, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I wanted to express my support for the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I feel that this suit needs to come to an end and that this settlement is a fair way to do so. The three-year process was not only well thought out and well monitored, but it had all parties in mind.

This settlement will be good for the technology industry, as well as the U.S. economy, not to mention the American consumer. The IT sector has floundered without the innovative leadership of Microsoft for the last three years, we will not see a turn around in the field until we can put this litigation behind us.

I trust that you will strive to implement this settlement. It is imperative that this suit ends, and that we can move on and focus on more vitally important issues affecting our nation.

Sincerely,
 John Heuerman

MTC-00009760

From: Walter Dominguez
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 12:24pm
 Subject: Microsoft AntiTrust

Why can't you just leave successful business alone. This company has done more for consumers and the world in General than any of you bias'd self asserting politicians have in Centuries!!! Get over it, should they be punished for being successful and their competitors just could not handle getting beat in the market place?? come on!!

MTC-00009761

From: SupplyCJI@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 12:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Isn't it time we stopped this fruitless battle in which only the lawyers win and the consumers lose. We have far greater problems in our country than pursuing and trying to reduce one of the greatest companies ever established. Let's stop the whining by the prosecutors and settle this case once and for all. Allow Microsoft to innovate and implement the new technologies we as consumers are waiting for.

Enough is enough!
 C.J. Roum

MTC-00009762

From: James (038) Pearl Tank
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 1:03pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Justice Department:
 Communism is almost dead. One of its principles was that people had to have a lid

on how much money and/or things they could possess; the excess had to be dispersed to the multitudes. This did not lead to much ambition on the part of the people.

Bill Gates has had an entrepreneurial spirit and worked hard to get his company going successfully. He has earned everything he has and our country has benefited in many ways from his work. Let us not put a cap on his or any else's ambition by taking away their just deserts. Let us not revive the communistic way, but let it die in disgrace. Let us end the wasteful spending being conducted in this case and get on with the business of America.

Thank you for all your work.

James Tank
 215 Mack Ct.
 Brillion, WI 54110-1330
 920-756-3474
 jptank@quixnet.net

MTC-00009763

From: Nick Maier
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 1:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotally:

Please allow me to comment on the proposed Microsoft Settlement. Microsoft has clearly and repeatedly demonstrated anti-competitive and criminal activity. They have both threatened and recriminated against competitors that have elected not to collude with them in anti-competitive activity.

The most effective way to prevent Microsoft's executives, its employees, and it's Board of Directors from behaving in this way is to levy a very large fine against the company. I would recommend a fine in the amount of \$1.0 Billion dollars. A fine of this amount will serve as a major "wake-up call" to the company, it's attorney's, it's employees, it's shareholders and it's Board of Directors. This is the only way to change the anti-competitive philosophy that is deeply ingrained in the Company.

I urge you to act forcefully to change this behavior, now. There will be no second chances.

nm
 Nicholas Maier—President
 NewZing.com, Inc.
 2465 East Bayshore Drive, Suite 400
 Palo Alto, CA 94303
 nmaier@newzing.com
 (650) 255-7403
 CC:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC-00009764

From: Les Brunswick
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 1:11pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to point out one way in which the settlement that the Department of Justice agreed to is deeply flawed. By breaking the anti-trust laws Microsoft made enormous illegal gains in terms of profits and market share. Yet under the agreement it is not forced to turn back any of these, but instead gets to keep them. The lesson that Microsoft learns from the agreement is that it is to its own advantage to break the law. The predictable consequence is that Microsoft will continue to break the law in the future,

in old ways or new ones. It would not be hard to make Microsoft give up its near monopoly in the internet browser market. It gained it by forcing original equipment manufacturers to install Internet Explorer (which was subsidized by its monopoly-level profits from Windows) and not carry Netscape Navigator. The remedy could be for Internet Explorer to be unbundled from Windows, for OEM's to be forbidden for several years to install Internet Explorer and required to install another web browser, and for Microsoft to be required to distribute Internet Explorer only by selling it at a price that represents its cost of development. Do this for two or three years and we would have real competition restored to the browser market.

The first Microsoft anti-trust trial failed to halt the company from continuing after the trial to abuse and expand its monopolies, and the second trial will have the same outcome if the present agreement is upheld.

Sincerely,
 Les Brunswick

MTC-00009765

From: John Girt
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern:

I have been a significant user of Microsoft products for years. The existence of a single entity that can use unrestricted power to get its way is not in the best interest of our economy. I am a software developer myself, but couldn't even attempt to compete with Microsoft. I develop custom systems and use development tools from various vendors. My issue is my inability to convince many clients that non-Microsoft tools are better in many areas. Because of this, these innovative products do not get a chance in the market place. I truly believe that the best thing for consumers and Microsoft Shareholders, is it's immediate split-up. The original split-up suggestions are heard were way too soft. I recommend that it be split as follows.

- 1.. Operating System and Networking software (including internet tools such as Internet Explorer.)
- 2.. Development tools and databases (Visual Basic, compilers and SQL/Server)
- 3.. Workgroup Tools (Exchange, Application Servers(.NET), Schedule Plus)
- 4.. Desk-top applications (The Office Suite of productivity tools, games, etc.) Without fair competition innovation is stifled. As individual companies each would be able to flourish in their own realm. And after at least two years, they could be allowed to develop competing products. This would give them a better idea of the effort required to compete against one of their own existing products and would most likely result in better products for consumers.

I have seen the quality of Microsoft products deteriorate due to the lack of competition. You can't even get help anymore with out talking to a staple. XP was supposed to be the best operating system ever yet they had a security hole in it that you could drive a truck through.

AT&T share holders who held all of their original AT&T stock when it split have

increased their portfolio several fold. I think the same would happen with Microsoft stock. My wife and I hold several hundred shares of Microsoft stock and believe that it would help its value.

Thank You
John Girt
John Girt & Associate
(206)399-4977
John@Girt.NET

MTC-00009766

From: REYES,RAFAEL (HP-PaloAlto,ex1)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 1:43pm
Subject: MS settlement contrary to public interest

Hello,

I am a long time IT professional. I use Microsoft products very extensively and have done so through my career. I respect their products and feel they have done many things well.

However, Microsoft's monopolistic practices are blatant, longstanding, and highly damaging. I still recall the false bug MS introduced in Windows 3.1 to cripple the superior DR DOS. Microsoft's behavior has not changed. Their bundling of products into their Windows operating system, where they have near complete control in the market, marches on unabated—squashing products should have the choice to use. Internet Explorer's dominance in the market over Netscape is a very recent case where their practices are blatant and now with Windows XP they continue their monopoly exercise with the bundling of their multi-media software (attacking RealPlayer), Passport, and Hailstorm. An operating system is an infrastructure distinct from the applications and it is long standing good programming practice that such components be "loosely coupled" to reduce unwanted interdependencies (and MS practiced this despite the baldfaced lie that Internet Explorer could not be removed from Windows).

It is as if General Motors owned the highways and decided suddenly to change the lane size, and not coincidentally, they are the only ones that sell cars that fit.

The settlement does nothing to address these very serious issues. In fact all it does is incentivize the company to extend its monopoly into education - one of the few places which Microsoft has not yet taken over. As an IT professional and member of the general public I find the DOJ's settlement to be a grave disservice to the public.

Rafael K Reyes
Senior Systems Developer
Content & Knowledge Management
Hewlett-Packard
650-960-5133
CC:'attorney.general(a)po.state.ct.us'

MTC-00009767

From: Richard C. Wharton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 1:47pm
Subject: Proposed penalties

Hello,

I urge you to inflict severe penalties upon Microsoft for their past illegal activities. Merley stopping them from future crimes is

insufficient. Criminals must not be allowed to keep their profits from past crimes.

Please keep us computer users in mind. It is we who have been saddled with a Microsoft "tax" for the past 10 years.

Respectfully,
Richard C. Wharton
Ibex Manufacturing, Inc.

MTC-00009768

From: David R. Freeman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings:

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 R. Freeman

MTC-00009769

From: Doug Bostrom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 1:57pm
Subject: U.S. vs Microsoft

Greetings,

I'd like to respectfully register my opposition to the Justice Department's proposed settlement of the U.S. vs. Microsoft case now in Judge Kollar-Kotelly's court. Microsoft has been found guilty of abuse of monopoly privileges, and Microsoft has amply demonstrated in the past that it is organically incapable of properly absorbing and implementing external guidance from judicial authority. The proposed settlement does little to mitigate the former circumstance, and in the latter is insufficiently informed by the prior experience of the Courts and Justice Department in their dealings with Microsoft.

Microsoft will not look upon the settlement as a benchmark upon which to anchor their ethical roots. On the contrary, the settlement terms will be used as the sine qua non of ethics that can be expected of their company as identifiable under the terms of the settlement, which also fails to properly address compliance monitoring. Microsoft has a fundamentally different view of acceptable civic behavior, as evinced yet again by today's (Jan. 9, 2002) disclosure that the corporation appears to have been systematically rigging user preference polls in a major information technology journal (<http://news.zdnet.co.uk/story/0,,t269-s2102244,00.html>).

Having done a superlative job in the trials phase of this enormously expensive proceeding, it is imperative that the Department of Justice bring a firm and historically aware proposal for remedy to the table. The proposed settlement does not fulfill this mandate.

Respectfully yours,
Douglas K. Bostrom
CTO Amaroq Systems, Inc.
www.amaroqsystems.com

MTC-00009770

From: Ray Kraft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:07pm

Subject: Opinion: microsoft settlement does not address problem sufficiently

I would like to voice my concern over the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the DOJ. Given that Microsoft has been found *guilty* of violating antitrust law and abusing its power in the computer operating system market, I feel that the measures outlined in the settlement will do little to redress this problem. In fact, I believe that some proposed "corrective" measures (i.e. those addressed at schools) will in fact have just the opposite effect, and will serve to strengthen Microsoft's monopoly position.

I would like to ask that more effective measures be proposed to bring about the changes required to prevent Microsoft from continuing to abuse its monopoly position.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Raymond H. Kraft, Ph.D.
Raymond Kraft, Ph.D. rkraft@api.com
Associate Technical Fellow 425-657-1348
Applied Precision, Inc.
Issaquah Washington, USA
GnuPG Public Key Available: <http://www.keyserver.net/en>

MTC-00009771

From: Chris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:08pm
Subject: Wrestling the 800-pound gorilla from Redmond

Good Afternoon,

As a person working in the technology field, it is practically impossible to go a day without hearing something about the battle currently raging in DC. Before today I resigned myself to be a casual observer. That was until I felt the time was approaching when you would have to weigh in with a decision. I would like to commend you on a valiant effort. Microsoft, I'm sure, was a surprise. They didn't appear to be as cunning or underhanded as the Bells, but certainly held their own. Mostly because our government was not ready to deal with a monopoly in such a new industry. An industry which is still growing. Next, let me say that public opinion is not good right now. Had the 9 states not protested, there would certainly have been a backlash. Which brings me to my point. I cannot even begin to imagine the amount of information you have to sift through on a daily basis, so I thought I would summarize what the tech community sees as the issues, and what it ignores:

First, The Browser War is Dead!...and has been for some time. We have all moved on. I realize that it was at the core of the anti-trust suit, but it does not need to be part of the settlement. I, like many others have been running alternative browsers on Windows for years. In fact, this letter is being written in Opera, which easily matches if not surpasses IE in all respects.

Second, OEM is where we should be focusing. Microsoft has such a strangle hold on consumers because PC manufacturers are forced to build either Windows only machines, or Windows free machines. A move to curtail their OEM agreement would be a big step in the right direction.

Finally, Who has really been hurt? The public?...sure, but more than that, the

competition. Why not repay them. Strip some cash from Microsoft and distribute it to the three major Linux Distributions, to Netscape, to Opera, to Apple, to anyone who can prove they have felt a negative impact in business. Provide money for advertising new, non-Microsoft technology. Whatever you do....DO NOT allow them to donate Windows PCs to schools. I'm sure you also see this as a win/win for Microsoft as well as we do. Cash, however, would be great. Keep in mind that most Linux users are running the OS on machines 5 years or older. The OS is free, and the machines to run it can be collected for pennies at local charities. A much better deal for all concerned.

All we want is a level playing field. As much as Microsoft threatens the stifling of innovation, you must stand firm. Everyone knows their products have flaws, major ones, in some cases. Yet they remain in power. Ask yourselves what measures can we put in place that would put Microsoft back under the control of the market rather than vice versa.

The public must regain it's will to choose. Treat this like the tobacco settlement. The public is certainly addicted to a product that causes harm.

I hope this helps.

Thanks for your time,

Chris Gregan
Portland, OR

MTC-00009772

From: Robin McMullen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement does not address the pivotal issue, which is that Microsoft has routinely indulged in unfair competitive practices, and has clearly signaled its intention to continue doing so in the future. It is difficult not to conclude that the court is either afraid of Microsoft for some reason, or expects to benefit directly from its own vapid decision.

MTC-00009773

From: Jim Kostrava
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:22pm
Subject: Settlement of Microsoft Case
To: United States Department of Justice,
The purpose of this email is to encourage you to settle for once and for all the Microsoft Case.

The Foundation for Economic Education (FEE) is the oldest free-market educational organization in the world, founded by Leonard E. Read in 1946. FEEA is monthly magazine, Ideas on Liberty, is the longest continuously published magazine dedicated to individual liberty in the United States. FEE is a nonprofit organization dedicated to free markets, private property, self-reliance, limited government, and the rule of law.

Since 1946 our organization has been supported entirely by private voluntary contributions. We receive no money from the government, nor would we accept money if offered. On behalf of our 4,500 supporters and the tens of thousands of people who have supported us over the past 55 years that are passionate about individual liberty, I urge

you to settle this particular case. I also encourage you to limit the intrusion of government in business in general. Barriers to initiative and endless litigation are the anchors on the economy and are the greatest threat to the prosperity of all U.S. citizens.

In liberty,
James E. Kostrava, CAE
Vice President for External Relations
Foundation for Economic Education
30 South Broadway
Irvington-on-Hudson, New York 10533
(914) 591-7230, ext. 330
Email- jkostrava@fee.org
<mailto:jkostrava@fee.org>
Michigan: (989) 687-6367 Fax: (989) 687-9088

FEE Web sites:
www.fee.org <<http://www.fee.org>>
www.cliches.org <<http://www.cliches.org>>
www.freespeaker.org <<http://www.freespeaker.org>>
www.feenationalconvention.org <<http://www.feenationalconvention.org>>
www.laissezfairebooks.com <<http://www.laissezfairebooks.com>>

MTC-00009774

From: Resom1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case without any further litigation. I believe this lawsuit has been harmful to consumers and the American economy. The very day it was announced the stock market went down and every time there is a negative statement about Microsoft it goes down again.

It is obvious that those wealthy competitors of Microsoft who oppose the settlement don't care about the economy and welfare of our country as they oppose Microsoft giving the poor schools and children computers so they have the same opportunity as children in more well do schools to learn and prepare themselves for their futures. Please put a stop to all litigations of this case.

Thank you,
Evelyn Moser

MTC-00009775

From: PETER CAPPOLA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement !
Settle this Case!

I believe this case should never have gotten this far. It should be thrown out of court.

Let Microsoft Innovate and Grow this Industry. Consumers and the Our Country Benefit!

The software industry is probably the strongest industry in this country. Instead of promoting it, its being torn apart by jeleous compeditors of Microsoft. Microsoft is the leading cause of the gains in technology this industry has had. Its speculation to say other businesses or competition would have emerged if Microsoft wasn't aggressive in their innovative goals. The Industry could just as well be ten years behind if they didn't persue their innovative goals. Bundling is a good thing. I worked for 17+ years for a computer Mfg Co. and know the negative results of

having to get different software products to work together and having to install software patches. This case is not in the CONSUMERS BEST INTEREST, its the compeditors who want to stop Microsoft from being succesful. What company every went in business to be Number Two!! Whats wrong with chairing for your own team to be the best!

Why is Microsoft to be expected to have to write software to its competitions advantage and product and not specific to their own, Apple Computer has been doing that for years.

Let Microsoft Innovate and Grow this Industry. Consumers and the Our Country Benifit!

MTC-00009776

From: Jim Smilanich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:42pm
Subject: I oppose the current settlement deal Sirs;

I have worked for US Bank for 6 years in the Network department as a network architect. Before that, I worked for Merrill Corporation for 7 years as the lead network designer and network management specialist. During most of that period I have supported and used Microsoft products in a wide variety of ways. I have also had the opportunity to compare and contrast them to Microsoft's competition.

I regard myself as about as hardcore a free market advocate as there can be. I believe, however, that a free market works only when all involved in it do so from an ethical viewpoint that embraces fair play. It is my contention that Microsoft's management has no conception of anything that even remotely resembles an ethical viewpoint. During my entire career in IT, I've watched with dismay as Microsoft eliminated one competitor after another in one market segment after another. In my experience, the finding of fact barely scratched the surface of the damage that Microsoft has done to the computer industry over the years. They did not do this by the quality of their product or by competing head to head. As the trial demonstrated quite clearly, they did so by arm twisting PC vendors, buying up the competition, predatory pricing tactics, and on and on and on.

Microsoft has almost gleefully gone back to their old ways since the proposed settlement was announced. Brian Valentine's leaked emails (<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/4/23518.html>) urging his sales force to spy on their customer base, their manipulation of a ZDNet Java vs. .Net poll (<http://news.zdnet.co.uk/story/0,,t269-s2102244,00.html>), Microsoft's announced pricing and licensing changes, and other stories all point to a monopolist company with absolutely no fear of the Federal government. None of the news that I have read since the original finding of fact shows any remorse over their actions. None of it even demonstrates an awareness that the company has been convicted of a crime!

Please, take the high road. Find a punishment that fits the crime. The wholesale destruction of dozens of companies and market segments deserves a harsh and swift response.

Thank you for your time,
Jim Smilanich

MTC-00009777

From: Kevin Bischoff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Company Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Attorney General John Ashcroft

The Microsoft Company has been in battle with its competitors in the marketplace and unfortunately with the federal government for too long. It is good news to the industry and to the nation's economy to know we are on the cusp of closure to at least the federal lawsuit.

During this open public comment period I want to take the opportunity to support your Department in the fine job that you have done to find the compromise and reasonable end to this long drawn out million dollar experience. Please consider the settlement sufficient and close the federal government's role in this competitive war. I support your settlement proposal.

Sincerely,
Terry R. Spencer
Utah State Senator
District 22

MTC-00009778

From: PLewis521@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Microsoft settlement was reasonable, fair and good for the consumer. HOWEVER the special interests are attempting to derail this settlement and prolong the litigation simply to benefit the few wealthy competitors of Microsoft. This is political posturing by the few States Attorney Generals who refused to sign on to the settlement. The only beneficiaries are the attorneys involved. The continuance of this case is NOT in the interests of the consumers for whom this law was originally crafted. The current settlement IS in the public interest. Please close the case.

Margaret M. Lewis

MTC-00009779

From: Stephen Grossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs:

The anti-trust laws are a Marxist, pseudo-scientific danger to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Their standard of competition is equality, an economically destructive situation in which the most productive people will be destroyed for the alleged sake of the least productive. It is a nihilist attack on production and human life. Inequality is an economic good. Economics should benefit the individual as an individual, not equality, society or power-lust.

Stephen Grossman

MTC-00009780

From: mjh48060

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:04pm
Subject: Regarding the Microsoft settlement

After reading the details of the settlement I reached the opinion that a lot more must be done in order to insure that Microsoft doesn't abuse it's monopoly on the desktop operating system market. I've made an opinion regarding Windows XP Home Edition to friends and family and after discovering the e-mail address to the Department of Justice, I thought the comments I made to friends and family might be relevant here as well.

If you're looking for a recommendation from me about Windows XP Home Edition, you won't see one from me. After playing around with it for a while I found a lot of issues....

1. Internet Explorer is as unstable in XP as it is in Me / 98.
2. Older DOS games either don't run well or don't run at all.
3. Some Windows games don't run well or at all. (Including both 32 bit and those older Win3.1 16 bit stuff)
4. Printing is slower if you're doing anything else besides.
5. Intermittant connection problems with the modem.
6. Losing modem settings (Big Issue!)
7. Recovery tools are either rudimentary or nonexistent. (Worse than Windows Millennium Edition)
8. Still crashes from time to time—Microsoft says 'Bad Hardware' I say "Software Bugs"
—* XP Home Edition still can't make it to a day. Linux has so far made it to 1 day, and 17 hours and is still going. Nothing wrong with the hardware I say. ;-)
9. It's claims of being the most secure operating system are a total lie! Network listening ports are open and unclosable—For example: Remote Procedure Call and Universal Plug and Play. Firewall is now mandatory for safety reasons I'm also noting the Universal Plug and Play security hole found just before Christmas. Interestingly it didn't show up on the Windows Update website until three weeks later.
10. XP complains about deleting files in use when they're clearly —not— in use! (Time to reboot.)
11. That 8 second shift lock accessory feature that totally messes up the CAPS LOCK function. (Enabled by default.)
12. XP sometimes refuses to read the CD-ROM (Time to reboot.)
13. Microsoft compressed folders are a joke. Doesn't open on some zip files. Complains about file corruption that just isn't true.
14. The new Windows look is nothing really special nor really customizable. Unix based operating systems were doing it better first.
15. Opening a pictures folder shows a link under Folder tasks called: Order Prints Online. (Bad, bad form, Microsoft! Unlike some people, I order *— NOTHING—* online if it involves a credit card. Surely online credit card theft still happens.)
16. Product Activation. My issue with it is having to call Microsoft to ask for an activation code everytime I upgrade or have

to reinstall XP. I feel that I simply don't need to ask permission to use something that I've paid for.

17. Desktop screen disappears spontaneously and randomly when opening folders. (\$80 billion dollars in their pocket and they still can't create a decent GUI shell since Windows 95? Whatever excuse it is I don't want to hear it! I want to drag and drop. Not cut, paste and pray! What's the problem with that?)

18. Plug and Play is still problematic.

19. That general stupid AOL feeling I get. However I like my face and name on top of the Start Menu. However the user interface is far too dumbed down for my taste. I can still use the classic interface and remove that AOL feeling but I lose my face, too.

20. XP Home Full version is overpriced. Upgrade version could be more reasonable, too.

21. Upgrading over 98 / Me causes lots and lots of problems with breaking programs already installed beforehand. Every program broken has to be reinstalled. Best idea for this problem is to repartition and install XP on a new partition and leave the old 98 / Me intact. (Dual booting gives a lot of flexibility with new and old stuff but it's also a hard drive hog not to mention a huge waste of time to set up!)

22. EZ CD Creator 4 screws up XP. Roxio's recommended upgrade is way overpriced! And you —still— have to download a patch! I was never even told about the issue nor was I able to find out about the issue with the Microsoft web site until after the damage was done. (Smells like a dirty marketing trick to me.)

23. Product support is given but on the condition that you have to sign up for a .NET Passport first. (Which is absolutely ridiculous! It —NEVER— said that on the packaging!)

24. The recovery console is useless in a real problem.

25. I cannot remove Internet Explorer, Outlook Express, Windows Messenger, Windows Media Player, and a lot of other Microsoft programs that are installed by default as well as the loss of hard disk space incurred from the use or lack of use of those programs.

26. I want to choose what kind of operating system I want on my computer when I buy a computer. So far the only way I can buy a computer and have a choice of operating system is to buy the components necessary to put together a computer from different sources so I don't have to purchase a Microsoft operating system. For example, I may want Linux or FreeBSD or BeOS or whatever may be available but if I buy components to assemble a computer from one source. I'm told that I need to purchase a Microsoft operating system. I simply do not have to accept that in my opinion. Simply put, I feel that as a customer I was misled, lied to, and ultimately swindled out of money when I installed XP Home Edition. I also feel that Microsoft's business practices are completely horrible and warrant punitive measures to keep the company in check up to and including splitting the company as necessary to bring real innovation to computer technology as a whole.

Sincerely yours,
Michael Hickey

MTC-00009781

From: Donna Ulrich
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:06pm
Subject: Get off the case

Dear Friends,

We've got more important things to do. I'm sure Microsoft is not perfect but then neither is the government. Let's build our families. Let's reduce poverty, feed the hungry—around the world.

Let's focus on more important things.

Donna Ulrich
10770 S. Voyles Road
Borden, IN 47106-7615

MTC-00009782

From: Mark Nielsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:06pm
Subject: The current settlement with

Microsoft is bad for competition and for the nation

Hello!

Microsoft is evil. That is a given. Given all the lies they have said in court over the years, you cannot trust anything they say. Thus, how can you trust the settlement?

Microsoft was probably going to give 1 billion dollars to schools anyways. Then the settlement says they have to, which doesn't make any sense, because they were probably going to do it anyways. Microsoft has always tried to grab the educational institutions, because when people graduate from high school or college, they will stick with the software they know.

Thus:

1. They were already going to do it anyways.
2. It interferes with Apple's ability to compete in the education market. Microsoft is entirely evil and I would prefer, be destroyed. I would like to see it get destroyed under a competitive market, rather than physical force. I like to win my battles fairly. Given the current republican administration, please do what makes the most sense for a competitive market, which you should understand since you are republican, and just don't do stuff that benefits the rich fat republicans/corporations who have no regard for our nation, just their pocketbook. I want business to thrive for those who deserve it, not those who are able to bribe/lie/cheat/steal their way into power because they have a lot of money.

Thanks!

Mark

MTC-00009783

From: JOHN T MUDGE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 2:43pm
Subject: Comment re: Microsoft DOJ Settlement

Microsoft is clearly guilty of illegal conduct—that has been decided in court. I, personally, do not like either Windows or Explorer. Even so, their products define the standard. That battle is over (I use a Mac). Nonetheless, the Court should dismiss State objections. The State AG's are clearly protecting in-state businesses or, in at least

one case, purely vindictive. I am amazed they even have standing! If the noose is tightened even more, it sets a poor precedent to harass even more businesses.

Unfortunately, this country is coming closer to getting all the government for which we are paying!

Glad to get this off my chest.

John T. Mudge
Chehalis, WA 98532

MTC-00009784

From: Brent Smith
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 2:10pm
Subject: Opposition of Settlement

Hello,

I am writing today to express my personal displeasure with the settlement terms between the Department of Justice and Microsoft corporation. I have been a user of Microsoft products since 1985 and I'm even have status of a Microsoft Certified Professional using Windows NT. Over the years as consultant and a long time user of these products I honestly have to admit that I make a living trying to find workarounds to make products work for my customers with the windows operating system. For this I thank Microsoft for having a product that isn't as stable as let say UNIX or the Mac OS9.

If we look at history—look at what happened after the DOJ split up IBM. IBM is still a very large company, but because of competition (thanks to the DOJ) much of our products are developed better today. I feel that there is continued motivation to compete and have a quality product when competition is present.

Thank you.
Brent Smith
Client Manager
RMRS-ECHO
www.rmrs.com—website
brent@rmrs.com—email

MTC-00009785

From: Bobporsh@a01.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:18pm
Subject: Fwd: Microsoft Settlement

I want to register my concurrence with the DOJ's recent Settlement action. Based on the information provided via the press the terms seem fair and reasonable. I think it is important to finalize the settlement to allow everyone involved to move forward with some predicability. Additionally, the software/internet service playing field is and has evolved so quickly and constantly, I am confident that with the system checks to be put in place, the free markets will allow businesses and consumers to choose the most appropriate technologies and providers for the future.

Furthermore, I think it is very important that Microsoft not be singled out as being anti-competitive. All its' competitors are likewise working to gain any and all advantages. To do so will risk constraining innovation here in the U.S., and might help a business, particularly a non-homegrown business gain a competitive advantage they did not deserve or earn.

Bob Nelson Geneva, IL

MTC-00009786

From: David Benander
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

I want you people to understand that you must LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE!!! You must not punish companies and creators like Bill Gates for being more successful than their competitors. That's why it's called competition! Someone wins and someone loses. And in so winning, Gates and his team have helped make PC use so inexpensive that we, the consumers, can all use them. Microsoft is PRIVATE PROPERTY, it has a RIGHT to its profits, and you have NO right to confiscate them.

David Benander
194 Bay Lane
Centerville, MA 02632

MTC-00009787

From: jeremy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:22pm
Subject: public comment on Microsoft anti-trust case

Ms. Renata Hesse—

As a citizen of the United States I'm very disturbed by the settlement proposal of the Microsoft antitrust case. Given the verdicts of a federal judge and federal appeals court judges affirming the basic guilt of Microsoft as a monopoly, I think the proposed DOJ settlement does NOT go far enough to remedy the situation. As a consumer I believe my choices have been limited by the monopoly and am disappointed the settlement does little to change that fact. Moreover, I'm concerned by a weak enforcement mechanism to assure the enforcement of the provisions, ineffective as they are. Even rigidly enforced, I have grave doubts the provisions would accomplish anything positive.

I suspect the Bush administration is concerned about expending taxpayer money in litigation. At this point, if this settlement were approved, I would think it a bigger waste of money; to have come so far and proved so much only to opt for a weak settlement that does not prevent Microsoft from leveraging its monopoly in the future is futile and non-sensical. To make the investment worthwhile, as a US citizen, I think a new settlement should be put in play that is designed to prevent Microsoft from leveraging its monopoly to the detriment of competition. At this point, only a new, tougher remedy proposal would make the litigation worthwhile and useful to me as a citizen of the United States, a consumer, and personal computer user. Additionally, my concern is that given the present economic situation, the Bush administration is concerned that by pursuing a tough remedy that it would hurt a big, successful company and therefore do more damage to a fragile economy. Personally, I believe that by breaking up Microsoft it would unlock more shareholder value. The sum of all shares in the new companies would be worth more than the present value of one Microsoft. Additionally, I believe it would create more jobs in a hurting tech sector as more

programming and administrative staff are hired by the new companies. I also think it would enervate the tech sector as more small companies find an atmosphere where they can compete and introduce new products and technologies that have a better chance at success. In short, please pursue a tougher remedy that will prevent Microsoft from leveraging its monopoly and create more competition and consumer choice. Please reconsider your position and advocate a stronger remedy that will truly bring the technology industry to a new level of innovation and competition.

Sincerely,
Jeremy Wilmarth

MTC-00009788

From: Tim Bryce
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/9/02 3:41pm
Subject: Not in Favor of Settling with Microsoft

Renata B. Hesse

I am a user of the OS/2 operating system from IBM. I have found this to be a technologically superior product over the operating systems offered by Microsoft, including their latest version, Windows XP. Unfortunately, OS/2 has been in decline for a number of years from what I believe to be unfair monopolistic marketing tactics of Microsoft. As a result, vendors of OS/2 related products have also diminished over the years. Contrary to arguments by Microsoft that their products encourage competition, I believe the opposite is true; that Microsoft's marketing practices actually discourages competition and stunts technological growth.

Consequently, I do not believe the Federal Government's proposed settlement with Microsoft, in its current form, is adequate and that stricter measures be imposed on the company to prohibit such tactics from being used in the future. In other words, I applaud the efforts of the various State Attorney Generals to seek stricter measures.

Sincerely,
Tim Bryce
Editor, OS/2 CONNECT
<http://www.os2ss.com/connect/>
timb001@attglobal.net
Palm Harbor, FL, USA

MTC-00009789

From: Richard M. DeLio
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 3:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Re. the Microsoft settlement, please convey my views to the court as follows:

As an Information Systems Consultant and a heavy user of Microsoft and non-Microsoft PC products, as well as software on other platforms, I can honestly say that Microsoft has brought much more positive progress to the information systems user community than any other computer hardware or software company. With regard to many of the points brought out in trial, I would offer the following comments:

1. Monopoly is a matter of frame of reference. If you ask if Microsoft has a monopoly in the operating system business for Intel-based computers, they do. If you

base the definition on the absolute number of computers, irrespective of size, Microsoft may still have a monopoly. I believe both of these definitions to be incorrect. I would propose that for a monopoly to exist, it should be based on total computing utilization throughout the US or the world. Yes, Microsoft has a large number of installed operating systems, and some are installed on computers with relatively high raw computing power. But many of these computers are used for a short period of time each day or few days and then often just to send e-mail or surf the Internet, clearly not "computing." If one were to compare the operating systems installed against the utilized computing power, I would doubt any monopoly exists. On PC's doing very little computing there are a very large number of Windows installations, but on much larger, heavily used machines you would find IBM, Sun and Hewlett-Packard installations. Simply put, Microsoft does not have a monopoly based on the total utilization of computing power. This is a very important difference.

2. Microsoft competitors have argued that Windows pricing is higher than it should be. I would counter that most people pay far less, through OEM installation of MS Windows, than the suggested retail price, or even the "street" retail upgrade price. However, on pricing, I believe we need to place things in perspective. For anywhere from \$40-100, based on the version of Windows installed, the consumer receives a technically advanced product which will be used on average 4-5 years before a new computer is purchased. In comparison, a pair of brand-name sneakers cost more than Windows and will likely be wrecked within 1 year. There is not a single consumer product of any type on the market today that provides the functionality of Windows in comparison with its cost over the life of the product.

In addition, Microsoft, unlike any other computer industry company in the last year, increased its research and development budget to provide even greater benefit to the consumer in the future. The money spent by consumers on Microsoft products provided both immediate benefits to the consumers, greater in value than any other computer product, and an investment in future benefits.

3. Much has been said of Microsoft's supposedly predatory practices re. Netscape Communications. Nothing has been said of Netscape's actions during this period. Prior to Microsoft's release of Internet Explorer (MS IE), Netscape had been giving away its Navigator Internet browser. When it effectively had a monopoly in the browser arena, just prior to the release of MS IE, Netscape announced that they would be charging for this product in the future. Essentially, they created a monopoly and then attempted predatory pricing. And, the price they wanted to charge was approximately what most people were paying at that time for all of Microsoft Windows, a product with far great functionality, and therefore value, for the money. I should also add that the Netscape personnel did not develop their product from scratch. They had been working on an Internet browser in a

college environment, and simply left, formed a company, made a few changes and released it under the Netscape name.

4. Microsoft did not initially try to compete with Netscape. In fact, Microsoft competes in a very small number of computer software product areas, choosing instead to offer Windows as an open base on which thousands of products can operate. Netscape personnel, however, announced at trade show after trade show that they would "destroy" Microsoft Windows as a platform. The Internet would be the new platform—actually a ridiculous idea, like saying if mass transit had great schedules we would all get rid of our cars. Microsoft attempted to work with Netscape and when that went nowhere, it decided to offer a better product and cut off the Netscape attempt at predatory pricing.

5. Microsoft competitors have argued that Internet Explorer was a standalone application and should never have been put into the Windows operating system. I believe this is wrong. I believe there is a very simple test for what is appropriate in an operating system and what is not. If a program creates or manipulates data, like a word processor or spreadsheet program it is an application and should not be added to an operating system. If a program simply displays information or manipulates data at the file level, e.g. copying or moving an entire file, it should be included in an operating system. In fact, the only times Microsoft has violated this approach was when they provided a very rudimentary word processor in Windows as a convenience to users, but not to replace a complete word processor, and a simple e-mail program (which still needed an Internet Service Provider (ISP) to be usable).

Regardless of this, anyone who wished to have Netscape Navigator as their default Internet browser could do so, simply by specifying that within the program of their Internet Service Provider or, even more simply, by placing the Navigator program on the Start-Programs list as he/she would do with any other program—word processor, spreadsheet, photo editing, etc.—and then having Navigator telephone the ISP.

6. But at the heart of this litigation from the beginning has been the hypocrisy and manipulation by Microsoft's competitors combined with a bluntly terrible defense by Microsoft. The competition has used the government to try to compete against Microsoft rather than relying on an open marketplace. And, the dissenting nine states are still being used by Microsoft's competitors. I would ask the current judge to ask one simple question regarding these nine states: Would they be suing Microsoft if Microsoft were based in their states. I strongly doubt that. They don't care one iota for their consumers; they only care about the MS competitors who are based in their states and exercise political influence.

Competitors like AOL, Oracle, Sun and IBM have long complained that Microsoft has produced mediocre products and did not deserve its success. Yet, with the exception of Oracle, Microsoft's products often exceeded the functionality and value of those provided by the competition. The consumer is not stupid. Offered a better product, with better pricing, the consumer will go with the

better product. Often the consumer will go with the better product even without better pricing, since we are not talking about large sums of money for these products (tens of dollars to hundreds, not thousands).

Competitors have complained that Windows is a closed system and source code should be opened for all to see or modify. The truth is that Windows is the most open operating system ever produced. If it were not, there would not be literally thousands of non-Microsoft products operating very successfully under Windows today.

7. The bottom line of all of this, however, is that Microsoft has been successful because they have provided a good, reasonably priced product, which is an open environment on which thousands of computer programs are available. In addition, Microsoft has provided a platform with integration of subsystems which should be in an operating system, yet, not eliminating the ability of the user to run alternative products.

I urge the court to find in favor of Microsoft and the settlement with the Department of Justice, a settlement which, I believe, is even more burdensome on Microsoft than it should be.

Thank you.
Richard M. DeLio
31 Manor Drive
Ramsey, NJ 07446
201-825-8098

MTC-00009790

From: Scott Bicknell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There is much chatter about this case—most of it saying that the DOJ is caving-in to Microsoft. I have to agree. And while there should be a penalty, I also realize that this wish is a pipe dream.

This case is moving toward dismissal. I understand Microsoft has already been convicted, but it seems after the conviction was handed down that the court said, "Oops, that's not what we meant to do. Now you boys go out back and find a way to fix this mistake. We use too much Microsoft software around here to deal with breaking up a company we do so much business with."

And that is the crux of the matter, whether the courts, the DOJ, Microsoft, or anyone else wants to admit it. As long as major pieces of judicial infrastructure (the software used to administer the judicial system) comes from one company, Microsoft, then the courts will never have the guts to do their job honestly. They will continue to pretend to themselves and the world that they are immune to bias.

Scott Bicknell
815 Creek Dr.
San Jose, CA 95125
(408) 266-9692

MTC-00009791

From: Del Gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:49pm
Subject: end clinton's

Please end clinton's anti-trust law abuse. Microsoft has done more for computing than any other company—leave them alone. No more law suits against them.

Sincerely,
(Mrs.) Del W. Gardner
Medford NJ

MTC-00009792

From: AVCS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:50pm
Subject: Anti-trust law abuse
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Let us end the Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse.

MTC-00009793

From: tatro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
End the Clinton-era Anti-trust Law abuse, please. It was a waste of time and money.
Elwood & Ellen Tetrault,
907 S 19 St.,
Grand Forks, N.D. 58201

MTC-00009794

From: Bryan W. Headley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Comments

Dear Sirs,
From what I understand, the bulk of the Microsoft punishment involves the donation of computers and software to school districts. As someone who lives in a school district that's teetering on consolidation (e.g., bankruptcy), let me tell you that giving school districts computers is not a beneficial act. With more computers, classrooms either have to be built or expanded to handle the extra equipment. More teachers have to be hired, and this is money we do not have. To be honest with you, we don't have the money to do extracurricular activities (e.g., football, basketball, etc.)

This is like other well-intentioned attempts to help schools: in Illinois, we have the state lottery benefitting schools by helping on infrastructure costs. The Americans with Disabilities act hurt, as the costs of making the existing plants accessible wasn't covered by this. And so, I ask you: what good are plants (buildings) when you cannot afford the headcount? When you cannot afford the materials? A lot of people do not understand how taxation works, in regards to municipal governments. Looking at my area, you'd assume there's a sufficient tax base. Not so: we have densely-populated residential, with little industry. So, where's the tax base for that school district? The base for students is evident.

So, the act of public service is not beneficial. Unless we're talking about schools that are well-financed, but for some reason do not have computer education. I cannot imagine schools operating in such a vacuum. Having mentioned industries, let's expound on the behaviour Microsoft has been accused (and found guilty of.) By engaging in predatory tactics, Microsoft weaken many of their competitors. Consider WordPerfect, once of Orem, UT. They used to have a successful product; their employees and they were in a position where they can contribute to the economic health of their neighborhoods. Now gone, who has stepped

up to take their place in filling the tax coffers?

Now, let's go into what I'm certain a lot of writers have pointed out to you: allowing Microsoft to pay off their debt to society in Microsoft software. This is more effective in establishing brand identity with the next generation of software users than any advertising I know of. What's the cost of the software? Are they writing this software off at full retail cost? Do you know how much it costs to mass produce CDs in quantity? Pennies.

I'm trying to think of something as distasteful as this settlement. This is not an exact simile, but I have to think of a dope pusher being forced to give free illicit drugs to children. What? You think those children WON'T want more dope? And, heh! This pusher gets to write off the expense, having been directed to performing this community service by judge.

If you are of a mind to go for a financial settlement, do like you did with the tobacco companies: make the company settle in cash. How the states opt to use the cash is something we can work on ourselves. I might never see any of that money appear in my school district, but we might get better roads and be able to attract/retain industries. By the way, regards to these computers: where are they coming from? China, Taiwan, Indonesia? That hardly helps out American manufacturing firms who make computers. And you know, the healthier these industries are, the better able they are to contribute to our local economy. As it stands now, we'd be better served if you forced the Microsoft board of directors to personally take roadside cleaning responsibilities for a 1/2 mile off of an interstate in Seattle.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Bryan W. Headley
bheadley@interaccess.com

MTC-00009795

From: gandamartin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As two tax-paying citizens, we believe that the resources of the Justice Dept can be put to better use than pursuing Microsoft.

Thank you,
Mr & Mrs Gene Martin

MTC-00009796

From: Ian Nowland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 4:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Hello!
I am a computer programmer. I (and all my programming friends and coworkers) have to work several times harder to get anything done because Microsoft's products are usually much more shoddy than any other software out there, since they know they can run out such products because they have such a huge market domination. Please break up Microsoft so that they are forced to be competitive and thus try and meet competition standards.

Ian Nowland

MTC-00009797

From: Andrew Davis

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:27pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement with federal government
 6308 Woodcreek Trail
 Fort Worth, Texas 76179
 January 9, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my support of the recent settlement between the federal government and Microsoft. It is with sincere hope that there will be no further litigation at the federal level. Taking into account the terms of the agreement, Microsoft did not get off with a slap on the wrist. In fact, Microsoft is left to make several significant changes to the ways that they now handle business. For example, Microsoft has agreed to design future versions of Windows, beginning with an interim release of Windows XP, to provide a mechanism to make it easy for computer makers, consumers, and software developers to promote non-Microsoft software within Windows. The mechanism will make it easy to add or remove access to features built in to Windows or to non-Microsoft software. Consumers will have the freedom to choose to change their configuration at any time.

With the many terms of the agreement, it is time to put this case to rest. The settlement offers a strong resolution to this suit, and I look forward to seeing the settlement implemented.

Sincerely,
 Andrew Davis

MTC-00009798

From: pankavichjm
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the it is in the public interest to settle with the Microsoft litigation. Personally, I find it hard to see how they were in violation at all. As far as I am concerned I always had the choice of using them or not.

However, I do believe that AOL is in some kind of violation in this respect. Whenever I load a program that also offers AOL I refuse the AOL but no matter I still get their program on my screen and it does start to load. I also think that they are in violation when they include free programs in cereals, etc. and send them through the mail. They are bordering on being a nuisance.

Joan M. Pankavich

MTC-00009800

From: HUNOLD38@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:30pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is time to go on with more important business than litigation in this case. The Dept. Of Justice proposed settlement is fair for consumers and the company. This case has been detrimental to Microsoft and its employees. The vagaries have caused many employees to quit and as shareholders we do not see the drive to innovate the company

was famous for. If the various State Atty. who object the settlement proposed by DoJ like to see a second rate company survive I believe we should have recourse for such stupid behavior. I, a small consumer, am perfectly happy with the product developed by Microsoft.

Respectfully submitted
 Axel Hunold

MTC-00009801

From: Ruth Zdanowicz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice:

We think that the prolonged, ongoing litigation against Microsoft, by a few special interest groups with biased agendas to promote their own products, needs to come to an end.

The economy has suffered enough with stock market blows to the "tech" industry. Get on with business.

A settlement was offered; we think it is extremely generous. Get on with business and life! The states that will not compromise continue to mire the entire industry, which affects all of the U.S. economy and attitude.

Our capitalistic society depends upon survival of the best product (i.e. fittest) to increase competition and innovation. Fault sits in the laps of those who have not produced a good product—or at least one a consumer majority is motivated to purchase.

It is essential in a democratic/capitalistic society that we all work hard to succeed and be innovative. The continued "whining" by those who refuse to settle reminds us of a sport team that complains about everybody else when they lose. A team either makes the right number of baskets or leave the basketball court. Is our nation's justice department going to support a business welfare system where the stronger companies have to "pay" lackluster companies (or the states that house them) in order to subsidize them?

If Microsoft's competitors spent half as much time and money on innovation and subsequently better products, as they do hiring attorneys to whine for them, they might actually become successful. It is time to stop supporting the so-called "victims" who want easy buck\$\$.

PLEASE: Stop this muckraking!

Sincerely,

Consumers and small business owners who appreciate quality, manufacturing responsibility, and accountability,
 Jim & Ruth Zdanowicz

MTC-00009802

From: Bruce F McKenzie
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a Senior Vice President of a large financial institution, I am greatly concerned about the Proposed Final Settlement for Microsoft with the Dept. of Justice. My primary concern, as far as I understand the agreement, is that it does not end Microsoft's existing monopoly or punish sufficiently past violations of antitrust laws (as the courts have affirmed), does not adequately address

anticompetitive behavior identified by the appeals court and does not have sufficient provisions for enforcement of the agreement. Overall, it's hard for me to see how this is in the public's interest.

Sincerely,
 Bruce F. McKenzie
 Northern Trust Company

MTC-00009803

From: Bob and Ruth Ferguson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a U. S. citizen, I am strongly opposed to a continuation of the lawsuit against Microsoft Corp., one of the finest Corporations in this Country.

I am particularly critical of our Justice system which permits a four year lawsuit to continue, particularly since the Federal Government seemed to arrive at a satisfactory settlement, which then permits the 'States' to continue this process.

The Federal Government and Microsoft agreed to permit oversight of their operations, and this should be sufficient. The cost to all parties must be astronomical, and to continue this suit is certainly detrimental and costly. The Federal Government should rein in the "States", and finalize this once and for all.

Robert A. Ferguson

MTC-00009804

From: rketover1@juno.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement is fair and equitable and in the best interests of the consumer. It is time for this litigation to be ended.

Richard Ketover
 Boca Raton, FL

MTC-00009805

From: Dennis Ertzbischoff
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 4:55pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sirs:

For what's it's worth, here is my 2 cents about the proposed breakup. . .DON'T!!!

In the 1930's and 40's, the U.S. Government prohibited Motorola from entering the land-line based communications industry by connecting to it with its radio-based systems, thus protecting AT&T. Think, where would all of our technology be today if the government had not interfered and had let the Free Market work its magic?

Today, we have the most successful software provider in the world facing a government action. When will bureaucrats learn that they cannot make proper decisions when it comes to market forces—no matter if they, the bureaucrats, are pro-competition or pro-monopoly? Stay out of business and market decisions. . .LAISSEZ-FAIRE.

Technology, especially, moves extremely quickly and no one, repeat, no one can stop that from happening.

Let's get on with the business of ADVANCING civilization, not retarding it.

Hey, get out there and read WEALTH OF NATIONS, ATLAS SHRUGGED, and WIZARD: THE STORY OF NICHOLA TESLA.

Then, let your mind work and see how narrow the viewpoints of bureaucrats generally are and how those viewpoints have damaged mankind's creativity.

As for Mr. Gates. . .GO, BILL, GO!!!
Sincerely;
Dennis Ertzbischoff
Detroit

MTC-00009806

From: Tricia (038) Ambrose Treacy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 4:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop the insanity. Microsoft has been open to a fair settlement in this case. The prolonged wranglings of a few special interest groups, and/or a few companies that are anti-Microsoft is costing the taxpayers too much money—AND IT ONLY STIFLES CREATIVITY, INNOVATION and COMPETITION. Please put an end to further litigation and get on with the resolution.

Tricia Treacy

MTC-00009807

From: lbaska@fabri-quilt.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:01pm

Please end this ridiculous lawsuit against Microsoft. Microsoft has made us better and we go after them.

Let's just stick with finding Osama Bin Ladan. He's only interested in making us worse.

Thanks, Lezlie Baska

MTC-00009808

From: Ed Harman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My letter is attached . . . thank you.

CC: fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw,Ed HotMail

Edward Harman 14 Pinewood Avenue
Ephrata, PA 17522
January 8, 2002

Attorney General Mr. John Ashcroft
Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The recent lawsuit in the antitrust case between Microsoft and the U.S. Department of Justice, which finally came to an end in November, reflected personal vendettas from competitors and politicians alike. I strongly believe litigation never should have begun in the first place, but I am happy to see that Microsoft will not be broken up. It does, however, trouble me to see that this settlement is mired in procedural sludge. I ask you to enact this coherent and important settlement as soon as possible.

Microsoft has been a leader in innovation and technology in the industry and has set the standards for fast paced growth. Microsoft continually delivers new products and services that are unmatched by its peers. Being the hardest working and most creative company in the technology sector should not be a negative mark against the Microsoft name.

I look forward to no further litigation against Microsoft and urge the US Justice

Department to convince the nine states withholding to discontinue their efforts against Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Edward Harman
CC: Sen. Rick Santorum

MTC-00009809

From: Derek Mason
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:05pm
Subject: Microsoft's Windows XP & privacy

Our state AG's office encouraged me to forward my complaints to you regarding MS Windows XP. my complaint isn't about the current issues with MS, but with their new Windows XP product. I believe their activation policy and procedure is an unwarranted intrusion into my privacy, and my right to control my own computer as I see fit. When XP is installed, it takes an inventory of your computer's hardware, and then sends this information to MS, which then activates your copy of XP.

They say no personally identifying information is sent.

That's troubling because if you register your copy with MS, they can easily match activation codes with personal information contained in a registration data base. Given MS's behavior over the last two decades, it is not unreasonable to be dubious that MS will not attempt to so. There is no assurance, except their word, that they will not do it.

Another problem comes when you change hardware in your computer. If I put in a new cpu, memory modules or motherboard, XP deactivates itself until you call MS and get a re-activation number.

My complaint is that once I've activated XP, MS doesn't have a right to know what I do with the hardware on my computer. Their attitude about it is incredible. About a month ago, I put in new memory chips, and had to re-activate XP. When I called MS, their agent said, "So what are we doing today?" Almost as if I need their permission to do something to my computer. It is extremely intrusive, and goes far beyond what's necessary to protect against software piracy.

I'm not the only one complaining about this. There are thousands across the country who voice concern and dissent over MS's procedure here, but must rely on the DOJ to advocate for their fundamental rights.

Obviously, the DOJ has misjudged MS. The current settlement that was reached with them has done nothing to cause the company to act with restraint. The proof of the inadequacy of the settlement is that with Windows XP they show a blatant disregard the right to privacy, believing that they are entitled to know what you do with your personal computer. Clearly, MS is showing us where it is they intend to take us: complete control over your personal computer. They have just purchased QWest's internet system, and will be able to leverage internet access as well. I guarantee that their next step will be to force people to buy MSN in order to use Windows, all the while claiming that MSN is part of the operating system.

It's a sad commentary federal and state governments are allowing MS to get away

with such behavior. Big Brother has arrived, but it's not the government, it's Microsoft.

I appreciate your time.

Thank you,
Derek Mason
Smithfield, UT

MTC-00009810

From: Harvey I. Salwen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Harvey and Jean Salwen PO Box 363 817
Brushtown Road Gwynedd Valley, PA 19437
January 9, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I have been a computer user since 1980 and clearly remember having 7 operating systems for my computer. There was one for each application. Microsoft eliminated the agony and chaos. Please honor the in-place agreement that will allow you, Microsoft, and the rest of the country get back to work.

There are more important things to do. cc: Senator Rick Santorum

Sincerely,
Harvey Salwen

MTC-00009811

From: charlie e guest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs;

I believe the time has come to settle the Microsoft case. I have no earthly way of knowing all the facts in this. I do know that some of the states have agreed to settle and I think the Department should do just that. See to it that they all agree and you gentlemen and ladies get back to your business. This has gone on long enough. It has taken a toll on the taxpayer. I am not even sure they did anything wrong, but you are in a better position to determine that.

Thank you for your time. Have a good new year.

Charles Guest
guestfam1@juno.com

MTC-00009812

From: Joseph Heck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Antitrust Division, US Department of Justice.

While I applaud the Department of Justice's efforts to settle the suit with Microsoft in a fashion that won't require eternal oversight by the courts, I am deeply concerned with some of the articles in the proposed final settlement.

In particular I believe there should be swifter and harsh penalties for Microsoft if there is any complaint from a member of the Technical Committee.

Microsoft has clearly shown in the past that it has little regard for the court's directives, which has directly led to this case, and that it's familiar with all legal standings to stall the courts of the United States in such

a manner as to accomplish its desired effects, even at some later pain to itself. Because of its monopoly status, it can withstand significantly more derailing than many middle-ware application companies, and it could easily drive competitors in this space out of business before the courts could muster themselves to act.

It would be exceptionally worthwhile to define in the proposed remedies whether or not Internet Explorer was a part of the Operating system, simply for the purpose to defining if it is considered "microsoft middleware", and hence removable, or to have API's with which developers can communicate and interoperate.

In addition, I believe there should be some explicit mention of other middleware programs currently being subtly integrated into Microsoft's product offering: Microsoft Messenger, Windows Media Player—and which match past microsoft actions to integrate what I consider middleware technologies into the operating system. Again, the purpose would be to define whether or not these should be able to be explicitly removed or API's provided to developers for interaction.

Finally, there was some significant press regarding a punitive action against microsoft involving the court-ordered disbursement of software & hardware to support education in the United States. I believe firmly that if this action is deemed nessecary that the courts will modify the specifications of the demand such that Microsoft is required to fund the needs of educational institutions without any control over what technologies they may choose to utilize and/or deploy. I viewed the initial reports of this disbursement with significant trepidation, as it honestly appeared to be an action which would effectively be a government sanctioned extension of the Microsoft desktop monopoly.

Thank you for reviewing my comments and taking them into consideration.

Sincerely,
Joseph Heck
302 Garfield St.
Seattle, WA 98109
joe@mu.org

MTC-00009813

From: Griffis, Tom
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft 'settlement'

Dear Sir or Madam,

Since the Supreme Court has affirmed the lower courts decision that found that Microsoft was guilty of violating our anti-trust laws, I feel that Microsoft should be punished in accordance with the laws and precedents concerning same.

The proposed 'settlement' currently before the court is a sham, that does little more than slap the wrist of Microsoft. Bill Gates and company are dancing in the halls with glee and visions of owning the world, as it relates to desktop computers and software.

Since the illegal practices utilized by Microsoft caused grievous damage to the Netscape corporation and others, any remedy should 'unfetter a market from anticompetitive conduct,' Ford Motor Co.,

405 U.S. at 577, and '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,' United States v. United Shoe Mach. Corp., 391 U.S. 244, 250 (1968).

The only way that this can be accomplished is to split Microsoft into multiple companies! One company that deals only in operating systems that, by definition, are vehicles upon which application software packages ride and do not provide direct application functionality. The rest of Microsoft could then be divided into software utilities, productivity suites, games, etc., company(s).

As a 30 year computer software engineer on IBM mainframes, military computers, and desktop computers, I do have knowledge in this area, which greatly exceeds the knowledge of the general populace. I already have a hard time finding desirable software that I can run on my personal and work computers that is not made by Microsoft. All of the really good stuff is already gone, swallowed by the behemoth of software, Microsoft. The few remaining companies tremble in fear that mighty MS may soon decide to cut them off from the information necessary to compete, if not actually force them out of business! And, all of this is killing my wallet! As long as Microsoft can continue to raise the price of their operating systems by integrating more and more application software, our economy will continue to suffer! The price of Personal Computers has dropped to one-third of their original price, while the price of Windows has increased in the same time period. And, as MS drives competition out of the market, the price on MS application software continues to rise.

The time to punish Microsoft is now, before it is too late!

Sincerely,
Thomas Griffis
SunGard AMS
104 Inverness Center Place
Suite 325
Birmingham, AL 35242
(205) 437-7622
Home office:
11535 McMeans Blvd.
Tanner, AL 35671
(256) 216-5683
Tom.Griffis@sungard.com
<mailto:Tom.Griffis@sungard.com>

MTC-00009814

From: Abigail Ochs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

After reading about the Microsoft antitrust case, I feel as though the Justice Department has ignored the majority of the court findings that Microsoft has aggressively abused its monopoly position for its own competitive advantage. Additionally, I feel that the final proposition to not penalize MS for its long-standing antitrust abuses is actually granting it a de-facto monopoly in the industry going forward. This failure on the part of the Justice Department could enable Microsoft's

predatory patterns to eclipse emerging software companies or even dissuade the creation of new companies. For this reason, I would strongly urge that you reconsider the proposed final judgment.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Abigail Ochs

MTC-00009815

From: Lindeman, Andrew
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:19pm
Subject: Microsoft needs a bigger penalty

To whom it concerns,

I believe that the previous agreement that was made by Microsoft and a few of the states involved is a mere (or less than) a slap on the wrist. Microsoft has no viable competition (at the time) and because of this, they have already been determined to be an illegal monopoly.

Competition is a good thing. Competition provides good prices and quality products. Are Microsoft products low priced and good quality? NO! They are way overpriced—XP full version HOME EDITION is \$200; 2000 Adv. Server can get in to the thousands and ten-thousands by the time all of the licenses are paid for. They are also not quality products either; There is a major Microsoft bug at least every 3-4 weeks, and many smaller to medium priority bugs almost every day! Microsoft would like to keep it this way, and they can't be allowed to be.

Microsoft needs something more than a slap on the wrist, they need to be punished for what they did, and they deserve more than what the current agreement allows.

Thank you,
Andrew Lindeman
118 Brookdel Drive
Madison, AL 35758

MTC-00009816

From: Mail
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree strongly with Richard Blumenthal regarding the remedies which should be imposed in any Microsoft settlement. These should include remedies (1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future, (2) to spark competition in this industry; and (3) to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains.

Please also consider the items listed in my previous correspondence as means to this end. As a computer professional, I am willing to help in this matter in any way I can.

Thank you.
Regards,
Michael Kitchen, CEO Front Row
Computer

MTC-00009817

From: Salim Furth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

To be quite brief, I urge you to reject the U.S. Justice Department's agreement with the Microsoft Corporation. As a computer-dependent student and webmaster, I experience firsthand the MS software and OS

monopoly firsthand, and find it distinctly unAmerican. The inability of other operating systems and software providers to be competitive in the American market effectively outsources innovation overseas, which will catch up with the U.S. software industry in a few years if Microsoft is not stopped.

Thank you for entertaining input from citizens, as one such citizen I greatly appreciate this service.

Sincerely,
Salim Furth
Milton, Massachusetts
s2000chops@yahoo.com

MTC-00009818

From: Jeff Monks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Renata Hesse
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530

As an information technology professional, I consider myself someone who is heavily impacted by Microsoft's influence in the industry. I also believe I am well-informed of the issues involved, and have a clear understanding of the case. That is why I am extremely dismayed at the settlement proposed by the Department of Justice. While it provides a possible starting place for a fair settlement, it is almost worthless as regards protecting the industry from Microsoft's illegal monopolistic practices.

Judge Jackson's findings that Microsoft's past actions constituted illegal maintenance of a monopoly are nearly unaddressed: where is Microsoft being punished under the proposed settlement? The settlement merely outlines a few guidelines for future business practices, without levying any sort of punitive action for past actions. It is important to remember that we are talking about a corporation that has been found guilty of breaking United States law, and under the proposed settlement will not even be subject to a fine.

I would propose at least two additional requirements for the settlement:

1. Require Microsoft to publish complete documentation of all interfaces between software components, all communications protocols, and all file formats. One of the most powerful tools for Microsoft to maintain its monopoly influence and control competitors is the use of its market share to force users to use Microsoft software in order to interoperate with other users. Open file formats and communications protocols would enable competitors to enter the market with substantially reduced barriers to acceptance, allowing them to compete with Microsoft on a "level playing field".

2. Require Microsoft to use its software patents for defense only (patents in other fields are not necessarily relevant here, and can be exempted). It does little good to force publication of specification to an interface, if elements of that interface are patented and Microsoft refuses to license the patent to competitors. Requiring Microsoft to offer open licensing for any patents that would

interfere with the requirement for open specifications is a must.

Further, I must stress that I feel it is a grave disservice to the people who have been hurt by Microsoft's practices to allow Microsoft to enter into any settlement without paying some sort of appropriate penalty for its past actions. To do any less would deprive the American public of any real justice in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Jeffrey L. Monks
7103 Rock Springs Cove
Austin, TX 78729

MTC-00009819

From: bredeweg@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:35pm
Subject: A comment

I am sorry, but I do not see how a slap on the wrist is going to improve things in the future. If the anti-trust case is anything more than a joke then the penalty MUST be commensurate with the massive amount of damage that they have illegally (Microsoft was found guilty of anti competitive business practices) wrecked upon other computer technology companies probably since the beginning. An inconsequential penalty will not give pause to the continuation of these unethical and, in my humble opinion un-American business practices. If Microsoft is allowed to continue unchecked the result will likely be the decline of the American tech sector as a whole with possibly unpleasant repercussions to our entire economy. Thank you.

MTC-00009820

From: Arthur McIntyre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that Microsoft should not be punished for the Windows product. The Apple computer only has 1 OS allowed on it and that is a monopoly for Apple Computers in that respect. If I wanted Linux, BeOs or Unix I would have it. None of these OS's offer what I need or want. I do not run a network system at home only a desk top system. I am not looking to be a hacker or such that I need these systems. If I wanted them I would use them. These are the company's that are pressuring everyone to do something about Microsoft. If they want to be on my desk top maybe they should offer something I want. But they do not. If I wanted to use Netscape as my browser I could. At one time I used Netscape as my only browser then I started to use both of them depending on what web site I was going to use. I stopped using Netscape because they did not keep up with IE in innovation and offering what I wanted. If they came up with a new browser I would use it. It is all about what have you done for me lately and they have done nothing. I think AOL is trying to become a monopoly in its own way. They bought Netscape but still offer IE and the browser that is AOL's is terrible. If you have AOL you have to use all of what they want. I do not see any other internet provider doing that. I have used at least 6 different Internet providers for the time I have been on the net

but the only one I have not tried and used is AOL and I would not ever. It is like be a mindless slave.

They only thing that should be required of Microsoft is that they allow computer manufacturers to set-up Windows how they want but if they do then that manufacture has to have help support or pay for the support from Microsoft for their systems if they change the set-up. They should also be allowed to add other company's stuff to Window's. But the consumer has to be thought about here.

If I buy someone's computer instead of building my own I should not have to be forced to have what that company says should be on it just because they have signed a marketing contract with them. If they are going to offer only AOL for me to sign on to the internet with then that is wrong is does not allow me freedom of choice. I think all computers should have the same windows on them then a extra disc is used and the consumer gets to pick what they want after that. All providers could put their stuff on this disc and then the consumer can choose what they want to install and it should work without a problem. Why should Microsoft be punished for something that everyone wants. For the people who bash Microsoft it goes to the same thing as TV and Radio, If you don't like the channel change it. Nobody is making you listen to them. It is all about freedom and this is now being walked on since other company's do not have something I want.

Thank You,
Arthur & Viva McIntyre

MTC-00009821

From: Jim Brents
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop the harassment of Bill gates and let him get on with doing what he does better than all his competitors; supplying the American consumer with the best products money can buy.

Jim Brents
Bay City, TX

MTC-00009822

From: Robert Talbott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 5:56pm
Subject: Microsoft

This case has drug on too long. They have paid the publicity price and Clinton doesn't need it any more.

Let's finish and be done with it.
Bob Talbott

MTC-00009823

From: Jeremy Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:01pm
Subject: US vs Microsoft Jeremy Brown
January 9, 2002 The Honorable Sen.
Edward M. Kennedy 315 Russell Senate
Office Building Washington, DC 20510
Dear Sen. Kennedy:

I am writing you in regards to the proposed settlement in the case of US vs. Microsoft. I am a professional in the IT field and have to deal with Microsoft products on a regular basis. In my opinion, this settlement is not good for the people of the United States or

its competitors. Microsoft has bullied its way to the top, and continues to use its considerable clout to keep its position.

In my every day dealings with Microsoft products, I have seen examples of limited choice, poor functionality and inferior workmanship. Some examples:

* In Windows Millennium Edition and Windows XP, many programs cannot be uninstalled or disabled, wasting space and resources. Examples include Microsoft Passport registration, Windows Media Player, Windows Movie Maker and Windows System Restore. Even if I wished to install another piece of software that would perform the same task more efficiently or with more features, these programs remain.

* The newest version of the Microsoft Corporate License Program requires any corporate subscriber to upgrade their software on Microsoft's timetable instead of their own. Microsoft states that the cost of software will be lower, but fails to mention that the Total cost of ownership will be higher. The demands that newer Microsoft's software puts on equipment rises in each iteration of the software. Corporations will have to invest in more powerful computers, staff training, and IT management. Reference: www.idg.net <<http://www.idg.net/ic-784747-1794-9-10000.html>>

* Microsoft has taken deliberate steps in order to force companies to upgrade to its newer software products. They have announced that it will discontinue support of all previous versions of Windows before Windows 2000 and XP as of the end of 2002. Windows 98 and NT 4.0 are still viable solutions in many companies, and will continue to be for several years to come and without regular updates to these programs from MS, many companies will have to spend more time and effort in maintaining corporate systems. MS has also pulled functionality updates, specifically Windows NT 4.0 service pack 7, which would have allowed companies to maintain their existing servers with newer Windows 2000 based servers and its newer network directory format. When MS introduced Office 97, they changed the format that files were saved making them unreadable for earlier versions of Office. All of these issues relate back to my second point.

* Time after time, MS has released products that are full of security holes that can endanger the safety of corporate networks, information and business. The latest Internet Explorer 6 security hole alarmed the FBI to the point that the agency issued a press release aimed at the general public and corporations that pointed out the severe danger level the error posed to computers and networks. In a study recently released by the National Academy of Sciences has called for legislation regulating this issue. Reference: www.theinquirer.net <<http://www.theinquirer.net/22120101.htm>>

* Microsoft has been proven to take international recognized standards and alter them so that they will work more efficiently with its own products and poorly or not at all with other companies' products. The most famous and egregious is the now-famous Sun Java fiasco, but others have included changes to the Kerberos security

protocol and Quality of Service (QoS) protocols.

* In a recently leaked memo MS is said that it will intend to launch a full-fledged Fear, Uncertainty & Doubt (FUD) against Linux, its most capable opponent in the server field. Reference: www.theinquirer.net <<http://www.theinquirer.net/>>

* Microsoft grossly inflates the price for various versions of its operating systems based on how many processors it can use in a computer, while Linux and most other server operating systems do not. This has led to issues with Intel's newest Pentium chip, which uses a technology called Hyper-Threading and will appear as multiple CPUs to the operating system. To properly use this function at home, minimally you would have to purchase Windows XP or 2000 Professional, at a 33% increase in price over Windows XP Home. The cost for server versions of Windows 2000 would more than double between each version. EG, Windows 2000 Server with 5 licenses costs approximately \$850+ \$50 for each additional license and supports up to four processors, but to properly use a four processor equipped server with the Intel Pentium 4 Xeon processor that supports Hyper-Threading, you would have to purchase Windows 2000 Advanced Server with 25 licenses (minimum amount of licenses available for this product) that would cost approximately \$3400. Reference: www.theinquirer.net <<http://www.theinquirer.net/30120102.htm>> , www.pcmall.com <<http://www.pcmall.com/>> .

* As seen in the previous point, Microsoft charges you to access their server products that are installed on a server. If you have a small company that only needs 5 Client Access Licenses, you are set. But if you were to hire a temporary employee, you are required to purchase a new license for the temp. Failing to do so could bring about litigation that could cost thousands. No other server operating system does this.

I have listed just eight points that just begin to scratch the surface of the abuse Microsoft commits, and there are hundreds if not thousands of issues that I do not deal with on a regular basis thus cannot address. I hope that you and other members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary will address these points in regards to the poor settlement worked out by the Department of Justice with Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Jeremy Brown
Network Systems Engineer
4 Montgomery Dr,
Framingham, Ma, 01701-3962
Phone: 508-877-2307
Fax: 508-877-0131

MTC-00009825

From: Barclay Thomas M
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/9/02 6:11pm
Subject: Real penalties and permanent oversight for Microsoft, please
222 Park Avenue
Long Beach,
CA 90803
9 January 2002
Ms. Renata Hesse, Esq. Trial Attorney

Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW,
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Ms. Hesse;

I am a citizen of the United States. I work in the information technology industry. I believe that it would be disastrous for me should all the tools of my livelihood be owned by a single corporate entity, no matter how well intentioned. This is what Microsoft intends. The evidence revealed in court which led to their antitrust conviction indicates that Microsoft is not well intentioned. I am profoundly concerned that, in the matter of US vs. Microsoft, the penalty phase of the trial is being managed by the convicted defendant in such ways as to increase their monopoly over today's information technology and, even more importantly, that of tomorrow. The far-reaching consequences of this de facto reversal of the anti-trust trial verdict would be difficult to overestimate. It is no exaggeration to say that this is a matter that will impact every life on this planet for many lifetimes to come.

Because of the importance of this issue (in my view), I will also fax this letter to you at 202/616-9937.

It is critically important that real, far-reaching and controlling penalties be assessed against Microsoft. Their very settlement proposal shows that the corporation's unbridled ambitions include actual control of every possible future application of information technology. The tendrils of this plan reach deeply into matters of the defense of this country and its economic health, in ways so insidious that they can be nothing but another Microsoft plan for market dominance.

This time, Microsoft is clearly thinking of the big picture. They are thinking of the entire nation and its governance. They are thinking of the entire global economy. They want it all. Their proposed settlement is another covert, gift-wrapped mechanism to achieve ambitious and self-serving ends.

Microsoft is not sorry that it has performed monopolistically. They are ceaselessly, incurably, rapaciously ambitious. They have been found guilty; the punishment you help to assign must somehow enforce a curb upon their avarice and ability to infiltrate the fabric of our entire lives. Serious penalties are called for. Constant oversight is called for. The proposed settlement includes neither of these elements.

I could synthesize my own arguments for your consideration, but others, better informed and more knowledgeable, have already done so. I will quote them extensively, and hope you will consider the wisdom of their words.

From Dennis E. Powell of LinuxPlanet:

"The ... proposed settlement ... would grant Microsoft its operating system monopoly—indeed, contains wording such that it would no longer be illegal for Microsoft to maintain that monopoly—while saying that if Microsoft wants to, it can make it easier for people to write Windows applications, but it's by no means required to do so. In short, the settlement is a travesty, an ill-advised

embarrassment that flings down and dances upon the law and upon all but the most twisted notion of justice.

"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 ... 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.

"I ... point out that if the national interest is at issue ... and as the judge has suggested... 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, 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."

"A settlement more along the lines of the one I propose above would greatly benefit Windows users as well, because 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 ask the judge to consider that the proposed settlement hurts each and every one of us in this nation in real, tangible ways. The proposed settlement should be rejected as ineffectual and again a tool of monopoly for Microsoft.

Here are the words of a California system administrator, with which I whole-heartedly agree: "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 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 its 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 its web of interdependencies. With its 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. . . ."

From a Canadian university (a nation whose economic fortunes are inextricably tied to those of the United States) comes a very specific analysis with which there can be no cogent argument, because it raises the issue of the user's right to his or her own data: "Because the most successful competitors in recent years in product markets in which Microsoft holds a true or de facto monopoly (e.g. 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.

"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 academic and business communities 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 3rd 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.

"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.

"A second cornerstone of Microsoft's monopoly is the fact that many computer manufacturers will not sell computer hardware without a Microsoft OS. I understand that the proposed settlement will prevent Microsoft from entering into exclusive arrangements with vendors, but I believe that stronger protections are required.

"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. As an example, I point to Dell which will, as far as I can tell, not sell a computer without a Microsoft OS and office productivity suite. If purchasers knew that without these products they could save some number of dollars, that now often amounts to a sizable 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."

If much of the legal profession is about finding loopholes (it is), then accountability is about closing them. So it's not surprising that a certified public accountant found a glaring and terrible loophole in the proposed settlement and argued that it should be eliminated:

"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."

Many of us are simply and plainly harmed by Microsoft's business practices. From Microsoft's own back yard, Seattle, a commentator considers the specifics of the proposed settlement. She provides a compelling illustration of how she is personally damaged by the Microsoft monopoly: "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. (Doesn't) this seem 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.

"... 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 (under the terms of the proposed settlement). "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: <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/localnews/134378212—qwest14m0.html> "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 ... have them fail (with resulting) 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 ... 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 ... 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 (an) 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."

A computer professional who has a long list of certifications—including some from Microsoft— makes the point that competition is the only assurance of high quality:

"Microsoft products, by virtue of being (created by) 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 viri 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 practices 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 (that) they also paid (for) 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 (be forced through software) included in the cost of the computer

“(This situation) is much akin to buying a car, and with that car purchase also comes 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? ...”

From Rick Hohensee of the cLeNux distribution comes a substitute remedy proposal: “(It would be best if) the Court declares Microsoft operating system products ‘criminally compromised intellectual property’. This is a special state of copyright protection vacancy, under which Microsoft operating system products lose their patent and copyright protections exactly five years after their release dates “First off, it has (the) one essential characteristic of anything that will be effective upon Microsoft, simplicity. They feed on loopholes. There are none in the above. There’s nothing they can do about the Fed not protecting the copyrights their existence depends upon.

“There is nothing for them to cooperate with.

“This doesn’t require any cooperation or good faith from Microsoft, which is also crucial. (They may actually favor this remedy, however.)

“It does actually partially break their monopoly. The AOLs and Oracles and Rick Hohensees of the world can produce their own alternatives to Windows, based on older versions of Windows. (I personally have to be very well paid to look at a Windows desktop, but distastes vary. I use Linux.)

The focus is on the software others are dependent on, (the) operating systems. This leaves Microsoft untouched as to application products such as Office....

“What goes in an OS, where they expend their energies, all product design decisions and so on remain with Microsoft. Federal micromanagement of Microsoft is avoided, to everyone’s benefit “

Another correspondent, from England, makes comments that must be seen in the Federal Register. They neatly address further Microsoft plans to manage national and world trade through monopolistic practices identical to those for which Microsoft was convicted. “MS is desperate to stop Linux from competing in the client /server market by enforcing an MS client/MS server strategy. An example of this is the recent non-standard extensions to Kerberos so that if companies have MS clients they will find the encryption protocols may only work properly when they’re talking to MS servers. This is to be expected from the company that continuously muddied the waters on SMB.

“.NET is really an extension of the same principle, though the spinmeisters at Redmond make sickening paeans to Open Standards with their ‘XML Foundations’ nonsense. “Let me give you an example of Microsoft’s commitment to XML as an open standard for data exchange—taken from the December 2001 issue of Linux User in an interview with OperaSoft’s Haakon Lie:

“MS office claims to support XML but it writes the XML tags inside HTML comments so that they can not be found (by non-MS

software). Even if the software then knew how to find the XML tags it would not know how to interpret them as the format used for the tags is proprietary! “I think this tells you all you need to know about Microsoft’s conversion to XML.

“What about those of us who do not live in the US? Microsoft’s policies affect the entire world— how do the rest of us try and have a say in this? I speak as someone who lives in a country whose government has decided to hive off the public sector IT infrastructure lock, stock and barrel to Microsoft, and whose leader, Tony Blair, goes weak-kneed in the presence of Bill Gates. Britain is about to become the first reference site in the world for .Net, if Gates gets approval from the government to roll out a multi-billion dollar 100% MS solution for the tax authorities. In the last month it has been announced that the National Health Service and the Ministry of Defence have signed deals to put *all* of their desktops under one MS licensing contract. In three years time, if they want to carry on using the software, they will have to pay whatever amount MS demands (the joys of software rental). The lion’s share of government contracts (in pound sterling terms) have gone to EDS, a company which makes no secret of the fact that it is little more than a value added reseller for Microsoft (all of EDS’s costly ‘solutions’ are 100% MS).”

Please consider that the U.S. government has made much of globalization. It is a good idea for the government to understand that in cases such as this one, which have a global impact, this means responsibility for corporate behavior within the boundaries of the United States. Additionally, parties injured by the actions of American companies, which actions took place in the U.S., have standing by every standard I can find.

Finally, I will quote another wise man, a Floridian with more intensive software industry experience than mine, who speaks to the point of freedom of choice for the consumer: “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 to any casual software user that Microsoft has attempted to maintain a monopoly on the Internet Web Browser market. It is more apparent to a software developer who works 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 MCS D (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. If I planned to do it (premeditated), it’s Murder 1. The fact remains that a man would be dead.

“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 manufacturers 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 judgment 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. Judgment 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, (and) 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.”

Please do not allow this travesty of a negotiated settlement to warp this nation's future. Please do not allow the tools of production to remain in a single pair of grasping corporate hands. Thank you for your consideration. Please help the judge to make careful and considered choices. The task before you now is to rein in this corporate megalith and constrain its future behavior into conformity with the letter and spirit of the law. The richest must not be allowed to legislate for all of us, with no end other than their further enrichment. That isn't justice.

Thomas M. Barclay

MTC-00009826

From: Steve Oualline
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:15pm
Subject: Problems with the Microsoft Settlement

I am extremely concerned about the proposed settlement with Microsoft.

Microsoft for a long time has been able to use their monopoly power to keep other products off the market. This has allowed them to overcharge for both their operating system and office suite.

The settlement does nothing to punish this past behavior. Instead it rewards Microsoft by letting it keep all the money it stole from consumers through overcharging.

The other problem is that it does not prohibit future problems. There is nothing to

prevent Microsoft from using its monopoly in operating systems from using that monopoly to leverage itself into the E-commerce market. Microsoft has long wanted to place a “Microsoft Tax” on every web based transaction and this settlement will let them go ahead. If the settlement stands I can easily see a day when Microsoft forces everyone who uses Windows to use Microsoft Passport (or some other Microsoft technology) when buying on line.

Finally, the settlement forces Microsoft to expose it's API's so that other people can write applications for the Microsoft Operating system. However, Microsoft has added a clause that excludes Open Source Projects. Since these are the principal competition for Microsoft's products I find that provision extremely troubling.

What Microsoft has done is said it will let anyone who wants to get a copy of the API's except for anyone who might be really able to use it. Is that a settlement or a gift to Microsoft?

In short this settlement gives almost everything to Microsoft that Microsoft wanted. What we need is a settlement that contains real penalties and provides for solutions that foster real competition.

Steve Oualline
11259 Paul Barwick Ct.
San Diego, CA 92126
858-695-2637

MTC-00009827

From: Derek Su
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

As a taxpayer and citizen, I want to express my strongest displeasure and disappointment of State government efforts 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 time.

Sincerely yours,
Derek Su
id5olutions
512.342.0500 x14

MTC-00009828

From: Matthew Dunn

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/9/02 6:27pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft needs to be punished for their crimes. Punish them in a way that will help the IT industry. Make them share their API's. As far as the making them give schools software...thanks now they can take over a new market that they are not in.

Matt Dunn

Tech Manager

Microsoft product user

MTC-00009829

From: Jim Brents
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it was totally unfair to persecute Bill Gates for doing a superb job of supplying the consumer with computer services. If the settlement will end the persecution & let he and his company get back to business, it should be accepted ASAP.

Sincerely,
Sandi Brents,
Bay City, TX

MTC-00009830

From: Randy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:35pm
Subject: hands off

The government should keep their hands off Microsoft! This intrusion is a threat to ALL businesses in this country! How dare they think they can just come in and take over! Are we still living in the United States, or what?!

Jennifer Davidson
Petaluma, CA

MTC-00009831

From: Francie521@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 6:49pm
Subject: (no subject)

I support the Microsoft settlement

MTC-00009833

From: Frapazoid 1.4
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:23pm
Subject: My opinion of the Microsoft settlement

Microsoft's proposed settlement of buying their own software for schools is absolutely insane, for many reasons.

1) If Microsoft buys their own software with the money, at full price, how are they being punished? Let's say they "spend" 100k dollars on WindowsXP. At 200\$ per copy, they are really only paying for the 3\$ manufactur cost, and the rest just goes back to them. So they are really only spening a 1.5% fraction of it. This applies to just about all of their software.

2) Buying Microsoft's own software only strengthens their monopoly by training millions of kids at schools in the use of Microsoft software. So when they someday decide to buy their own computers, they will get what they are used to; Microsoft software.

3) The simple fact that it's Microsoft who suggested this settlement should be very suspicious. Obviously a company will try to

come up with a punishment that doesn't really work but seems bad.

4) A well known tactic of Microsoft is to pay people to send supportive E-mails and mock flame-mails from fake Linux users. Anyone who claims to use Linux and is sending really moronic messages to this address is probably really a Microsoft supporter. Check their Email headers and you will see they are using Windows.

Here is my preposed solution. Microsoft should spend 1\$ dollars on installing and support of competitor's software.

That means Linux, StarOffice, possibly Macintosh, etc. The rule should be that whoever they buy software from must not be an ally; They must be a competitor.

Also, Netscape is a must, in place of Internet Explorer. This would work better for the following reasons:

1) The money doesn't just go back to Microsoft. They actually have to do some spending, instead of just faking it.

2) It hurts the monopoly buy training people to use competitor's software and hardware rather than their own.

3) WindowsXP has high system requirements, so a good portion of the money will be spent on hardware. As a result, a smaller number of machines will be able to be updated, because of the higher cost. However, if something like Linux is used, hardware will not require as much improvement. Less upgrade cost means more computers to be upgraded.

4) Linux is far cheaper than Windows XP, which also means more systems will be upgraded. Even with support, RedHat Linux would only cost 60\$ per copy, where WindowsXP would be significantly more. Without the support, it would be about 5\$ per school for OS software.

5) This would be very supportive of Microsoft's competitors, thus causing much damage to their monopoly. Also, if Microsoft opposes this type of settlement, that means it will work as a punishment. After all, if the criminal is okay with the punishment, it's not a good one.

6) Most of Microsoft's competitors may be willing to give price cuts to help their reputation, which would allow even more systems to be updated with the billion dollars.

If you read this, please reply. You don't even need to say anything, just hit reply and send without typing anything. I would just like to be aware of whether these messages are being read or not.

MTC-00009834

From: Barry Tucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good Sir: I am glad that the DOJ and numerous states have reached a settlement with Microsoft.

It is my sincerest hope that the remainder of the states be brought "into line" with the settlement, so that the entire computer industry, including Microsoft, can get back to what it does best.

Thank you,
Barry Tucker
PowerPro Systems Group, Inc.

Microsoft Certified Solution Developer
(programmer)
Microsoft Certified Solution Provider
CPA
www.ppsg.com barryt@ppsg.com
520 742-9929

MTC-00009835

From: Ricevuto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:28pm
Subject: Web page not being updated...

To whom it may concern,
Will the web page (<http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms—index.htm>) be updated with any of the recent court activities (e.g. Microsoft not being able to extend the deadline for the hearing)? It seems that there has been no activity on it for a while.

Please let me know.
Thanks for your time.
Sincerely,
Pat Ricevuto
email: cmprice@gte.net

MTC-00009836

From: Elmer Laudinsky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: It is time to get on with business. The settlement agreement, while still unfair to Microsoft, is most agreeable to all those it affects. It is time for forget those special interests, those that are complaining because they cannot compete at a fair price with a good product. Microsoft has made available to the public programs that are the best on the market at a price that anyone can afford.

Let's get on with it and finalize this settlement.

—Elmer Laudinsky
—designtwo@earthlink.net

MTC-00009837

From: Will Pearson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Proposed Settlement

Rebuttal
Hello,

I'm writing to help inform those who are deciding the fate of the known world. The settlement with Microsoft as it currently stands is little more than a pat-on-the-back for a proven Monopoly.

When Standard Oil was accused of being a monopoly Rockefeller believed that the government didn't have the authority to dismantle his monopoly. When the government threatened to send in the military, Rockefeller backed down, thus we have the several oil companies we have today.

Today we have Microsoft, a company with a reprehensible past. A company which has not innovated a single thing in its history, and yet Microsoft gets rewarded for its carpetbagging.

I work in the Education business. I take care of Networks and computers for a School District. For proof of Microsoft's monopoly just walk down to your local school and look at the software that is being taught. I'd bet my computer certifications that 90% of them say "Microsoft" upon start up.

Here we are, teaching our children that it's good to play unfair. That it's right to break the law because you'll be rewarded for it. Just look at how the proposed settlement will effect other companies. For instance, it gives Microsoft the authority as to who can use their protocols. Now in the computer world, things work good if protocols are standardized. Just look at the Internet running TCP/IP, it works only because of that free and public standardization.

Now look at Linux, the free operating system originally created by Linus Torvalds, in the words of Microsoft Officer Brian Valentine, "It is the longterm threat." Lets look at that sentence, notice he said 'the' not 'a' or even 'possibly', he left straight to the big 'ol 'THE'. Microsoft believes that there isn't a single operating system in the world that possibly poses a threat to it's monopoly, except Linux. And here we have under the proposed settlement authority given to Microsoft to say who it can share it's protocols with. How, because it gives Microsoft the ability to discern what it believes is a legitimate business. Since Linux is free, it is non-profit. And therefore, not a legitimate business. Nobody has made any money selling it.

Furthermore, the settlement will have a devastating effect on the outcome of the various state lawsuits with Microsoft. Also the lawsuits involving the European Union. Why, it sets a precedent.

You have a job to do, you have a job of punishing the bully in the playground for not playing nice and breaking other kids legs. Do your job and do the right thing.

William Pearson
Desk# 505-954-2583
Pager# 505-820-8488

Technology Resource Center

"The tree of liberty must be refreshed Santa Fe Public Schools from time to time with the blood of Patriots & Tyrants"—Thomas Jefferson "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."—Benjamin Franklin "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones."—Albert Einstein "The purpose of war is to decide who has justice on his side, the looser is the guilty one"—Lucan

MTC-00009838

From: Doug Spittler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:52pm
Subject: Justice???

To Whom It May Concern:

It seems difficult to believe that the U.S. Government is STILL persecuting the company and the man who have brought about a revolution at least as great as the Industrial Revolution.

This same government would be INOPERABLE if Bill Gates and Microsoft didn't exist.

If another operating system of superior value were "out there," the market place would surely have discovered it by now. Frankly, if I were Mr. Gates, I'd simply shut down Microsoft and let you folks stew in your own juice.

Sincerely,

Doug Spittler
Kalama, WA

MTC-00009839

From: Dorothy St. Onge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is time to settle this anti trust case in favor of Microsoft who should be free to innovate so that we can move into the future. I don't believe Microsoft has hurt anyone who purchased software to use for business or pleasure. A computer today is considered old at 3 years and this case has gone on far longer than that and is costing the public a great deal of money. Money is what it is all about as far as the states and Microsoft competitors are concerned. They not only want Microsoft's money they want the tax payers to pay the court costs for as long as possible. Wrap up this case and let us get on with our lives and the right to innovate.

Dorothy St. Onge
e-mail: stonge@waypt.com

MTC-00009840

From: robert begley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 7:55pm
Subject: Drop to Case Against Microsoft To Whom This Concerns,

I am writing to say that Bill Gates, not Bill Clinton, is responsible for the boom in the economy we enjoyed during the 1990s. If you follow the NASDAQ since the AntiTrust trial against Microsoft heightened, you will see that it has spiralled downward dramatically. The Anti Trust laws are non objective and should be repealed immediately.

Sincerely,
Robert Begley

MTC-00009841

From: Deborah Levinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I just wanted to write to tell you I hope you well do everything to settle this case quickly and once and for all and do everything in to get the last states to agree to the settlement that was agreed by the government and Microsoft. It is time to move forward from this case and move forward with our economy and letting Microsoft build great products.

Thank you.
D Levinger

MTC-00009842

From: Keith Frederick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a supporter of BeOS, an operating system that has recently—more or less—died with the sale of its parent company, Be, Inc. to Palm. I have noticed that many BeOS users are lobbying to extract gains from Microsoft or to increase punitive damages. However, unlike other BeOS supporters I do NOT support the anti-trust case against Microsoft and hope that the Department of Justice does not seek to come up with new penalties or

excessive penalties against Microsoft as it would be counter-productive.

The truth about BeOS is that it failed due to poor management. Originally, BeOS was provided for a PARTICULAR COMPUTER SYSTEM—just like the Macintosh Operating system is provided for a particular computer system. Originally, BeOS was NOT DESIGNED to work on multi-boot systems. That is, BeOS was designed for computers that COULD NOT run MS-Windows just like the Macintosh Operating system is on computer systems that can not run MS-Windows.

The Be product was designed to compete for media developers who were currently using the Macintosh—so, originally Be's competition was the Macintosh. In fact, Be, Inc., at one time had hoped that Apple would purchase Be — instead Apple purchased NeXT and based their future operating system on NeXT's technology rather than Be's technology.

When Be failed to make headway with its own proprietary computer system; and when Be failed to win against NeXT; Be, Inc. then decided to compete in the general operating system market—against Linux, FreeBSD and Microsoft—all systems that run on low-cost Intel hardware. Be CHANGED their operating system to run on these new Intel systems. There was very little software for BeOS compared to Windows and Linux—that's why BeOS failed.

Unlike Linux which gained headway and had tens of thousands of developers; the constant failures of Be turned-off developers and little software was every produced for BeOS systems. Microsoft's tactics had little to do with the failure of BeOS. BeOS was competing in the same market as the Macintosh originally (proprietary non-Intel systems) and failed; then BeOS went for the low-cost Intel market and failed; and then Be, Inc. once again tried a new strategy of forgetting about the desktop and concentrating on devices with their BeIA—then they ran out of money and sold themselves. Be had more ideas than money in the bank to support their goals.

The history of Be is one of poor management. Be did not take the time to slowly build market share. Be, Inc. could NOT even erode Apple's market share when it competed against Apple. To think they had a good chance in the even more competitive Intel market is a laugh—Be was selling a proprietary closed operating system with little software—and virtually ZERO marketing. That combination against Linux (free with LOTS of publicity) and Windows (costly but with LOTS of software) was doomed to initial failure— however, if Be had the money they might have carved out a niche — they didn't have the money and thus no time to build a niche. That's not Microsoft's fault.

Please end the whole Microsoft affair quickly and please don't allow people to put their failures at MS's doorstep. The story of Be has to do with poor management. Be lasted 10 years trying to be the next APPLE—only in the last few years did they compete in the Microsoft realm—their failure has nothing to do with Microsoft.

Sincerely,

Keith Frederick,
Seattle, WA
CC:msfin@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00009843

From: Alan Hensel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:26pm
Subject: think about the future

People tend to forget this Law of Nature: Nature does not favor the mundane, nor does it favor the fantastic. Nature favors that which is probable.

Keeping this in mind, consider these 4 facts:

- 1) E-commerce is already a big thing, and will be even bigger in the future.
- 2) Microsoft has a history of pulling the rug out from under competitors' feet.
- 3) Microsoft wants to be the sole platform of future e-commerce.
- 4) Microsoft wants to be able to helpfully auto-update their software instantly over your broadband connection.

Alan Hensel
108-G Shadewood Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
alanh@mindspring.com

MTC-00009844

From: Jim Poulton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:38pm
Subject: Retired USAF SWBell union memeber & MS Stockholder

Is our government stupid?
Quit screwing with the brightest light in our economy.

If any other nation in the world had Microsoft in their country they would back them to the limit. Only because our country allows foreign lobbyists and because we have so many other multi-national companies bribing our officials do we have this problem. Support the USA and our workers and KNOCK IT OFF!

James Poulton
USAF (retired) MSgt
214-902-8996

MTC-00009845

From: Richard Wray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:40pm
Subject: Microsoft

We love Microsoft hardware, but if their competitors come up with something better, we'll try it. We don't think the Government should force the market. Microsoft hasn't used force; they have used contracts that both sides have agreed to.

Leave Microsoft and the high-tech market alone. You'll only destroy the market by interjecting government force.

Dick and Vivi Wray
Palo Alto, CA

MTC-00009846

From: Kelly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 9:00pm
Subject: Proposed settlement ICO U.S. v. Microsoft

Dear Sir or Ma'am,
The proposed settlement, in my view, does not punish Microsoft. Indeed it strengthens them. Please allow me to illustrate this:

(a) The proposed settlement provides Microsoft with the sole legal license to determine who shall be considered a business. This does not at all bode well for organizations who write programs under the Gnu public license. As no actual financial instrument changes hands, Microsoft could state that a business/organization which operates under the Gnu public license is, according to Microsoft, not a business at all. As such, Microsoft is not required to provide technical details of their middle ware, etc.

(b) As the settlement is to, at least purportedly, punish Microsoft for their—proven—monopolistic practices, nowhere in the proposed settlement is the requirement to, if you will, force the consumer during installation of the operating system to make certain choices. Choices pertaining to which web browser to have installed. Which e-mail program to have installed and on and on. And, even if there were, there is no requirement that there be no default settings. That would be counter to the intent and purpose of the settlement.

(c) Since there is very little competition against Microsoft, how can there be as Microsoft has a proven monopoly, the products which Microsoft ships are by any reasonable standard quite poor. Security holes and patches that don't work are just two examples of many. This traditional shipping of poor products has cost consumers and businesses alike—billions—of dollars annually. Without competition there is no reason to improve a company's product line. Yet I can not find within the proposed settlement any protection for consumers or businesses which are using Microsoft products. There is no change to the current "End User License Agreement" which would provide businesses and consumers alike with a legal remedy (standing) should their system(s) be attacked by a virus, worm, cracker, etc. Furthermore, there is no legal remedy (standing) should a Microsoft product—cause—a business or consumer injury to their computer or files.

An example of this is upgrading from Windows 98 to Windows 98SE and Windows 98SE fails to shut down properly due to Microsoft's willful—failure—to maintain device driver databases from previous editions of Windows. Consequently, a business or consumer either has to upgrade hardware or have their computer(s) crash on a daily basis. In short, there needs to be remedy for the consumer and business users of Microsoft products.

(d) Consumers should have the—choice—of operating systems when purchasing a new computer. Consumers should not be stuck with "comes with Windows [pick a flavor]." Hence, Microsoft should be forced to pull their operating systems from manufacturers. This would give consumers a choice in the matter.

Thank you for your time.
/s/Mr. Kelly Prince

MTC-00009847

From: Eric MacKnight
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 8:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

I am appalled at the Justice Department's proposed settlement with Microsoft, which is nothing more than a disguised capitulation. Microsoft's business practices are unrepentingly rapacious. Bill Gates will do anything to win, and his ambition to control is insatiable. Just today I found another small "incident" illustrating Microsoft's lack of ethics, in this story of how Microsoft employees attempted to rig the results of a website poll in Microsoft's favour: <http://news.zdnet.co.uk/story/0,,t269-s2102244,00.html> Clearly, half-measures will have no effect whatsoever in restraining Microsoft's illegal and unethical business practices. I urge you to take the strongest possible measures against this company. My own preference would be to require that the corporation be split in two, with the operating system business in one company, and the application software in another. This solution would remove the incentive to monopolize, remove most of the company's means to bully competitors, and promote innovation by allowing smaller companies a chance to compete in the marketplace.

Sincerely,
Eric MacKnight
ericmacknight@shaw.ca
CANADA
Don't do Windows, and don't let Windows do you.
Boycott Microsoft!
<http://www.procompetition.org/>
<http://www.breakupmicrosoft.org/>

MTC-00009848

From: M. Andrews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hello—

I'd just like to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft Settlement.

About the 1 Billion in refurbished equipment and software. I really don't think that this is a punitive move. My reasons are as follows.

1) While Microsoft is the default standard in nearly every market it is less a leader in the educational market. This now dictates that Microsoft has a federally mandated responsibility to pursue market dominance in education and in fact cannot be refused.

2) Apple Computer, while a healthy company, is not the giant that Microsoft is and to have the Federal government instruct Microsoft to aggressively pursue market dominance will place undue and unnecessary strain on Apple Computer's abilities to effectively market products to this segment of Apple Computer's business.

3) While the donation idea seems to be a decent and thoughtful move on the surface it in no way accomplishes the goals of the court case as I understand them, "...the remedial goals set by the U.S. Court of Appeals:

(1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future,
(2) to spark competition in this industry;
and

(3) to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains." I have owned stock in both companies. I have sold my stake in Microsoft this year. I have read the issues with Microsoft's corporate behavior and have decided not to

be associated with a company that appears to have no ethical or moral underpinnings regarding their corporate methods. The latest developments with Microsoft's browser only underscore the fact that even though the company has judgments against it, it has failed to amend it's business practices to conform to generally accepted methods.

Please pursue a better solution to the Microsoft Anti-Trust case, one that enforces the U.S. Court of Appeals goals.

Thank you for your time,
Mark Andrews
109 Chestnut St.
Branford, CT 06405

MTC-00009849

From: GAMatthews03@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 9:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I, along with the vast majority of the masses, are getting sick and tired of the Dept of (Justice?) continuing to spend taxpayers money to punish Microsoft because some of it's competitors want a "level playing field" so that they can gain on Microsoft without any development on their own. Why should a company (MS) give out all its source code (that took years to develop) to the world? This whole thing started with some silly browser (hah!) AOL now has both IE and netscape, so now where is the argument? The government has no business in this suit that it will never comprehend the damage they are doing to the country and to the many consumers. If you want to attack someone, go get AOL...who continues to push and push a BAD product after they have locked in millions of customers. They are MUCH more monopolistic than MS. If the government would leave this area up to the industry, they would resolve it by themselves. The DOH HAS NO IDEA of the many agreements and the damage this is doing to the millions of consumers and customers...it is not just punishing Microsoft.

These last states attorney generals are just blowing smoke for some special competitors....this is not about abuse of the public and MS customers.

MTC-00009850

From: john l denny
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 9:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that further litigation in the Microsoft case is undesirable.

John L Denny
4445 Catalina Place
Tucson AZ 85718
Prof. of Mathematics, Prof. of Radiology,
Emeritus, University of Arizona

MTC-00009851

From: web blank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 9:26pm
Subject: ELIOT SPITZER AND DOJ NY NY
WADC

YOU HAVE TO HAVE THE LETTER AS IT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN YOU ME AND THE WWW GOPHER. REPLY O.K.
SIGNED RICHARD JOHN FRANK 1-9-2002

MTC-00009852

From: Erwin Brown
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the justice department should notify the renegade states that a settlement has been agreed upon and either join in or go home and sulk. Those States I refer to are backing companies in competition with Microsoft. The market is open to all who want to compete for it, if they are not competitive, they have only themselves to blame.

Please put this issue to bed now.
 Erwin D. Brown

MTC-00009853

From: Jean (038) Gene Millsaps
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:45pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Honorable Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

To the Honorable Court:

As an interested software user and occasional application developer (novice), I write to protest the proposed settlement in United States Department of Justice vs. Microsoft.

Microsoft's monopolistic practices have apparently crippled software publishers Corel (office suite) and Netscape (web browser), and perhaps others of which I am not aware, yet no remedy is proposed to compensate the damage to their stockholders or successors. In my opinion, a true remedy would restore these damaged firm's products to a market-equal position and let the firms duel fairly in the marketplace.

Thank you for your consideration.

Gene Millsaps
 131 Sport Court
 Mooresville, NC 28117-5506

MTC-00009854

From: Don Granston
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 9:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it's past time for us to get this behind us.

We have reviewed the settlement and think that it would be in the best interest of all parties to settle this NOW!!! Don't we have more important thing to do then to find unreasonable fault with one of our countries for thinkers?

You are always going to find a small minority that is out for their best interest, and not for the betterment of everyone. Microsoft has helped us little people get connected, and without their work for many people today wouldn't be on the internet. It's our choice who we use and Microsoft doesn't dictate as many people think.

Let's settle now!!!
 Don Granston

MTC-00009855

From: Jason R Lee
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/9/02 10:14pm
 Subject: I oppose the Microsoft settlement as it currently stands

Hello, I am a computer professional that works out of San Francisco. I would just like to say that when Microsoft was found to be a monopoly, I was very happy. I grew up using Microsoft and Apple products—starting when I was 12 years old. From that time though, I have seen Microsoft transform from just just “another” software vendor, to a company that rolls over anyone they see fit.

I was there when were being investigated by the government during the DOS times. I was there during the “Office wars”—which Microsoft clearly came out ahead (I mean, if you owned the code to the operating system, how can't you come out ahead). It didn't suprise me to hear that other Office developers were getting API (Application Programming Interface) documentation (and *not* getting undocumented APIs at all—unlike the Microsoft teams) late. And the list goes on and on and on.

So, naturally, even though I grew up with Microsoft in the computer industry, I was naturally happy to hear they were finally ruled a monopoly. They are. Plain and simple. I cannot buy a big vendor computer without having to pay the 'Microsoft tax'—every machine comes bundled with some sort of Windows Operating System.

This year, instead of buying a PC, I bought a Mac, in direct response to the Microsoft tax. Unfortunately, my Mac does not do the same things as my PC does, so I'm finding certain hard to accomplish, so I have to work on my work machines that do have a Microsoft OS on them.

For me, a computer professional, I can handle other Operating Systems and computers. But for someone like my sister or mother and father, that's a different story. They have no choice. They have no recourse. They have to take what's given to them to communicate and participate in the 'digital age'. If they had a choice, I would feel much better.

WindowsXP: B-A-D! Another area that really raises flags that the ruling does not cover is Microsoft's push into digital media. If they get their way, just like in the computer industry, then I'm sure I'll see more “Microsoft Powered” devices on the horizon. Limiting my choice of audio and video codecs; image compression algorithms; services that support these. Plus, Microsoft requires that in order to use XP, I have to have a Passport account. This is really scary. 2001 has been such a debacle from Microsoft in the security arena. Yet, very few seem to be raising the issue of one company owning a database (and their track record shows that they are lousy at security—even their own servers) of my information. If I buy XP, then I should own it. I should not be *required* to register for an online ID to activate it.

For me, a computer professional, I can get around many Microsoft issues. Over the past few years, I've watched the web start as a platform independent medium, to a heavily Microsoft controlled one. Another way for them to own the desktop. It is sad because if you ask anyone who has used the web from the beginning, they will acknowledge just how dependent it is on Microsoft Internet Explorer. There used to be a choice, however.

Now the justice department has set, in my opinion, the wheels in motion to let Microsoft continue on their path of, basically, domination of the PC and media industries. There are judges that are not qualified to make decisions on behalf of the American public regarding this matter. They do not understand the implications of this ruling nor the technologies involved. I for one feel that I must voice my opinion, as a computer professional and someone who has used countless Microsoft products over the years, and say that this ruling is inadequate and does not do what it was intended to do.

Microsoft has been ruled as a monopoly. This is fact and cannot be changed. They should be now dealt with accordingly just like other landmark cases—AT&T, Standard Oil—were. This will NOT hurt the industry. In fact, competition is what drives our great economy. Let's have more of it. The American people deserve it. We demand it!

Thank you.

Jason Lee
 Associate Senior Software Engineer
 Novo Interactive
 San Francisco, CA
 CC: jrlee@novcorp.com@inetgw

MTC-00009856

From: wayne tynes
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 10:18pm
 Subject: Dear Sirs,

Dear Sirs,

I'm writing to you as a concerned citizen. The Microsoft trial has been going on too long. As a taxpayer, I'm pained to see the government used as tool of Microsoft's competitors. How can you honestly tell people that there is a software monopoly?

Will we run out of software? Can't people write their own software? Aren't there other operating systems to choose from that are free? Give us a break.

Please stop spending my money this way.

Regards,

Wayne Tynes
 email: waynetynes@hotmail.com

MTC-00009857

From: Jahorlick@cs.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/9/02 10:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern.

I generally do not write E-mails on the behalf of big business. But I find this whole Microsoft saga disturbing. I do not agree with the idea that Microsoft should be punished or broken up. I think that Microsoft is an industry leader, in part because of its aggressive and forward thinking business practices, vital for competition in a very competitive market. I for one am thankful for what Microsoft has done. I think that the tremendous advances in computer technology can be attributed to Microsoft.

I can assure you that if another company comes out with a product that I read about or try and find it that I like it better than Microsoft's version, I would certainly buy the product that I liked.

If Microsoft feels that this latest judgment is fair, then I would have to agree.

Thank you for your time.

John Horlick

MTC-00009858

From: Chris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Decision

Please realize that allowing Microsoft to continue its business practices (current and past) is extremely dangerous and unfair. I have been involved with computers for over 18 years, and I have observed Microsoft's business practices. Although it may seem that Microsoft's innovation is the main reason for their dominance, but there is little that Microsoft has innovated. The company has used its size and deep pockets to overpower smaller companies. By protecting Microsoft, there is a risk that the industry will become stagnant. The prospect of putting all the eggs in one basket in the computer industry is extremely dangerous, especially with the security track record that Microsoft has. Even the use of a single OS in an organization can spell disaster should there be a major casualty. Due to the advances in cross platform compatibility, heterogeneous systems should be used to exploit each platform's strengths.

Please consider the consequences of your actions by letting Microsoft off the hook. The computer industry understands real well the dangers of giving too much leeway to Microsoft. The full impact should be considered before Microsoft is allowed to continue unchecked.

Sincerely,
Christopher R Susalis
Yorktown Virginia

MTC-00009859

From: Steve Sparrow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 10:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is high time this case be settled. The government, as well as Microsoft, continue to pay legal fees, which are ultimately paid for by consumers. Cut the costs and get the case settled.

By the way, I don't believe consumers are complaining about monopolistic practices of Microsoft. The complaints are coming from businesses. I thought legal remedies for monopolies only applied, when the public sector screams for action. Don't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Microsoft is a great business that contributes favorably to the balance of trade and is a great tax paying corporation. Also, Microsoft's innovations have contributed heavily to the productivity of everyone in the world.

I look forward to a prompt settlement that allows Microsoft to stay in tack and continue to offer innovation that produces greater productivity. Certainly, Microsoft should be required to treat corporations and individuals fairly. As for the past, I am all for a smack on the wrist, and let's get going. The economy could use a shot in the arm, and I am sure Microsoft could help more, if they were involved in this long drawn out case.

Sincerely,
Steve Sparrow
3408 Forestway Court
Arlington, TX 76001-4849

Family Phone: 817-561-1277
Personal Phone: 817-561-1323
Fax: 817-561-1339

MTC-00009860

From: Whittington, Tim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear United States Dept. of Justice,
Under the Tunney Act, I would like to provide my comments regarding the Microsoft settlement.

As a US citizen and a tax payer, I'm very concerned and quite frankly disappointed about the continued efforts of my government to pursue a company that continues to innovate. Here is a company that started with nothing, developed quality software at very competitive prices, became successful and now the government wants to punish them. Microsoft's software continues to deliver more features, integrate additional applications, increase performance, all at lower prices. As a consumer, I'm not sure how I'm harmed.

I disagree with the appeals court ruling against Microsoft, but respect their decision. I feel the recent settlement reached is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I, along with many others consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy. I hope you reach the same conclusion.

Sincerely,
Tim Whittington
VP, Premier Call Center Accounts
Intecom, an EADS Telecom Company
Bus: 972-855-8012
Fax: 972-855-8006
Pager: 800-421-8870
E mail : TWhittington@Intecom.com
Web : www.Intecom.com

MTC-00009861

From: Robert E. Brode
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:19pm
Subject: Public comment

To whom it may concern,

While I believe the Justice Department has done a heroic job in the legal struggle against Microsoft, it would appear to me that, once again, money talks and Corporate America will have succeeded in screwing the little person again.

Only a brain dead person who has no clue as to the reality of life would think that innocent little Microsoft has been put upon by the big bad Justice Department.

Over the years, Microsoft has made every effort possible to destroy the competition, maximize profits and force consumers to accept faulty, less than adequate operating systems and bloated and overpriced software. Microsoft has made very effort to become a monopoly and has finally succeeded. There is no competitor anywhere close to Microsoft's market share except possibly Apple (a far better and more efficient operating system and computer) but they're so busy looking in the mirror admiring themselves, that they have lost the marketing advantage they had years ago. They simply pissed it away.

If Microsoft walks away with this we can look forward to another 20 years of non productive software, operating systems that crash at drop of a hat and no real innovative thinking. As I recall, Bill Gates didn't actually design the DOS operating system. He bought it for \$50,000. No innovation there. Windows is a 'not as well done' copy of the Apple graphic users interface. No innovation there. In fact, wasn't it Bill Gates who told people that 'command line processing' was here to stay and no body would really use a mouse? No innovation there.

Robert Brode

MTC-00009862

From: Patrick Auth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/9/02 11:37pm
Subject: Drop the Microsoft case.

Bill Clinton's administration was good for nothing other than slowing big business down. I believe it's call communism !! I think the justice department needs to find who killed Vince Foster. they should'nt have to go far, just ask Bill. I bet he knows !

MTC-00009863

From: drummond@bethe.physics.
uq.edu.au@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice,
Washington,
USA.

RE: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to make a submission with regard to the Microsoft settlement.

First of all, this settlement has international and global repercussions, and I hope that you can accept a submission from someone who is not a US citizen—from the viewpoint that monopoly is a global problem.

When there is a monopoly in software—as already ruled by the courts—the international nature of the software market means that the monopoly is far more extensive than the US, and causes damage internationally.

From my point of view as a consumer, I have never had a software product sold by Microsoft work acceptably. In every case, there were bugs that caused data loss or worse, which Microsoft did not fix.

So, these products do not suit me, yet I find myself continually being forced to purchase them because of the monopolistic types of business methods used by Microsoft in Australia and elsewhere.

These methods include especially the bundling of software with PC's, which I find highly objectionable. Why should I have to pay for an OS and software that I never use? Yet I have no choice in this!

The use of proprietary and nonstandard file formats is another weapon used by Microsoft, which forces email and internet users to adopt Microsoft software. This is objectionable, and surely illegal. To settle with Microsoft, I suggest that Microsoft at least should be forced to refund the cost of unwanted software to consumers—both for past and future purchases—in order to discourage this monopolistic practice.

In addition I suggest that file formats be published, and MS be enjoined to support at

least one internationally approved format—preferably standardised through the W3C—in each of its high market share programs.

The idea of Microsoft donating software in settlement is out of the question. How can a legal settlement that tends to increase the impact of illegal activity be accepted? As a consumer, I prefer a cash refund!

Peter Drummond. —

Physics Department, University of Queensland, St Lucia 4072, Queensland, Australia. Tel:+61-7-3365-3404 Fax:+61-7-3365-1242

drummond@physics.uq.edu.au;
www.physics.uq.edu.au/people/drummond

MTC-00009864

From: Janemanni@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 1:46am

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I THINK THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE WHAT THEY WANT TO BUY AFTER ALL WE THE PEOPLE; BUY WHAT WE WANT AND THAT IS MICROSOFT, AFTER ALL THEY HAVE THE BEST PRODUCTS AND THE GREATER HELP NETWORK. I FEEL THAT YOU SHOULD LEAVE THEM ALONE TO DO WHAT THEY DO FOR ALL OF US.

MTC-00009865

From: Harald—Jensas@Dell.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 2:05am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of a worldwide network that is working on getting the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: examples: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, make dual-boot options mandatory. Especially this dual boot options must be addressed. You can find more info here: <http://www.byte.com/documents/s=1115/byt20010824s0001/0827—hacker.html>.

Mvh

Harals Jens's

MTC-00009866

From: Graeme Gott

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 4:00am

Subject: The proposed settlement is the worst thing yet

I am forced to deal with Microsoft and their monopolistic ways on a daily basis. I cheered when it appeared that the DOJ would finally do something about the monopoly. And then you sold out to Microsoft. Make no mistake, if you go through with this settlement, the computer industry will get even worse... and the economy with tank even more. Please reconsider your settlement. It gives Microsoft even more loopholes without doing anything about their anti-competitive practices.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Graeme Gott

MTC-00009867

From: mercury@crossroadz.com.au@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 4:10am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement of the M\$ anti trust action represents a complete failure of the current laws to protect consumers & ensure a level playing field for competition.

Microsoft failed to abide by the original judgement against them, has clearly continued their anti competitive behaviour and has now taken that behaviour to even higher levels with the release of Windows XP.

The issues with XP are far wider & more serious than any previous behaviour & this behaviour is apparently now being condoned by this settlement which provides M\$ with a platform to further promote their products over any alternatives.

Within Australia the pricing issues alone are beyond belief. US Court evidence indicated 50% overcharging of consumers, with exchange rates taken into account the overcharging in Australia has been 200% and now with XP, the removal of Domain login from the basic/home version of the operating system, small business will be forced to move from a \$A400 operating system to an \$A660 operating system. Some 80% of small business is affected & the cost worldwide will run into \$USBillions. The pricing of the M\$ component of any PC price has risen in a market of dramatically increasing volumes, the opposite of normal market behaviour where shipment volumes increase.

This has been possible due to the monopoly position. In some cases the M\$ component is now 50% of PC manufacturing Price.

There is also an element of using US PC manufacturers to engage in product dumping into the international market to the detriment of international PC assemblers. The court evidence indicates some US manufacturers purchased NT4 Operating System at \$US20 where local manufacturers in Australia were being charged \$A320 (\$US160)

The schools concerned could utilise free open source software rather than waste money on M\$ software & thus free up resources for additional hardware or teaching resources.

Throughout the current case M\$ has been clearly in contempt of the courts in their actions which have been designed to ensure that it was not possible to recall or change products in the field with the browser (as distinct from the HTML rendering engine & communications utilities) embedded in the Operating Systems. The W98SE & Windows ME releases along with various Browser updates have been dubbed "The DOJ releases" with good reason.

This case has been a classic example of how a Corporation can use delaying tactics in the courts to their advantage & profit from those tactics. This proposal for settlement should be withdrawn and a regime which ensures an open standards interface approach is adopted with full disclosure of all API's for application services & network services put in it's place. Penalties which reflect the magnitude of the crime and recover the revenue improperly gained by M\$ during the case should also be put in place

In addition to the above a public list of areas in which people believe M\$ has/is acting improperly should be initiated. There are numerous areas in which this has been

the case & the current case has only brushed the surface. A public list/discussion board is the only way in which the technical details of how M\$ has acted anticompetitively will ever be fully disclosed or determined.

Competition law will not be treated with any respect by Corporations unless this settlement is revised

Wayne Carruthers

MTC-00009868

From: Thomas Fuller

To: Microsoft ATR, attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inet...

Date: 1/10/02 5:52am

Subject: Concerning the Microsoft Antitrust Case

To whom it may concern,

The antitrust case against Microsoft is of huge importance to the public, and I believe that the public should be made aware of the findings against Microsoft, along with the details of the case.

I believe that Microsoft's consistent and aggressive business tactics have hurt the competitors and consumers in many ways.

I'd be happy to expand on my statement, however I am certain you receive many emails, and probably know much more than I do in this area anyways.

Thanks for your time,

Thomas P. Fuller Jr.

3425 West 83rd Street

Chicago, IL

USA

MTC-00009869

From: Double 'S'

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 6:39am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of the Spanish Speaking BeOS Community.

I have been promoting BeOS among friends and small companies for 2 years now, and are now helping to bring BeOS (now from PALM) back again to the community.

But to get people really using BeOS or to get more people or small companies trying out BeOS, some changes are needed in Microsoft policies.

One drawback for novice computer users to try out BeOS or any other OS is the lack of easy of coexistence with Microsoft Operating Systems, aggravated in the new releases which deliberately kick out of the computer during install any bootmanager other than Microsoft. In Windows Me the BeOS Windows Compatible Loader does strangely "not work anymore".

The other main problem is the license policy of Microsoft Proprietary File Formats. Since MS Office Suite has a huge market share, it's almost impossible for Small Offices to work in team with other companies if they are not able to open (and save to) Microsoft file formats. This is also the case for the many Microsoft Proprietary Media File Formats used on the Internet.

While Microsoft often license their File Formats or Technology to companies that endorse MS Windows, they deliberately do not to companies that endorse other Operating Systems.

It will be almost impossible under these Microsoft practices for BeOS to gain market again if:

- Microsoft does not use a more flexible Licensing of their File Formats (Office and Media / Internet)

- Microsoft don't stop bringing competing new file formats and implementing them by brute force to compete with already good multiplatform file formats of other companies

- Microsoft Windows Installer and Bootmanagers keep deleting other Bootmanagers and Loaders.

I do respect the effort and market gain of Microsoft, but many tactics have forced better solutions of competing companies out of the market, and they seem not to endorse any Technology that improves quality of computing for all users worldwide if this technology is not in their very best economical interest.

Double 'S' a.k.a. Mr. Sanchez
ssdouble@hotmail.com
619370538@correo.movistar.net
MSN Messenger ssdouble@hotmail.com
ICQ—95140266

MTC-00009870

From: belonlord@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:22am
Subject: Microsoft penalty

Dear Sirs,

It is ludicrous to believe for one moment that allowing Microsoft (MS) to donate its old stockpiles of outdated computer hardware and software to "underprivileged schools" is an appropriate penalty for a decade long multi billion dollar monopoly that to this very minute is still exercising its dominating influence around the world in every arena of the computer field. From component manufacturers to OEM's to distributors the computer industry is wrapped around microsoft's little finger. The latest release of windows xp is excellent example of the continuing violations of its unethical and unfair behavior. Windows XP purposely was designed so that AOL's internet browser would not function or even appear on the windows startup screen. AOL was forced to create a new revision that would work with WinXP and then had to try to bargain with OEM's to include it as a option on their preloaded retail computers. Please look beyond the short sightedness of the nine states agreeing to this paltry "fine" and take action to enforce a real penalty that removes MS ability to continue in such a dominating manner. Ten to fifteen year old computers and softwares will do nothing to increase the education of disadvantaged children primarily because none of it is compatible with anything that MS current produces. Such an education in nothing is a waste of childrens valuable learning time and an insult to intelligent parents everywhere.

Benjamin R Buhanan
Police Officer
Surprise, Az

MTC-00009871

From: BOBNVI@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,
Both Fax's sent as requested.

Bob

MTC-00009872

From: JGlenn1518@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a long time consumer of Microsoft product software who thinks that your DOJ settlement of the antitrust case was fair and proper. I do not feel that I have paid excessively for Microsoft's products, and have always had sufficient choice in tailoring my software to my own needs. I do not understand the 9 states, including my own, Florida, who want to punish Microsoft further for its past successes. None of those power-hungry attorney generals really has the end-user's interests in mind. Enough is enough.

One fact is sure. Microsoft will include the lawyer fees they have paid in this law suit in pricing their future products. Please just stop all of this lawyer-profiteering at the expense of consumers like me—NOW! Tell the 9 states to cease and desist. By doing so, you are looking after MY interests!

James Glenn
Daily Home Computer User

MTC-00009873

From: John.Styles@med.va.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:13am
Subject: Public coverage of M\$ trail

Please fight for the right for the American people to observe the testimony of any and all phases of the Microsoft trials. The people deserve the right to see how this monopolistic behemoth has abused them. I personally want to hear what Sun Microsystems has to say at this hearing. Thank you for protecting the American Citizens rights in this matter.

MTC-00009874

From: Mariekraem@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:19am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We firmly believe that this settlement as proposed is good for the company, for the country, and especially good for those of us who have come to depend on Microsoft as a leader and innovator. No company should be punished for being heads and shoulders above its competitors. This country was founded on free enterprise and competition. If Microsoft is able to give us wonderful new tools with which to communicate, then they should be allowed to do that without obstruction. If their competitors want a piece of the action, they should get smarter, not look for handouts from the Government. We buy Microsoft products because they are the best, and we have never been disadvantaged by Microsoft's marketing or management.

Please leave them alone to create new and even better products for us.

Marie and Fred Kraemer
mariekraem@aol.com

MTC-00009875

From: DR(u)Ammer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

1263 Monticello Avenue
Hermitage, PA 16148
January 8, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

After three years of litigation, I am pleased that Microsoft and the government have finally decided to settle the antitrust suit. It will benefit the entire IT industry in the long run, and will give a great breath of fresh air to the economic doldrums we are currently experiencing.

Tort reform is needed in all areas of our legal system. It is becoming impossible to function from medicine, dentistry and even in non profit situations. It's the money not the (joke) statement.

Under the agreement, computer manufacturers are granted new opportunities to configure systems with access to various Windows features, such as those accessed by Windows Messenger and Windows Media Player. These programs can now be easily replaced with competing products.

Also, Microsoft is allowing computer makers to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software, and to disclose information about certain internal interfaces in Windows. Finally, a "Technical Committee" will guarantee that all this actually happens.

This agreement is both fair and reasonable. My tax dollars should be used to tackle the more important issues affecting the country. I trust that the Justice Department will not seek another round of action against Microsoft on the federal level.

Sincerely,
Raymond Ammer
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00009876

From: Rich King
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/10/02 8:21am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
why do you what to brake up the one true American success of the last twenty five years!

MTC-00009877

From: Kevin McCormick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:20am
Subject: microsoft anti-trust settlement
I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed settlement. I object most strongly to the continuation of the "Microsoft Tax" or the fees to Microsoft that are part of the purchase price of many, if not all, personal computer systems sold in the United States. Basically, the "settlement" is a sham since it does not absolutely prohibit the "percentage of sales" licensing schemes that Microsoft has used to force its software onto the public. PC hardware vendors such as Compaq, Dell, and Gateway should be required to offer a "no pre-installed software" option which completely avoids any costs for Microsoft licenses. However, I believe the (In)Justice Department currently is little more than an arm of giant corporations and right-wing extremists, so, in

a way, it is fittingly ironic that the corruption of Justice results in the imposition of inferior software at inflated costs. In politics you get what you pay for, but in PC's you pay for what you get.

Thank you,
Kevin McCormick

MTC-00009878

From: James Urie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:52am
Subject: Antitrust settlement.

You guys and girls should be ashamed of yourselves. The best analogy that I can give to what Microsoft is doing to the marketplace and the consumer is: what their lawyers have done to you. You couldn't win and neither can we.

Funny thing is that by all respects you could have done the right thing in this case, we have no choice.

MTC-00009879

From: William R. Cwynar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

The time has come to move forward and settle this matter. If we were to take a serious look, as to when our economy began to falter, it would probably fall very close to the time when the government initiated these actions against Microsoft. And, because of it the entire technology field has suffered. Please settle this case once and for all. Everyone likes to criticize and attack winners, and the majority of them are followers not leaders (as is Microsoft).

I stand with Microsoft and its Chairman Bill Gates and urge the government to put and end to this unjustified act.

Respectfully,
William R. Cwynar

MTC-00009880

FROM: Ken Sherman
TO: MS ATR
DATE: 1/10/02 9:21am
SUBJECT: MS Settlement
Guy Carpenter
Guy Carpenter & Company of Pennsylvania
Two Logan Square Telephone (215)864-3600
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Facsimile (215)636-9929
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing concerning the settlement negotiated between Microsoft and the Justice Department. After three long years of litigation, this settlement represents an opportunity to move forward. The entire IT sector is ready to move on and get back to business, but it seems that there are those who still want to hold up the process.

This settlement is very strong and requires Microsoft to make many changes. For example, Microsoft will be required to disclose information concerning certain internal interfaces in Windows. Microsoft's competitors will also be free to sue Microsoft

if they feel the company is not complying with the agreement. Beyond that, Microsoft has agreed to be monitored throughout the entire process to ensure that they are following proper procedure.

The concessions that Microsoft has made speak volumes to the fact that they want to help the IT sector get back to business. Let us help support the agreement by letting the terms speak for themselves. Let us help not only our technology industry, but all industries which utilize technology such as insurance and finance, move forward and help get our economy back on track.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Sherman, CPCU, ARE
Senior Vice President
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00009881

From: someonedead@gods-heaven.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:24am
Subject: My thoughts regarding the Microsoft Settlement

the anti-trust campagne of microsoft is a damn shit.it is unbelivelabel why microsoft think the people would trust a company whose company-politic is only spying, lying and changing results of studies. with their anti-trust campagne they make it only more worst.

ps: what the fuck do u think should mean: "americans for technology leadership"!? the usa-flag is not the symbol for every country on america! the people who live in mexiko, kanada, peru, brasil, etc. are also americans!

MTC-00009882

From: Tim(038)Sharon Daniels
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:28am
Subject: response to tunney act

To whom this may concern, my comment is simple.microsoft has been declared a monopoly.With out adequate competition the consumer has been harmed in at least two distinct ways.

1: lack of choice. 2: lack of robust, quality, products that do not have flaws that can cause loss of data and productivity.When I was a child, I was never given the right to negotiate my punishment when found out. why is this happening with microsoft. At your heart you are the last voice of justice, if you dont stand who will?Please restore proper competition to the market place.Do the right thing.

MTC-00009883

From: James Mitchell Ullman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:39am
Subject: Public interest

Greetings,

I am a concerned citizen who has been following the Federal Antitrust case against Microsoft and have, as is my civil duty, some things I would like to be made known to the judge.

I am a technologist of several years experience and have noticed many trends in the industry which, to me, seemed less than right, much less legal. Microsoft is not the only company in this industry which has created, using underhanded tactics and most

certainly illegal procedures, a monopoly of sorts. But, as has been the case in the past, Microsoft has been found guilty of not only breaking the law, but also damaging the economy in such a way that it may take decades for us to recover. I do not think that the government should have anything to do with the internal proceedings of the company as that would be fascism. I do, however, think that just as a war criminal who has committed crimes against all of humanity should make reparations to their enemies, that Microsoft Corporation should be punished.

They have been let off of the hook before for the same reasons, yet when they are brought to court again, they are tried yet again instead of punished. Now, here we are at a major turning point in the case and they are asking that the public, which they harmed directly, should not be allowed to see nor hear the testimony against them. What ends are they trying to meet with this tactic? Possibly to shield themselves against the public outcry if they were to be let off again(as in the case of the over-lenient settlement between one-half of the prosecuting states and the Federal government)? I can testify plainly that Microsoft is an illegal monopoly on several industrial fronts, as I am forced daily to fix their problems which they force on the people of the United States of America who wish to use technology to get their jobs done in a timely, efficient manner. I have previously written mentioning an open letter written by Ralph Nader about the evanescent settlement in this case, but now I am petitioning that there be public access to the witness questioning. I am taken aback by the arrogance of Microsoft Corporation's demand, not request, that the Publicity in Taking Evidence Act of 1913 is deemed nonapplicable to their current status in court whereas it was previously found that it was under nearly the same circumstances. The public must know what is going on. They deserve to know, they have the right to know.

Thank you very much for your time,
James Mitchell Ullman
Technical Specialist I
Zach S. Henderson Library
Georgia Southern University
<http://www2.gasou.edu/facstaff/jmullman>
Office: 912-681-0161

MTC-00009884

From: judhug
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:48am
Subject: End Anti- Initiative Prosecution

The case against Microsoft should immediately be concluded.

It gives the nation an idea that initiative and success is going to be punished.

Hugh W Pagett
681 Hawkins School Hs Rd
Xenia, Ohio 45385

MTC-00009885

From: Aaron Alberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division

U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

"The Proposed Final Judgment will provide a prompt, certain and effective remedy for consumers...." To Whom It May Concern:

I fully support the settlement that Microsoft has agreed to. Prompt, certain and effective remedy for consumers will only be the direct result of a final judgement to which Microsoft agrees or that is in Microsoft's favor. Please finish this lawsuit quickly so that Microsoft can go on satisfying their customers, like me, by producing top quality software. Microsoft should not have to waste money on frivolous lawsuits like these. Having thoroughly studied the economics of competitive advantage, it is clear that the case against Microsoft is based on shoddy economics at best. Stop prosecuting successful corporations and get tough on criminals.

Sincerely,
Aaron Alberg
9027 W. Shorewood Dr.
Apt. 603
Mercer Island, WA 98040

MTC-00009886

From: Louis Ferreira
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Though the majority of Linux lovers are posting this E-mail address in order to stop Microsoft's Settlement, I am all for it. Many people do not understand how important Microsoft is to today's high-tech world. Though I do not agree with there practices it is due to your poor judgment that the problem has become this big. If something was done years ago when apple had a good share of the market then maybe some good would have come from it, but as of today no good can come of punishing Microsoft. The reason I believe this is because Microsoft has established the standard and that is what is needed for computers to grow. The reason why other OS' can't compete against them now is because of this issue. Microsoft was never the best software and neither is Linux or Mac OS, but it is all that we have now. The hopes of other OS' like BEOS are nothing more then a dream now. Companies like this that seek to innovate must maintain reverse compatibility and yet they can not because any emulation of Windows that they try usually ends up much slower then windows. Probably the best thing you can do to Microsoft is make them release the code needed for other OS' to use windows applications, that way the best OS will win no matter what Microsoft does about it.

Just My 2 Cents
Louis W Ferreira III

MTC-00009887

From: Frank D'Angeli
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:00am
Subject: Microsft public deposition

Your Honor,
Since MS declares that they are so important to the US and the economy and

that they are such innovators, blah, blah, blah, I would like my right as a US citizen and computer user enforced which allows me to hear the depositions of MS executives.

It was Bill Gates deposition which allowed the public to see the depth of Microsoft's soul and we should be allowed to see what the company that wants to control every aspect of our life is trying to hide from us. Please allow every fact about MS' predatory, monopolistic behavior be known to all that were hurt by them.

Respectfully,
Frank D'Angeli
57 Pinkert Street
Medford, MA 02155
781.396.5815

MTC-00009888

From: TJimKay@cs.com@ inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

James J. Trageser
181 Sheldon Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15220
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
The intention of this letter is so that I may go on record as being a supporter of the proposed settlement that the Microsoft Corporation and the Department of Justice arrived at last November. The settlement brings an end to the three-year-old antitrust dispute that was costing both Microsoft and the federal government millions of dollars in court costs. I'm sure that Microsoft actually had to concede more than they would have liked in the settlement. In fact, the settlement places restrictions and obligations on technologies and products of Microsoft that were not even mentioned in the lawsuit at the beginning. I wouldn't be surprised if some of the technology mentioned in the settlement hadn't even existed when the lawsuit was started! However, the IT industry will benefit from this settlement and so will the economy. It will generate competition by letting Microsoft's competitors in on trade secrets such as software codes that help programs run better on Windows, making their software run more effectively. I am pleased to see that the federal government and Microsoft could agree to terms, and I support the settlement that was reached.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
James J. Trageser
CC: Senator Rick Santorum
Guy Carpenter & Company of Pennsylvania
Two Logan Square
Telephone (215) 864-3600
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Facsimile (215) 636-9929
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
I am writing concerning the settlement negotiated between Microsoft and the Justice

Department. After three long years of litigation, this settlement represents an opportunity to move forward.

The entire IT sector is ready to move on and get back to business, but it seems that there are those who still want to hold up the process.

This settlement is very strong and requires Microsoft to make many changes. For example, Microsoft will be required to disclose information concerning certain internal interfaces in Windows. Microsoft's competitors will also be free to sue Microsoft if they feel the company is not complying with the agreement. Beyond that, Microsoft has agreed to be monitored throughout the entire process to ensure that they are following proper procedure. The concessions that Microsoft has made speak volumes to the fact that they want to help the IT sector get back to business. Let us help support the agreement by letting the terms speak for themselves.

Let us help not only our technology industry, but all industries which utilize technology such as insurance and finance, move forward and help get our economy back on track.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Sherman, CPCU, ARe
Senior Vice President
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00009889

From: shaun arral
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:17am
Subject: They are making fools of you
Lied in court.
falsify evidence.
bought your opinion (the settlement papers).

"The sun, the moon, the stars
Is that what you're thinking that you are
As I'll disintegrate over time
If I expect my body to try and keep up with
my mind
Today everything's mine", Blind Melon

MTC-00009890

From: Jack L. Levy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jack L. Levy
972 Cypress Drive
Delray Beach, Florida 33483
(561) 279-9099 jacklevy@telocity.com
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to voice my thoughts on the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department. I believe that this litigation should not have been brought forth by the Justice Department, in the first place. There are many Americans who seriously question whether Microsoft has in fact broken any laws that would warrant a suit that has lasted for three years, all the while causing substantial financial hardship to the corporation and its many investors. The federal government should leave Microsoft

alone, and pursue more important matters that are affecting our nation currently. Although this company may have made mistakes during its rapid growth, no one can question the substantial contribution that Microsoft has made to the computer industry. There are many people who believe that the operating systems created by Microsoft may very well be the chief reason for the viability of one of our largest and most successful industries.

I believe that the settlement that has been reached is both fair and reasonable to everyone involved. Microsoft will be making numerous changes with its software and business practices. For example, some of the changes include but are not limited to the following: better relations with computer makers and software developers, internal interface disclosure, and a three-person technical committee to oversee Microsoft's compliance with the settlement. The recession has had a devastating effect on both government and industry. Many private investors have suffered non-recoverable losses, especially those who have invested in the technology sector. It is extremely important that the technology industry be allowed to concentrate on improving business, and not defending what many feel to be frivolous lawsuits. It is in the best interests of everyone involved to see this settlement enacted as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Jack L. Levy

MTC-00009891

From: Heins, Jill
To: 'Microsoft.atr (a) usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/10/02 10:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end the Clinton-era Anti-trust legal abuse. The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. Consumers would rather see competition encouraged. The investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry, and the American economy. I support the Microsoft settlement.

Sincerely,
Jill M. Heins
7833 Garnett
Lenexa, KS 66214
jill.heins@vetmedpub.com

MTC-00009892

From: Joe Amoroso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:26am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

As a citizen, I find it very disheartening that so many states seem to see this suit as a means of generating revenue. The facade of protecting the "public interest" when really acting to put \$\$ in the State's Treasury is in itself a fraud against the public interest.

This is not the only instance of such behavior by the several states and I would ask the Justice system to recognize this transparent money-grab and deal fairly, openly and honestly with the issue at hand—i.e. what damage has been caused to the

citizens—this is the essence of "public" interest; State Treasuries and their viability, although, are a "public interest" issue, robbery of private corporations to maintain such Treasuries is not.

joseph amoroso
pobox 22421
baltimore, md 21203
410-659-0097

MTC-00009893

From: David W. Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
I am a student at Boston University, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does nothing to stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly through the use of its operating system. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws in the past. It would be a terrible standard to set by letting Microsoft get away with its retaliation tactics, bolting schemes, and attacks on Java. All these tactics lower competition in a supposedly free market and also limit software standards. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

To sum up, I'm deeply concerned the recent settlement does not regulate Microsoft enough in the future allowing Microsoft to continue its monopolistic tactics. In addition, Microsoft is not even being punished for laws it clearly broke in the past. This sets a terrible standard. I would request that you do your best to overturn this settlement.

Sincerely,
David W. Hill
Brighton, Massachusetts

MTC-00009894

From: Delmonte, Tom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:18am

First of all thank you for allowing us to voice our concerns.

My main focus is the pattern that Microsoft has exhibited over the 15 years that I have been involved in the IT arena.

The first negative experience was one which happened with a company called Stacker, in which it was proved that Microsoft had illegally used their file compression scheme, by the time the issue was settled the company no longer was viable and in fact is no longer in existence.

The next example is the competition between Microsoft and Netscape and how in a variety of actions which I am sure you are familiar made the company loose most of its relevance in the PC arena, it still has a presence in the Linux arena, but that may change as well depending on how Microsoft handles that or is allowed to handle that arena in the future.

The main problem I see is one of ethical behavior, they do push the limits and go beyond as in the Stacker case in every area that they see is important, and one may think that this is how business is done, the stronger survive. But when it is at the cost of

innovation by individuals or small concerns, which Microsoft is eliminating more and more due to its size and influence, I think that the American public and entrepreneurs have lost incredible opportunities due to what I consider predatory behavior.

The level of excitement due to opportunities available to individuals in the 1980's was palpable across the whole Silicon Valley in which I worked at the time, as the 1990's approached this level of entrepreneurship decreased steadily.

Some of it is due to the maturing of the industry, some of it due to standardization all of which are good. But much of it has to do with Microsoft getting involved in so many areas of the personal computer arena that it left less and less space for the smaller less financially endowed institutions to contribute to the progress of a field that still has wonderful opportunities if this level of entrepreneurship is allowed to flourish again.

Unfortunately much of this has been squelched in the US, but with the arrival of Linux and what it can contribute and has contributed from many areas across the globe there is some activity in this entrepreneur-friendly environment that has received a lot of focus in the last couple of years.

I would suggest that the American technologists would be much more interested in putting an effort again into the IT arena if a more favorable environment was fostered by curtailing some of the more obvious actions that Microsoft has taken, and I am sure that that venture capitalists would support this effort since the rewards are still very high.

What I would suggest is to split the company into separate entities in all senses, applications and operating systems are two of the ones that have been suggested.

And if Microsoft wants to enter a new arena in the computer industry (and that has to be based on a well-defined criteria) then the amount of money they can put in that concern cannot be more than the best financed institution that is already present in that arena. If none are in existence a criteria for that has to be established as well, so that other can compete on equal footing.

Once that concern is established Microsoft cannot contribute any further funds, otherwise it would perpetually be competing in an arena even its efforts were not successful, creating an artificial concern and hampering competitiveness.

If the company failed they should not be permitted to enter that arena for a pre-specified amount of time, to allow those who had good ideas to flourish without the annoyance of having another company artificially affecting the competitive environment to that specific arena.

I understand that this may have a short-term (1-2 years) effect on the economy, but the long-term effects would be a healthy, creative, growing and dominating industry for the US.

Tom Delmonte
WorldCom—Revenue & Segment Reporting
E-mail: tom.delmonte@wcom.com
Voice: (719) 535-1562
vnet: 622-1562

MTC-00009895

From: Olie Echevarria

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:26am
 Subject: Microsoft pre-trial hearing motion
 To whom it may concern,

In light of the Microsoft motion to bar the public from pre-trial hearings, I humbly ask that court deny the motion. Here is why I believe that the motion should be denied.

In my opinion, as a citizen of the United States of America, obedient and tax paying citizen, it is my right to know what is going in the American judicial system. We are a society of information that is readily available to anyone. Microsoft wants to deny the citizens of this nation information that it would deem a public relations nightmare because of the current anti-trust proceedings that are occurring against it. This information, the pre-trial hearings, is not a privilege but a right to all citizens of this country since this will show their American tax dollars at work.

The Attorney Generals and judge doing their job. I urge you deny this motion without question. Thank you,

Your obedient citizen,
 Orlando Echevarria
 Orlando Echevarria
 Webmaster
 E-Mail: echevarr@snet.net

MTC-00009896

From: Doris Lippincott
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you regarding the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case. I am writing to you from a Windows platform and through Hotmail. Although I do not consider myself a computer expert I think that it is a long stretch to consider me a victim of Microsoft. I appreciate what I have gotten from Microsoft and wish that you would settle this case. In my mind, since you have the extraordinary power of the federal government behind you, it is incumbent on you to be extraordinarily careful not to misuse this power for personal aggrandizement or to back those who feel the heat from Microsoft's innovation.

Robert H. Lippincott, Jr.

MTC-00009897

From: pobox.com
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:52am
 Subject: Civil Action No. 98-1232 (CKK)

The proposed settlement in this case is a good beginning but it does not go far enough. While providing greater freedom to the resellers of Microsoft Windows and systems that run Microsoft Windows, it does nothing to insure future abuses do not occur. Due to this, I strongly encourage the court to amend this agreement with more stringent requirements.

Best Regards,
 Tim Malloroy

MTC-00009898

From: Joshua Adam Ginsberg
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:56am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Greetings—

I'm sending you a copy of an email that I send to the Attorneys General of the states that did not agree to the proposed settlement with Microsoft. Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General of Connecticut, who in my opinion is serving his constituents in the finest of fashions, suggested that I copy you on that email. It is below. Thank you for your time, and best of luck to you.

Sincerely,
 Joshua Adam Ginsberg
 Attorneys General—

First I would like to commend you and your respective states to refusing to back down to Microsoft in light of its blatant violation of consumer rights and anti-trust laws. You do your constituents a great service.

As a member of the technology community, I'd like to provide you with some input regarding your proposals to the court that might help you better understand some of the interests of those most affected by your proposals.

I think it's a safe thing to say that it would be counterproductive towards punishing monopolistic practices by extending a monopoly. The rumors that you will propose that Microsoft be required to continue developing MS Office for the MacOS seem to suggest you agree.

In this light, let me point you to <http://www.redhat.com/about/presscenter/2001/press-usschools.html>

To summarize this article's contents, RedHat Linux Systems has proposed an alternative to the settlement the DOJ and other states have accepted. Instead of extending the Microsoft monopoly by letting them install more copies of Windows across our nation's poorest schools, RedHat proposes that the money that would have been spent on purchasing more copies of Windows and more support for them be used to purchase more hardware, and RedHat will donate copies of Linux and provide support at no cost. Students would be exposed to a cutting edge desktop operating system and be enlightened to the software world outside the Microsoft monopoly.

And even requiring MS to develop Office for Linux (as it's been reported you seek) would be fruitless, because Linux users have available to them complete Office suites for free with as much functionality as the Microsoft suites. Examples are the GNOME Office Suite (<http://www.gnome.org/gnome-office>) the KOffice Suite (<http://www.koffice.org>) and most notably Sun's StarOffice (<http://www.sun.com/staroffice>).

Again I commend your resolve to find the right solution as opposed to the easy solution. I appreciate your openness to suggestion. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
 Joshua Ginsberg

MTC-00009899

From: DR Basso
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:14pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement proposal
 The proposed Microsoft settlement is a fraud on the consumers of this country. It does not adequately address the practices the company undertook to draw public scrutiny

in the first place and it rewards the monopoly with a backdoor entrance into one of the major areas of technology where it lags behind its competitors? the education market. Far from reigning in a conglomerate that used its market position to terrorize competitors, this settlement gives Microsoft an even larger market share in education.

The software proposed is almost entirely for Windows computers. The offer provides only a very limited selection for competing operating systems such as Mac OS.

Public school officials, under the gun to get the most "stuff" they can get for as little money, will have little choice but to take up this offer? thereby expanding the company's reach and dealing a severe blow to firms such as Apple.

Besides Apple, however, there are other firms that make software that compete with the items Microsoft proposes to offer schools. Why should those firms be injured in the form of fewer sales by a settlement that is meant to punish Microsoft? It makes no sense to try and increase competition by injuring the competitors you seek to aid.

Also, why should schools have to settle for refurbished and outdated computers. If Microsoft really plans to offer computers to schools, it should be ordered to purchase new machines that will have a long shelf life (in the relative world of computers). Refurbished machines probably already are near the end of their useful life in regards to what new programs they may be able to run.

Finally, I believe the total value of the settlement is far below the actual damage done to competitors. The value should be increased, perhaps even doubled.

Daniel R. Basso

MTC-00009900

From: Kayler
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:15pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am in favor of the settlement. I would like to see the litigation ended. I think it's been bad for the economy. I wish the whole thing had never been started in the first place.

Kayler
 "A proper concept of government is a voluntary one."

"The only true revolution is Capitalism—the Liberal Revolution."—Andrew J. Galambos

Join the discussion of Freedom at <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/volitional-science>
 Check out true freedom at:
<http://www.bridgetofreedom.com>
 The importance of gratitude:
<http://www.e-gratitude.com/home/index.cfm?sourceid=100100129>

MTC-00009901

From: marty (038) janet
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:25pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Didn't the Government also cause us to have all these "Baby Bell Telephone Company's" by breaking up AT&T. The Quality of services went down and prices went up. My mail now takes two to three times longer to get to me than when a stamp cost .10 cents. And it never got lost back then

either. Now they want another price increase for slower, incompetent service. The Government needs butt out of Microsoft's pocket, and business and allow business to flourish. It's good for our economy.

Marty Turner

MTC-00009902

From: F P
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:32pm
Subject: Final Judgment

I do not believe that the proposed Final Judgement (<http://www.microsoft.com/presspass/trial/nov01/11-02settlement.asp>) serves the public interest. Section J.1. is of particular concern, since it could be used to limit the usefulness of non-Microsoft middleware, applications, or even other computers trying to interact with these sections of API or Communications Protocols, and help ensure that Microsoft can continue to extend its monopoly on such products by keeping this information secret. Since none of the listed items benefit significantly from secrecy (good security is difficult to break even with full disclosure), I believe that these should be made available to allow fair competition in the future, with the single exception of individual keys for Microsoft Middleware for the purpose of protecting their identity.

I also note a distinct lack of any penalty for Microsoft's past actions that made them an illegal monopoly.

I believe that some form of remedy should be used, to reduce the chance that Microsoft or another corporation attempts to use similar practices in the future. As a split of the company has been rejected, I'd recommend a monetary remedy.

Frederick H. Page
1305 Kathy Drive
Yardley, PA 19067

MTC-00009903

From: Glen DeGarmo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

First, a personal comment from a long-time computer user: I think the proposed settlement is little more than political window dressing given Microsoft's well documented illegal activities as the 9,000 pound gorilla monopoly of computer operating systems. Microsoft's practice of bundling applications with its Windows OSs has as its ultimate goal eliminating competitors and establishing Microsoft as the sole provider of software for desktop computers. Microsoft's use of the term "innovations" to justify this practice is sheer nonsense...there is no innovation worthy of the term. The proposed settlement does nothing to correct Microsoft's illegal operations which effect tens of millions of consumers.

Second, proposed additional remedies:

(1) Require Microsoft market and make readily available to all consumers "clean" versions of its desktop operating systems with NO bundled applications. By "clean" I mean OSs that have been completely stripped of all non-OS applications (e.g., browser, cd burner, multimedia applications,

etc., etc.). Do not permit, under the definition of the term "clean," any application not absolutely required for the core OS to operate properly or any application that later can be removed without effecting the core operation of the OS if the consumer chooses. Microsoft's attorneys will find loopholes if the definition is not explicit. By clean, I mean CLEAN.

(2) Require Microsoft to make public all the "hooks" to all its currently supported, and future, OSs to permit other software developers to design applications that work seamlessly with all currently supported and future Microsoft, desktop OSs. That requirement should mandate information about "hooks" be made readily available to all non Microsoft designers of applications during the earliest design of beta versions of any new desktop OS, and mandate that updates be made immediately available as a new OS proceeds through development and testing. The requirement must include information about ALL the hooks that Microsoft's designers of applications use to make Microsoft's own, or sponsored, applications work seamlessly with its desktop OSs...NO EXCEPTIONS!!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Glen DeGarmo, Ph.D.
732 Madison St. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
(505) 266-6472

MTC-00009904

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

AG Ashcroft,

It is time that this dog is laid to rest, it will just not hunt anymore. Microsoft has been an innovator in technology and it is not required that they be punished. Let this competitor driven attempt die, it is time to move on.

Please let it be heard that I am one of many Americans whom support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit

Respectfully,
Bruce Mann
CANAC
(281) 588-3160 (phone)
(281) 588-3041 (fax)
bruce.mann@us.sasol.com
bmann@canac.com
<http://www.canac.com>

"Leadership is the art of accomplishing more than the science of managements says is possible."

General Colin Powell

MTC-00009905

From: H. Leslie Friday
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:35pm
Subject: I want to end Clinton-era Anti-trust

I want to end Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse

MTC-00009906

From: Ralph crosswhite
To: Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/10/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Federal Government can be more responsive to the claimants in this "Settlement", and void the "Settlement" as

it is at this time. Microsoft needs to be made aware of how serious their Anti-Trust actions have affected their competitors, and the Voting Public.

The penalties imposed are not severe enough, nor do they change the business practices of Microsoft to a more ethical standard.

Breaking up the company may be too severe, however large monetary fines, and the restriction from engaging in any outside enterprise that is now competitive, should be included.

Ralph Crosswhite

MTC-00009907

From: Ben /Joyce Loving
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to stop persecuting Bill Gates and Microsoft for being smart and able, and doing things to help all the world. It is ridiculous to spend taxpayer money to prosecute this company for antitrust activities. I use their software and also use software of competing companies which is fully compatible with Microsoft products.

Stop the mindset of punishing the smart people who do good. They do not owe anything to the less smart and less energetic. Everyone has choices—it is up to each one of us to exercise these choices in the best and most productive manner for us.

Make a choice NOW!
joyce@doublegum.com

MTC-00009908

From: Mike Lindley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 12:47pm
Subject: Do they own you, too?

HI,

If this gets read, I appreciate your time. Microsoft Corporation has been abusing its position for years and years, this case just happen to be brought forth.

They were found guilty in the Apple-threat part of the original case and that alone is evidence of their monopolistic practices.

Compaq, Dell, Gateway, e-Machines, Hewlett-Packard, etc. All must do the bidding of Microsoft because without the OS, they can't sell their computers.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not let this company live by their own rules simply because they were clever enough to figure out how to control the market.

The fact that they have managed to eak Apple out of the school market and the graphics market is evidence enough NOT of the quality they put out but because of the THEIR ABILITY TO THREATEN THE MARKETPLACE. They were even found guilty of libel when they put an ad campaign out against Novell when Novell took over Cambridge Technology Partners.

It should be obvious enough: They have 96.4% of the WORLD MARKET SHARE in operating systems. Even AT&T never had it that good.

STOP THEM OR THEY WILL OWN US ALL. They only want to rule the world and if not stopped, they will.

Thanks,
Mike Lindley

MTC-00009909

From: dlantz@armorholdings.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:53pm
 Subject: settlement

Hello, this email is to share my opinion that the proposed settlement with microsoft is NOT in the public interest. The settlement does very little to detour microsoft from further illegal operations, and does not adequately punish microsoft for it's past actions.

Thank you,
 David Lantz
 CAD/CAM/MIS
 Protech Armored Products
 158 Hubbard Ave
 Pittsfield, MA, 01201
 413.684.3104 (phone)
 413.684.4166

MTC-00009910

From: LOIS AMACHER
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:53pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 1-10-2002

As a consumer, I would like to express my hopes that this antitrust lawsuit be settled as soon as possible.

President Bush and Microsoft will settle if not interfered with.

I support this settlement.
 Lois Amacher
 Carmichael, CA

MTC-00009911

From: Roger Bowser
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:54pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 sir—

i have been heavily involved in computers since 1983. i like the windws operating system much more than any other system.

please stop this worthless prosecution started by a president with other things on his mind. we need windows.

MTC-00009912

From: Robert G Kraatz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Mr. Ashcroft:

Get the government (State and Federal) off the back of Microsoft! Bill Gates and Microsoft have done more positive things for this country than all of posturing people in our Senate combined.

We need to tell our power hungry politicians to get out of the way since only President Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld seem to be both willing and able to lead in a positive direction. You have great promise but it is time to get out front and lead.

Robert G. Kraatz
 24321 Dry Canyon Cold Creek Road
 Calabasas, CA 91302

MTC-00009913

From: Kopecki, Ron
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:55pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Clearly this settlement should be accomplished. Enough already of the

competitive "whiners" trying to weaken Microsoft. In a free market the fit find a way to survive and prosper. The Microsoft technology has done more good than bad for this country. Tradeoffs exist in all facets of the business environment. Darwinism occurs. Microsoft should be viewed for their positive contributions to our country and society and should not be "punished" excessively because they did not always in the best interest of their competition.

Ronald J. Kopecki
 Corporate Vice President, Sales
 Intecom, an EADS Telecom Company
 972.855.8340 (O)
 email: rkopecki@intecom.com

MTC-00009915

From: Sam Heath
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 12:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is definitely time to put a stop to this nonsense about Microsoft!

Sam Heath
 dheath@lightspeed.net

MTC-00009916

From: thomas l easton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement:

Please end this ridiculous persecution of a company just because it is successful. We have funded this prosecution long enough. The only thing Microsoft is guilty of is making smart business decisions.

Thank You.
 Thomas L. Easton
 835w. lusher ave.
 Elkhart, In. 4617
 219-293-2495

MTC-00009917

From: Tony Dalton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

I request you to settle the lawsuit with MS because they are NOT a monopoly. I am a consumer and have the option of NOT using windows if I chose.

Please stop this unnecessary case and use the money to prosecute real criminals.

Sincerely,
 Tony Dalton

MTC-00009918

From: Duke Gersema
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it may concern:

Re: Acceptance of the Microsoft settlement.
 First, let me say that I am not particularly a fan of Microsoft. They charge too much for their products, they are restrictive and arrogant. That said, I think the whole suit against Microsoft should never have happened and should be dismissed outright, immediately. The current proposed settlement goes too far but should be agreed to if it is the best resolution that can be made at this late date.

Here are my reasons:

The Justice Department has far better things to do,

This lawsuit has drained too much time and money from the taxpayers,

Microsoft is already systematically "shooting itself in the foot" and will not retain its market dominance.

Though arrogant, Microsoft has increased the productivity of businesses exponentially and brought capabilities to people that they did not even dream of two decades ago.

This lawsuit is supposed to "protect the consumers" but the existence of Microsoft has benefited the consumer and this lawsuit will add no protection to the American consumer.

Please accept this settlement and move on to something productive.

Thank you for allowing my comments.

Douglas W. Gersema
 dgersema@employersresource.com

MTC-00009919

From: John Mcdonald
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:06pm
 Subject: ms case

The sooner the trial is over the better for everyone. At the same time I really don't see any problem with breaking MS into different parts. If their code is so good and developed the way they like to claim that it is, then there shouldn't be any problem with a separate company developing Office to run on Windows for example. That is unless they have something to hide, and I personally suspect they have plenty. Why is it that everything has to be incorporated into the system. Why can't they simply develop Windows and then programs and or applications can then be installed separately at a later time. MS could certainly sell these other products, people could purchase them if they want and install them at their leisure. I'll tell you why I think they are doing it the way they are: they are greedy bastards that only care about the bottom line.

They haven't innovated anything they've only incorporated ideas they either borrowed or bought from someone else.

They crank out one OS after another all the while adding things that somehow cut the competition.

Their software is so full of holes it's laughable. Patch after patch after patch. Things that could have been prevented had they taken the time to do it right instead of forcing it sooner to make more money. They already have most of the PC market right? Why push out the new stuff so fast? It's all about getting our money, why else would they be now trying to tell us that we should pay them monthly or whatever for a service. What exactly are they going to offer that doesn't already exist. Nothing, they'll resole an old shoe and push it as something new. What a joke. That said thing is I really liked 95 when it came out, but that's all changed.

MTC-00009920

From: John Townsend
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:09pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If the Government is so against you (and us), have them remove all Microsoft products

from all of their computers. See how they like that!

MTC-00009921

From: mavis caracostas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft

To continue this vindictive assault on Microsoft is insane! The case is against superiority of one company over others, and has led to the recession we are now suffering. It was ill-advised from the inception, and I would like to see it ended ASAP.

Mavis M. Caracostas
Colorado Springs, Co.
80904

MTC-00009922

From: Joseph G. Grochowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Ashcroft:

Stop the government action against Microsoft immediately. This has done nothing but hurt the consumer. Continuing this action begun by a disreputable administration only further erodes the public confidence. And stop State Attorneys General from continuing their harmful actions.

Joseph Grochowski
724 Ardmore Ave
Redlands CA 92374
(909)793-3495

MTC-00009923

From: Hart Slater
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

If the purpose of the legal assault against Microsoft is protection of the consumer, please explain how this "consumer"/taxpayer is protected? I lost much of my retirement nest egg because of the stockmarket response to the DOJ action; and, further, I would like to know how much this suit has cost the taxpayers, both in government costs as well as legal costs. Microsoft has had to pass on to consumers. Very costly "protection" !!!!

Hart Slater,
835 Shenandoah Road,
Lexington, Virginia
hart.slater<hartbon@rockbridge.net>

MTC-00009924

From: Paul Greatbatch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:14pm
Subject: ...and it just keeps going on until YOU do something about it!!

Microsoft apparently tried to rig a ZDNet UK online poll, according to the news outlet: "By 21 December, more than two-thirds of the respondents (69.5 percent), said they planned to deliver some applications by Web services by the end of 2002, with a large majority of those (nearly half the total sample) planning to use Java. Only 21.5 percent said they planned to use Microsoft .Net— less than the figure (23.5 percent) planning to use neither.

But by the time the poll closed, on 5 January, the position had dramatically changed, with three quarters of voters

claiming to be implementing .Net. This apparent sudden change of heart over the Christmas period appears to be the result of a concerted campaign within Microsoft.

ZDNet UK logs reveal rather obvious vote rigging, and prove that it originated from within Microsoft [...]"

Best Regards,
Paul

MTC-00009925

From: Oropeza, Jenny
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/10/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
JENNY OROPEZA (D)
Assemblymember, 55th District
Long Beach, California
916/319-2055
916/319-2155 (fax)

MTC-00009925 0001

STATE CAPITOL
P.O. BOX 942849
SACRAMENTO. CA 94249-0055
(916) 319-2055
FAX (916) 319.2155
DISTRICT OFFICE
ONE CIVIC PLAZA, SUITE 320
CARSON. CA 90745
(310) 518-3324
FAX (310) 518-35,08
COMMITTEES:
AGRICULTURE
BUDGET
ELECTIONS. REAPPORTIONMENT AND
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
JOBS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND
THE ECONOMY
TRANSPORTATION
SUBCOMMITTEES:
CHAIR. INTERNATIONAL TRADE
BUDGET SUB 5, TRANSPORTATION AND
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
SELECT COMMITTEES:
CHAIR, LOS ANGELES METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS AND
EXPORTS

CALIFORNIA. MEXICO AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA PORTS

January 10, 2002
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530-0001
Re: Comments on the Microsoft Proposed
Settlement Agreement

Dear Ms. Hesse:

Microsoft is a company that has long provided good products to consumers and businesses, as well as providing opportunities for other software companies to develop programs for the Windows platform. The provisions of the proposed settlement, worked out with one of the nation's top mediators, will be good for consumers, businesses, the tech sector and the economy as a whole.

The proposed settlement is fair. It proposes significant changes in the way Microsoft handles its software, in addition to preventing Microsoft from abusing the strength that it derives from its operating

system. However, the proposed settlement also allows the company to continue innovating in all areas of software development. I fully support the Department of Justice and the nine Attorney Generals for their efforts to finally put an end to this case and agree to a settlement that is in our nation's best interest.

Sincerely,
JENNY OROPEZA
Assemblymember 55th District (D—Long
Beach, California)

MTC-00009925-0002**MTC-00009926**

From: Mary Silva
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General Ashcroft,
Department of Justice:

I am sending this email to urge you to settle the Microsoft case. The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy.

This case should never have been brought by the DOJ during the Clinton administration. I have always believed that Microsoft is a very fierce competitor in a rapidly changing technology world, and that Microsoft has done far more good than harm to consumers. In fact, it appears that the only ones whining and crying are those that lost a share of the computer business due to their own ineffectiveness, and not because Microsoft took it from them. There is no monopoly on progressive thinking as Microsoft has done and continues to do, and it certainly should not be a crime. Those that cannot compete should get out of the business.

Respectfully,
Mary J. Silva
3429 Maywood Drive
Richmond, CA 94803
CC:BillGates@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00009927

From: Matthew Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir,

I am writing to ask that the Microsoft Antitrust battle be put to an end as soon as possible. In my opinion (as well as the majority of the public), this suit has been a witch hunt driven by Microsoft's industry competitors from the start. Illegal monopolistic action can not be assumed simply because of a high market share. There was no proof of anti-competitive action, unless you believe striving to be #1 in an industry is necessarily anti-competitive. The only organization in this country that has been thwarting competition is the federal government. Please take action to discontinue this charade immediately.

Sincerely,
Matt Jones

MTC-00009928

From: Bret Nelson

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:22pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement Glacier
 Atty Gen Ashcroft,

I want to thank you for your hard work for our nation under difficult circumstances and unwarranted scrutiny.

I am writing in support to some sort of end to this expensive ringer that Microsoft is being put through. I would say that if, indeed, Microsoft is guilty of a crime that I would be happy to see the perpetrators brought to justice, even if the process is costly. However, it also seems to me that in-as-much as Microsoft has competitors, the overall case is unjustifiable on the surface. It appears to me that the case is a remnant of the Clinton administration that needs to be brought to a close (we all need closure from that administration).

I wonder how those bend on Microsoft's demise would feel if the government had decided that rather than spending \$1,000,000 on litigation they would award \$500,000 to Microsoft's number one competitor to develop a more competitive operating system to assure that Microsoft hadn't such an advantage in the market place. This of course would cut tax-payers expenditures in half. Of course, this notion is cockeyed, but it would have shown more responsibility with the taxpayer's purse than Janet Reno was want to do when this whole thing started.

Once again, thank you for all your efforts. I'm glad that you were confirmed and I feel confident that you bring a positive chord to the new Bush chorus which is serving the country well in this time of crisis.

As a final note, I pray that your office is concerned with expediting the process of finding and punishing our citizen, two-bit, homegrown terrorists. I feel very confident that we can handle every foreign threat if only we can eliminate the threats from the Timothy McVie's of our homeland. I'm much more concerned about threats from within from Uni-bombers than from long-range bombers and I fear the wrongs committed by power-hungry politicians elected at home than from foreign regimes who exercise authority over cactus and rocks. Most of all I fear the judgments of God more than man and I hope that your office can hand back to the people the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience wherever they be—home, class, court or elsewhere. I believe the less we fear man, the more apt we become to fear God again, an guiding light this country needs—personal responsibility based on Judeo-Christian values so that strict laws and punishments become less needed and hence, considerably less costly to enforce.

Sincerely
 NAI Capital Commercial Real Estate
 Bret
 Bret D. Nelson
 Vice President
 1712 19th Street, Suite 220
 Bakersfield, California 93301
 661-864-1000—phone
 661-864-1011—fax
 661-201-9855—mobile
 bnelson@naicapital.com
 www.naicapital.com
 www.naidirect.com

MTC-00009929

From: john r. emra
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Enough is enough. Stop this constant bickering and settle this case.

John R.Emra
 3529 SE Doubleton Drive
 Stuart Fl.34997-5627

MTC-00009930

From: Jane Smith
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Attorney General Ashcroft,
 I urge you to support the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft along with the 9 states who have reached agreement.

Enough taxpayer money has been spent to harass Microsoft and this gives us the opportunity to end it.

Sincerely,
 Jane M. Smith
 2104 Chestnut Hill Drive
 Cinnaminson, NJ. 08077

MTC-00009931

From: Bryan Fandrigh
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:27pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
 Re: Microsoft Settlement.

The U.S. Government lawsuit didn't solve a problem.

The U.S. Government is the problem. The Sherman Act is a relic and should be repealed posthaste. The whole procedure was a costly waste of time except for the lawyers involved.

Settle it as leniently and expeditiously as possible to discourage future pointless government interference.

Sincerely,
 B.Fandrigh.

MTC-00009932

From: Stan Dickison
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 With all due respect, it's time to move on. The settlement reached by the Justice Department is perfectly fine. There are many more important issues in which the Justice Department needs to be involved.
 Stan Dickison

MTC-00009933

From: Palmarin Merges
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/10/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Dear US Dept. of Justice,
 Leave Microsoft alone.
 Stop penalizing commercial success.
 If I want to buy Microsoft products, let me decide. If other competitors want to compete they can create a better product. FREE ENTERPRISE. LET THE CONSUMER DRIVE THE MARKET NOT THE GOVERNMENT or whiny competitors. Stop wasting my money on this decade-long competitor-driven persecution of Microsoft.

"The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy." (from an ACU article)

Do not divert any more government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies. Leave Microsoft alone.

"The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public." (from an ACU article) DO NOT continue this litigation.

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.
 Sincerely,
 Palmarin P. Merges

MTC-00009934

From: Kevin Kahley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:27pm
 Subject: Reasons for Change
 Hello,

I would like to discuss my concerns for Microsoft's continuing monopoly and the effects upon the education of computer experts in the future. I have a bachelors degree in computer engineering and am currently working on a masters in computer science. During my junior high and high school years the only machines that I used ran Microsoft Windows. Having only used Windows until college placed a rather large learning curve in front of me as I entered the serious computer science arena. I am not saying that Windows is useless, my parents happily and productively use it. However, choices in computer operating systems need to be widely available to our younger children so their education will not be sheltered until they reach college. Having more choices in operating systems will widen the schools of thought in computer science and lead to a better world for all.

Thank you.

MTC-00009935

From: evanness@rice.edu@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:30pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

The federal government should back off the case against Microsoft. Microsoft has successfully standardized the industry for operating systems which has allowed the unparalleled growth in technology.

I remember when Macintosh was competing with Windows. Though Macintosh was a better product (and I'm a 10 share Microsoft shareholder), Windows won. That was probably the best thing to happen to the computer industry.

Microsoft may have made some minor mistakes, but nothing that would justify a large settlement of such a magnitude.

Evan Van Ness

MTC-00009936

From: James Wobser
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:30pm
 Subject: US Government vs. Microsoft Corp.

Dear Sirs-
 Please end all legal action against the Microsoft Corp and let the market determine the outcome.

Thank you,
 James Wobser

MTC-00009937

From: Thomas E. Strickland
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:30pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Putting this Reno farce behind us is long overdue.

MTC-00009938

From: Merle J VanDyke
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Senator Ashcroft Please settle (curtail) this legal action of the last 9 states now.
 Merle VanDyke

MTC-00009939

From: kanninen@juno.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Mr. Attorney General:
 I believe that it is a vital interest for our country that when the Justice Department settles a case with a litigant, in Antitrust or any other part of the department, that it ensures that it has settled the case. It is unconscionable that the economic security of our country be endangered by the political desires of any one of the 50 state Attorneys General. Please do your best to ensure that the judiciary accepts the terms of your department's settlement of the Microsoft case, and see that it is applied nationwide.

Thank you for all of your good work in this dangerous time for our country.

Cordially,
 William R. Kanninen
 457 Spring Lane
 Ocala, FL 34472
 352-687-0123
 352-895-7528 (cell)
 801-409-6494 (Fax)
 bill@kanninen.com

MTC-00009940

From: Steven M. Stallings
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Mr. Attorney General,
 Please stop spending taxpayer money on the competitor-driven suit against Microsoft. I have been a professional software developer for over thirty years and have used many software products from many different vendors in addition to Microsoft. The Information Industry is now at a difficult point where we cannot afford to hamper its ability to contribute to the economy and to enhance every aspect of government, business and personal life. Microsoft's competitors are trying to take advantage of a

few misdeeds of this corporate giant and those competitors are no less guilty of such misdeeds themselves. The current settlement is fair and sufficiently addresses the past problems and provides a just path for the future of Microsoft, its competitors and the public.

It's time that the U.S. Department of Justice and the States Departments of Justice to move forward to other more pressing matters.

Thanks for the service that the DOJ has provided in this lengthy matter.

Sincerely,
 Steven M Stallings

MTC-00009941

From: Jud Cox
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:37pm
 Subject: settlement

I support the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Gov. I urge you to support it, and encourage you to pass these sentiments along to the Federal judge. Thank you, and keep up the good work you have been doing. You have the trust of the American people. Keep in mind that we often are the silent majority.

Jud Cox
 152 Hilltop Way
 Blowing Rock, NC 28605
 conservativejud@yahoo.com

MTC-00009942

From: Joel Carlson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft antitrust must be enforced

Dear US Department of Justice:
 If we don't stop Microsoft now, we will have no choice or innovation in the future. Microsoft has apparently bought off the Bush Administration but we must not let that happen. Microsoft, like robbers barons of the past, will stop at nothing to eliminate the competition if given the chance. For example, see <http://vb.channelsupersearch.com/news/crn/32424.asp>

Sincerely,
 Joel Carlson,
 622 6th Ave,
 Fox Island, WA 98333

MTC-00009943

From: Willard Bass
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:39pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern;
 As a life-long professional in the field of computers, I wish to register my support for the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I believe that it encourages consumer product-choice, allows for continued product innovation by Microsoft and other software companies, and provides adequate safeguards to give software manufacturers other-than-Microsoft confidence in marketing their own products. Further, a settlement at this time is definitely in the public interest, in that it will free Department of Justice resources to pursue other anti-trust issues.

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their stated desire to settle this lawsuit.

Sincerely,

Willard C. Bass

MTC-00009944

From: Alexander Martinez
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:42pm
 Subject: against proposed settlement vs. Microsoft

Dear Sirs,
 As you may have noticed: I'm no US citizen, but I'm concerned about the proposed settlement involving that Microsoft is going to supply US schools with software and equipment to settle some court cases against them. I'm against this because Microsoft will be able to further spread their software and, by this, gain greater market share than it already has. This is one step further towards a Microsoft software monopoly and this is definitely the worst thing that I can imagine for IT firms and home users. Some competition is good for Microsoft (and the entire software industry) because then they are forced to produce better software.

Yours sincerely,
 Alexander Martinez
 Student of Computer Science
 Independent programmer
 78120 Furtwangen
 Germany

MTC-00009945

From: T. Aaron Metz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 1:12pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: I am a 26-year-old college student at West Virginia University. I'm an active member of the community in Morgantown, WV and I believe that I represent a good majority of people my age with my student's lifestyle. I ask you to please end this persecution of Microsoft. There is absolutely no wrong in being the leader of an industry because you are the smartest and the fastest. But, for some reason, the individuals who are fighting against Microsoft believe that success and leadership is breaking the law. It's not Microsoft's fault that their competitors cannot keep up.

Because of this lawsuit, the public as a whole has suffered. Look at the good Microsoft has done for society-Windows, easier access to information, and better hardware to work with, to name a few. You're probably reading this message on a Windows-run machine. Does that mean that Microsoft has a Monopoly or just the best product? I choose the latter and I believe that society has chosen the latter, as well. Microsoft has the capability to drive us through the 21st century with a fury, but this lawsuit has given them a Model T to drive us there. LET THEM BE!

Need I mention the millions of taxpayers' dollars that have been wasted on this lawsuit? We need to end this mess and let Microsoft go on being successful, making money, and bettering society.

Thank you for listening to my opinion.
 Sincerely,

T. Aaron Metz

MTC-00009946

From: JOHN F BRISENDINE

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement arrangement negotiated by the Bush Administration and Microsoft. Please make every effort to end this litigation immediately. We have much more important priorities for our legal system to handle.

John Frederick Brisendine
Charlotte, North Carolina
jfbrendine@prodigy.net

MTC-00009947

From: scott gould
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I just wanted to comment on the proposed Microsoft Settlement. I think that we/the United States and Local Governments should settle this lawsuit ASAP and let Microsoft go back to doing what they do best. In my opinion the high-tech industry and the nation in general would certainly be better off expending their energy, time and money on new software products rather than dragging out this legal action.

Sincerely,
Scott Gould

MTC-00009948

From: robert sirignano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I support the position that the US courts are wasting much money in there attempt to prosecute Microsoft. I do not believe it is a good use of tax payer monies. I further believe it has a negative effect on the computer software industry, and the US economy. I think that competition could create, and has the ability to create alternative software and platforms, and are not bound to Microsoft in any way. With the growing popularity of other platforms such as Linux, I believe that this lawsuit is a mute cause.

Please help end this wasteful use of tax monies any way you are able. Thank you and your staff for your time and concern in reading my opinion.

I am very happy to have you in DC, and know you are the best choice Our President could have made.

Sincerely,
Robert Sirignano

MTC-00009949

From: Morgan Philpot
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:50pm
Subject: Attorney General Ashcroft,

Attorney General Ashcroft,

The last few years have been most difficult for the technology industry. The Microsoft lawsuit that the Department of Justice has been engaged in has cost the industry and has taken millions of dollars away from matters of urgency that would make this country better. The original suit was persuaded by Microsoft competitors and unfortunately they used taxpayer dollars to push their competitive edge in the market.

The settlement agreed upon by the Department of Justice and the Microsoft Company is at this time reasonable. It allows the entire technology industry to move forward and start the innovations rolling again. Our economy is ready for a new idea. Please accept the settlement and close the books on the matter.

Sincerely,
Rep. J. Morgan Philpot
Utah House of Representatives

MTC-00009950

From: Brock N. Cordeiro
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

It's time to stop penalizing commercial success. It's time for the states to stop persecuting Microsoft. The proposed settlement is in the public's interest. I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy.

Furthermore, America's taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies. The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

Sincerely,
Brock N. Cordeiro
15 Sagamore Drive
Dartmouth, MA USA
02748-1261
508-979-8930—Phone
508-996-4622—Fax
BNCordeiro@Mediaone.net

MTC-00009952

From: Sanford Kenyon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:54pm
Subject: Trials

PLEASE STOP DAMAGING OUR
ECONOMY WITH THE LAWSUITS
AGAINST MICROSOFT.

ALSO STOP WASTING OUR TAX
DOLLARS

SANFORD KENYON
P.O. BOX 212
WEST POINT, CA. 95255
email skyk@volcano.net

MTC-00009953

From: David.M.Talmadge@mail.
sprint.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support this proposed settlement.
Thank you.
David Talmadge
6708 East 132nd St.
Grandview, MO 64030

David.M.Talmadge@mail.sprint.com

MTC-00009954

From: Harland W Cashman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this suit and go forward with real needed litigation.

Thank you
H.W. Cashman Plainview, NY

MTC-00009955

From: Ed or Anna McNeill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop the anti-trust suit. In today's environment, the customers have spoken by an overwhelming preference for purchasing Microsoft products. This is not because Microsoft products are the only ones available. It is because the customers prefer them.

Harole E. McNeill
201 Calle Del Juego
San Clemente, CA 92672

MTC-00009956

From: Connie D. Husley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to advise that I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in the settlement of this lawsuit.

Let me add a few of my own thoughts and comments: A former partner of mine walked out on our business a year and a half ago and started her own business.

She proceeded to call and send letters to our clients leading many of them to believe that she would be "taking over" their cases when no such agreement had been made. She continuously smears our reputations with clients as she has done to her previous employers in the past. We lost more than 1/2 of our client base to these unethical actions. She attempted (and is still doing so) to take all of them in any way she could.

Fortunately, my reputation in the field is good enough and her slander is not with the other 1/2. This, along with many other actions she practiced and continues to practice, is a violation of anti-trust laws; not what Microsoft has done.

I am tired of the government constantly attempting to divert the money and success that honest, hardworking individuals have obtained to 'provide to the less fortunate' individuals. I do not make much money; in fact, I am a single parent of two teenagers and make less than \$50,000 a year. There have been times that I have made \$15,000 a year and I have never felt that the so called rich people owe me something. Because of my intent to provide for myself and my family, I have done whatever I could to make sure my success was a priority. I have admired the ambition of people such as Bill Gates who have built themselves an "empire" on their own intelligence and abilities. It is ironic to me that the ones that feel that the "poor" people need to get more of the government's (American's) money than the ones that have actually paid the taxes into the government are Hollywood elite who make millions of

dollars a year and wouldn't give a penny up without plenty of media coverage to make sure they become noted for their alleged wonderful contributions. If the "poor" people would quit laying on the legs of honest, hardworking Americans, they may be able to actually make it on their own. President Bush's tax cut and the refunds was the best thing in the world and I think if the majority of it went to the "richest of the rich", then they were deserving of it since they were the main contributors. While I don't agree with salaries paid to CEO's, etc. that are non-owners of businesses, I cannot agree with penalizing them because they may have been diligent enough to get where they are.

I could continue with my point of view but feel that this should get my point across in regard to the Microsoft case.

Thank you for your consideration of my interest in this matter.

Sincerely,
 Connie D. Husley
 6911 Rosebank Dr.
 Metairie, LA 70003
 504-456-0905

MTC-00009957

From: mail.televar.com
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 2:09pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Let this matter get settled and stop the hold up on new products Microsoft has been penalized far too long for being too good at what they are good at doing. This is supposed to be a free market country. If the other manufactures can't swim with the big fish too BAD.

Richard H. Baumann

MTC-00009958

From: Francis Johnson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 2:11pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I have tried to follow the Microsoft case as much as possible and I am appalled with the DOJ for settling that easily. The law states that Microsoft broke the law, why does the punishment not fit the crime. As an individual on the street I start drawing my own conclusions. Did Microsoft pay off somebody etc? When IBM was found guilty of monopoly, they were dealt with accordingly and they could not profit from their business.

When Southwestern Bell (I forget what it was called) was a monopoly, it was dealt with too Why is the DOJ afraid of dealing with Microsoft. Wrong is wrong.

The proposed settlement is an insult to the "poor under privileged schools." I could understand if Microsoft offered to make all these schools top of the art with new technology/hardware etc. But to offer outdated hardware/software!, all they are doing is using the schools as trash cans, because they have nowhere to put their junk. "give it to them under privileged schools, they should be grateful", and the worst part the DOJ accepted this. This is the United States for pete's sake. We are supposed to offer justice for all. Stop this atrocious settlement.

I use Windows software on my pc and I appreciate the software, it is good and to most extent reliable and easy to use (if you know what you are doing). But I do not think that should get Microsoft special favors/treatment. DoJ act like a department of Justice and not like somebody's lacky.

You read almost everyday that Microsoft is doing something bad here or there. This will continue until someone says "The Buck Stops Here Microsoft, enough is enough". A good example is a simple poll. They tried to rig a poll so that it looks like people want Microsoft, having people voting multiple times, how low can a company go to wipe out competition. Microsoft cannot stand that people like something else other than Microsoft, they are now like dictator governments "Its our way or noones".

DoJ clean up your act and do the right thing.

THANK YOU
 FRANCIS

MTC-00009959

From: evilpaul13
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 2:13pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Honorable Members of the US Senate
 Judiciary Committee,

I have been following the Microsoft case reasonably closely. Based on what I've read from the testimony before the committee, I do not believe that the proposed punishment is fitting or effective. Because Microsoft has acted unfairly against competition, and price gouged consumers I believe the proposed remedy should reciprocate. Microsoft's competition should receive an indirect boon, and consumers should be repaid in some way.

So, I propose that Microsoft pay 20 billion back to consumers split two ways. First, 8 billion should be put into Social Security. Many of the consumers Microsoft gouged will one day hope to collect SS, and every little bit helps. 12 billion should be put into education and schools. I propose that it be distributed by state according to population. In the individual states, 80% of the money should be given to the bottom 33% of schools and 20% to the 17% above the bottom third. With the condition, that not a penny of that money be spent on Microsoft products.

This is how Microsoft will compensate its competitor's for its unfair business practices. By not using Microsoft products, schools will use its competitors. I attended public schools, and based on my experience with their systems, there is little to nothing that is done on their computers that a competing product does not do just as well as its more expensive Microsoft version.

Linux is an operating system that could easily replace Windows on school servers. And on desktops too. Contrary to what Microsoft might have you believe there is no shortage of quality software available FREE OF CHARGE. Two of the most popular and easy to use are Redhat Linux (their CEO testified if I recall correctly) and Mandrake Linux. Mandrake is as easy to install as Windows 98.

Sun Microsystem's Star Office is a FREE full featured office software suite, with nearly

identical menus and identical functionality to Microsoft Office. Netscape has a web browser that works as well as Internet Explorer. All Linux distributions have several to choose from including Mozilla (what Netscape is based on), the KDE project's Konqueror, and Galeon. All three are high performance and stable web browsers.

There is a graphics manipulation and creation program called "The Gimp" also available free of charge with most Linux distributions. Adobe Software also offers world class graphics software used by professionals everyday. This is also a place where schools could consider Apple iMacs which are known for their strength in graphics.

It is very important to remember that while Microsoft's proponents will claim that while free Linux has a higher total cost of ownership, this is simply a falsehood. Schools will need a "computer guy" no matter what type of systems they run. Additionally, "Windows was built for the Internet" while UNIX-like operating systems such as Linux "Built the Internet." So, networking is very much a part of Linux systems and they are more easily (and without expensive addons) administered to remotely.

A default installation of Linux is also far more secure than a default installation of Windows. Having used Windows in school, I can attest to the amount of downtime computers had caused by their frequent infection by Windows viruses and by malicious hacker-wannabes. Under Linux, a person logged on cannot delete critical files which would crash the computer or change settings that would crash the computer. Windows viruses like Code Red, Sircam, Nimda, and every other of the dozens of Windows viruses that make the headlines every year simply will not work on Linux.

I hope the committee will read and consider my proposal, as I whole heartedly believe it will be a more effective punishment for past transgressions, and send the message that future abuse will not be tolerated.

Sincerely,
 Paul Dougherty IV
 Resident of Media, Pennsylvania
 Computer Science Student

MTC-00009960

From: kherzog
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 2:14pm
 Subject: Microsoft Message Attorney General
 Ashcroft:

Please consider the fact that Microsoft has become successful because it has developed and marketed the software most users of computers want to and are willing to buy. Those who are attacking Microsoft can only be described as losers. They can't compete in the game so they want to change the rules.

Please use your authority stop the penalization of success and restore the competitive software market.

That is the American way to do business.
 Keith Herzog
 kherzog@msn.com

MTC-00009961

From: Phil Cunningham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:18pm
Subject: Microsoft

Why does the Government punish success? Look at Ma Bell and see the chaos the government produced, higher rates for all. (not to mention the competitive resistant Post office)

MTC-00009962

From: kadojohnson@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General Ashcroft Department of Justice Dear Sir: We support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Sincerely,
Mr. & Mrs. Donald Johnson
2154 East Dallas Drive Terre Haute,
Indiana 47802-5133

MTC-00009963

From: BJ Trahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,
Please settle this now. This is hurting the ultimate people it was suppose to help. It is hurting the economy and wasting a lot of time and money.

Mr. B. J. Trahan
324 Orgeron Drive
Lafayette, La. 70506-6846
Email: bjtpop@netzero.net

MTC-00009964

From: Susan Whitaker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:35pm
Subject: MICROSOFT LAW SUITE OVERALL

I have no idea what Clinton's motivation was in initiating a law suit against Microsoft and really do not care. But, you judges, government lawyers, and other bureaucrats involved should be ashamed of yourselves! Gates was not born with a silver spoon and privileged, he had an idea and kept after it until today we see Microsoft. It is too bad that others either cannot or will not spend the time to do what Gates did, some "real" competition would be okay too. But, Microsoft is not a monopoly. There are hundreds of domestic and foreign companies competing but none who apparently want to take the time, and borrow or spend the money to do what Microsoft has done.

Shame on the lot of you!! Gates actually did what people, Americans are told, who have the ingenuity and drive can do in this Country. But apparently there is a P.S. at the bottom of the American dream—and that is, if you achieve it and are successful without the Government, you will be punished by that Government.

Shame on the lot of you!!!
This NEVER should have happened and there should be NO judgment. The government sues a private individual, with taxpayers money using a judge and court full of government people, and guess what—the government won. Isn't that a surprise.

This entire matter is disgusting and so are those involved, beginning with the most immoral and treacherous president this Country has ever had. I suppose this will be deleted and never see the light of day but unlike the antitrust suit against Southwestern Bell a number of years ago when there simply were no competitors at all, this law suit was not about antitrust, this was about something else, something far more scary—Federal Government power.

Thank you for your time.
Susan Whitaker
Kansas City MO

MTC-00009965

From: Wendy Bolding
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wendy Bolding
258 Freeport Road
North East, PA 16428
January 9, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
It has come to my attention that there may be further delays in the recent settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department. I really don't think this is necessary. Considering the fact that Microsoft has gone above and beyond the call of duty to help our IT sector move forward, it is ridiculous to further delay the process.

It is beyond me as to why some parties feel they need to delay this matter any further. Not only has Microsoft has agreed to reconfigure marketing and licensing agreements, but has agreed to design future versions of Windows to promote installation of non-Microsoft software. Beyond this, they have agreed to be reviewed by a committee that will make sure that they follow procedure. All of this was done in the interest of our entire technology industry. Microsoft, as well as most other IT companies, wants to move forward and get back to business.

The settlement is very fair and should be finalized as soon as possible. Microsoft's opponents should not be allowed to derail it; it is my sincere hope that you will not do anything to hang it up.

Sincerely,
Wendy Bolding
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00009966

From: Frank Haman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:31pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Stop penalizing US businesses for doing their job. Stop the prosecution of MICROSOFT and get on with more important things that the government should care about, like the economy !!

Sincerely,
Frank Haman, a concerned citizen.

MTC-00009967

From: Chuck Hall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:29pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time to let the free market do what it does best. Produce men like Bill Gates. Stop tyranny now, reward the businessmen who can help our economy. Stop the lawyers from taking what isn't theirs. Tort reform is needed.

Gen Hall
Orinda, CA

MTC-00009968

From: Don Babo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:32pm
Subject: MSFT settlement

I urge you, the DOJ to settle and be done the this Microsoft litigation case. It has been going on for four years now and two presidents. I think the government and the DOJ has more important things to do. With the way things are in the world today I think your resources could be put to better use for the american peapole. Do not let a minority stand in the way of what the majority wants. Put the case to rest!

MTC-00009969

From: Bazil Ghani
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the market forces decide the fate of Microsoft and the competitors. I assure you, us consumers don't purchase software because Microsoft places it in front of our face. We make educated decisions. If Sun and the rest of the industry want to use the government to sell their software, it is indeed a sad situation for them. I don't think we as consumers are harmed with Microsoft. The best case one can make is that Microsoft is guilty of annoying some consumers. But their competitors are often far more annoying. (example: Real Networks, Netscape, AOL, and Sun's Office)

I hope you'll decide to settle and let the us, the consumers decide whether we'll let Microsoft tell us what software to use.

Regards,
Bazil Ghani
Vice President of Business Development
Italia Bella Inc.
8647 Hayden Place.
Culver City, CA 90232
310 204 0200

MTC-00009971

From: Becky Bardon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
I would like to let the Federal District Court know that I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. I believe that the proposed settlement is in the public's interest. Please do not continue this litigation any longer.

Sincerely,
Rebekah Bardon
3926 S. 2500 E.
Vernal, UT 84078

MTC-00009972

From: Joshua Barney
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 2:36pm

Subject: Microsoft needs competition!

I felt compelled to write in because of the current state and possible future of the internet and computing in general.

If Microsoft continues to have its way, no data on the internet will be safe, and our economy will likewise suffer. Microsoft's policy of "If it's broke, why fix it?" is startling to say the least, but understandable when they are in such a position of power. They don't have to worry so much about people fleeing from their services. For those that would wish to flee, there are licensing restrictions or bosses that are entirely focused on using nothing but Microsoft products to help keep them in the fold.

Microsoft thinks they are helping companies by making the computing world a Microsoft one. They are wrong. Truth is they're hurting companies by taking such a lax stance on security and quality. When there's no competition around there is no reason to improve.

They aren't quite king of the server arena yet, but even now they act like they own that market. They do not use the quality of technology to coerce companies into using their products, but very carefully orchestrated marketing and trickery. They mislead consumers into thinking that Windows is the fastest, most reliable and most secure OS. They try to make consumers think that "everybody else is doing it", the most recent evidence being a rigged ZDNet poll asking whether consumers would use Microsoft's .NET or Java-based web services.

While I do acknowledge that Microsoft has made some marginal strides in useability and stability in their operating systems, their security is still bar-none the worst in the industry.

They don't care about other companies. They only care about themselves. Now in today's cutthroat business world that doesn't mean much, and I wouldn't expect anything less from a capitalistic society, but you would think that a company as ubiquitous as Microsoft would at least take pride in its work, and at least consider other's problems of stability and security into account. If those servers aren't running, from any reason from instability to security breaches, companies are losing a very large amount of money. I'm no economy expert but I can only assume that does hurt the economy visibly. The current state of our economy isn't too great either, so do we really need any additional danger to it by poorly-engineered software?

Microsoft /needs/ competition in order to get better. Not only to help companies and to help Microsoft, but to help the end user as well. So far I have been focusing on the server market, but the home user market is also affected by these decisions. Microsoft leaves open very serious security holes in even its software meant for home users (oddly enough, they call some of these holes "features"). When using a Microsoft OS at home, you can never be completely sure that your data is completely safe.

So there needs to be competition in the home desktop user market, as well. A variety of operating systems can easily take over what average Joe User wants to do at home, but Microsoft, intent on securing its perch, has

made certain that support for the latest hardware and software is a Windows-only deal. This is the ONLY reason I see that operating systems like BeOS and Linux aren't more prevalent in the user's home.

If support was there from hardware and software vendors, even an operating system as "difficult" to use as Linux would be a piece of cake to use, and in fact to a large degree it already is easy to use thanks to the huge strides and hard work of millions of collaborating programmers across the globe, and companies that have decided to be sympathetic to those that want something other than Windows. Hell, I'm just an animator. I have no interest in my computer beyond getting the best hardware and the best software, and in getting the job done. Linux does this for me nearly flawlessly. I can do almost everything a home Windows user can do, save being able to play a few games and use some hardware. I've based my entire studio under Linux, using freely available software to craft artwork and animation.

Despite this I still have to be careful about what hardware I get because Linux support is still a bit spotty. I shouldn't have to worry about that as a home user, though. Companies, likewise, shouldn't have to worry about having Microsoft breathing down their necks when they want to support an alternative platform.

I think I've said enough for now, and I hope my words, along with the words of everyone else, are heard. Swifter and stricter action must be taken against Microsoft to ensure that tomorrow's world will be a good one for everybody. Even Microsoft.

Joshua Barney
Founder and Lead Animator, Arctic Winds Animation
"You can't have bread and loaf."

MTC-00009973

From: Randy (038) Shirlee Wadlow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
Please forward my comments to the Federal Judge in the Microsoft antitrust matter. I am IN FAVOR of the settlement agreement that has been reached among Microsoft, the D.O.J., and the 18 states on the suit.

(1) I, for one, am just the ordinary consumer who is, as I see it, going to pay double for this litigation. My belief is that it is our tax money funding the litigation, and afterwards my money that pays for the additional software costs as brought about by any settlement reached. (i.e. tobacco though I'm a non-smoker) Therefore, any further litigation would just be a detriment to me, and millions like me, as the so called "benefits" are negligible from my perspective.

(2) I am not a computer "guru" and I put the Microsoft program packaging in the same category as buying a car. I don't want to purchase a basic car and then have to go somewhere else to purchase all the options I want. Not only would that be too time consuming, but it would also be cost prohibitive.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my views in this matter.

Sincerely,
Randy L. Wadlow
5318 Glenwood Ln.
Lakeside, Arizona 85929-5135
928-532-0470

MTC-00009974

From: tancerf2@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I support the speedy settlement of this case. Our tax money can be spent more wisely than continuing this lawsuit.

MTC-00009975

From: Ovenbirds@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Hesse:
We are concerned about the proposed settlement with Microsoft. We feel that they will eventually become such a monopoly that we will have NO choices when we buy software.

Please stop this company from limiting our choices by taking a strong position against them.

Sincerely,
Gerald & Judith Arnold
418 Aiken Road
Shelbyville, KY 40065

MTC-00009976

From: Mark Virkler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Attorney General Ashcroft
Please bring to an end the governments attack against Microsoft.

Blessings,
Mark Virkler
President of Christian Leadership University
1-800-466-6961 or Mark@cluonline.com
www.cluonline.com

MTC-00009977

From: Ronald Tognetti
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft

Dear Sir,
I'm writing you a quick note to support you and the Bush Administration as it seeks to end the litigation against Microsoft. Pursuing this action any further will further justify a bad precedent—the notion that the Federal government can enclose itself in the pursuit of 'Consumer Protection' when in fact it yields the opposite effect—creating uncertainty for businesses which produce goods in a competitive environment, which itself yields stagnation, fewer competitors and less innovation. Microsoft appears to have acknowledged wrong doing, and if the penalties outlined in the settlement are enforced to the letter, that will be a fair outcome.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment directly to you, and wish you well in the pursuit of truer justice for consumers.

Sincerely,
R. Tognetti
Littleton, CO

MTC-00009978

From: Moore, Kevin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
As a technology professional I use all types of computer software daily. I support the tempting to make gain Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. I feel that further prosecution is based solely on competitors or politicians attempting to gain points or a tax payer funded advantage.

I hope that this settlement goes further in stopping States from wasting taxpayer money on frivolous suits.

Kevin Moore

MTC-00009979

From: RocksaltandNails@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

PLEASE; Let's settle this matter now and get on with other important matters!
Thanking you in advance,
Allie Simpson

MTC-00009980

From: Mike Donovan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Mr. Ashcroft, It is time to move toward as much financial stability as possible. End the Microsoft litigation. Perhaps Microsoft took advantage of their proprietary system by providing the users with more value for their money. So, what else is new. If IBM hadn't foolishly allowed Microsoft to keep the rights to DOS it would be IBM who would be under the gun. If Apple had grown to #1 with their proprietary system, they would be under fire. It has already cost Microsoft, stockholders, related industries and the American people more than is deserved.

Mike Donovan,
11038 N. River Lane,
Cornell, MI. 49818

MTC-00009981

From: John Zehnder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear AG John Ashcroft,
This fiasco of a suit against Microsoft initiated by the Clinton Justice Department has had a very detrimental effect on the high tech portion of our economy. I urge you to cease and desist any and all actions against Microsoft and use the taxpayers' money to pursue the actual criminals in our country.

Sincerely,
John Zehnder
—John Zehnder
—jzehnder33@earthlink.net

MTC-00009982

From: EVAN LEE
To: microsoft.atr
Date: 1/10/02 3:13pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ Anti-Trust Division:

I am deeply troubled by the recent DOJ decision to settle the anti-trust case against Microsoft. Guilty or not, Microsoft is the most dominating presence in the operating system and the software market today. For years they have bought out or pushed out competition not by superiority of the software, but by money and lawyers. Microsoft does not promote fair competition, their goal seem to be eliminate all competition. Every new technology or company comes up with new and cheaper ways that benefits customers have been targeted by Microsoft as enemies. I do not believe behaviors such as this will be curbed by this settlement, if anything else this gives Microsoft more confidence to destroy their competitors, because what's the worst that will happen? a slap on the hand to microsoft.

what will this settlement accomplish? by making microsoft providing computers to poor schools in the country? How will this punish microsoft? All they have to do is buy in mass quantity refurbished computers which manufactures are gladly to get rid of. The software of course will be windows. This will not punish microsoft, instead it helps them breaking in to previously Mac dominated education market share. This settlement is not punishing Microsoft, it is helping them gaining publicity and market share.

It is amazing to me that this case started hard and heavy in the late 90s when microsoft had no presence in washington. but it ended with less of a whimper after microsoft dumped millions if not billions of dollars in to washington's political arena. I believe this is the wrong decision by the DOJ to settle with Microsoft, and their monopoly will only get worse. . . I fear the day that Microsoft conquers all.

Evan Lee
Disturbed Computer User

MTC-00009983

From: Alfred M Selgas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Affect on

Americans with Disability Renata B. Hesse Antitrust Division U.S. Department of Justice 601 D Street NW Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Madam,
Richard Blumenthal replied today to correspondence which I recently sent to him: "Dear Mr. Selgas:

Thank you for your recent thoughtful correspondence concerning the Microsoft antitrust case."

"You may also express your opinion to the judge of the federal trial court considering this settlement by filing written comments with the United States Department of Justice by January 28, 2002.

Please keep me informed of your opinions on the case.

Thank you again for contacting me.
Sincerely,
Richard Blumenthal
Attorney General"

Thus, I am providing you with opinions that may help you obtain an equitable

settlement for all Americans, especially those who are not always included.

My email to Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General, follows:

Subject: Accessibility and Unbundled Version of Windows

Date: Fri, 07 Dec 2001 18:38:03 -0500
From: Alfred M Selgas <selgasa@erols.com>
To: attorney.general@po.state.ct.us CC: mail@oag.state.va.us, askdoj@usdoj.gov

Dear Sir:
I have just read the below referenced article in today's NYTimes:
"States Ask Judge for Unbundled Version of Windows
By REUTERS Copyright 2001 Reuters Ltd December 7, 2001"

In your efforts to secure an open marketplace, please consider the circumstances of Americans with Disabilities in particular

Accessibility has varied definitions:
1: providing access
2 a: capable of being reached ; also : being within reach b : easy to speak or deal with
3: capable of being influenced : OPEN
4: capable of being used or seen :

AVAILABLE

5: capable of being understood or appreciated

All of these definitions are pertinent to the able bodied and even more so to those of us who need all of the capabilities of personal computing, internet, world wide web, e-mail and more to not just exist but to function effectively in the current and evolving world. These capabilities are not truly accessible if we are locked into one company's version of accessibility.

I see Microsoft embracing "accessibility" only if one uses their version. The concept of Open Systems is not that of one company's version of the appropriate pieces of computer resources and their architecture. It is the concept of all widely available commercial computer resources being able to be selected and used as required by the consumer in an architecture of his or her choosing. This is especially true to provide equitable treatment of those with disability.

I applaud your efforts; and I appreciate your attention.

Yours truly,
Alfred M. Selgas
4606 Herend Place
Fairfax, VA 22032-1714
703-425-1519

selgasa@erols.com
Please satisfy these concerns in any federal settlement with Microsoft.

Thank you for your efforts and attention.

Yours truly,
Alfred M. Selgas
4606 Herend Place
Fairfax, VA 22032-1714
703-425-1519
selgasa@erols.com
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009984

From: RLB
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:28pm
Subject: the trial

It would be in the public interest to keep the proceedings open to the public, including the pre-hearing questioning of witnesses.

Richard L. Berger
1223 Amherst Ave.,
Los Angeles 90025

MTC-00009985

From: Spike Forbes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft antitrust settlement proposal

Dear Sirs: The proposed remedies in the settlement of your antitrust suit against Microsoft are an absolute and complete travesty. You are totally denying justice to the millions upon millions of citizens and computer users you supposedly represent. Microsoft has continually, repeatedly and flagrantly used improper and illegal techniques not only to maintain its monopoly status but far more seriously, to deny computer users access to far better technologies. It has created an environment where no competitor has had even a remote chance of successfully competing in the marketplace, independent of both quality issues and pricing issues. Your settlement would effectively allow Microsoft to continue its abhorrent practices without material modification.

One can go back to significant antitrust cases in the past, with IBM and AT & T recently coming immediately to mind. Before them, most monopolistic practices were of the price-fixing variety. But no company in the U.S. of the last sixty years has ever operated to such material detriment of the public interest as Microsoft. Sadly, most consumers are not even aware of what they have lost out on because few have seriously investigated (or, thanks to Microsoft, even been able to investigate) alternatives.

IBM was predatory in its pricing and packaging, and maintained its monopoly for years because of the service and comfort it offered. With all its flaws, it remains to this day a research-oriented company which has brought to the market incredible innovation. The marketplace eventually removed it from monopoly status, in about the same time frame as the antitrust case, if continued, would have done. While IBM's practices were contemptible and slowed the introduction of such things as personal computers for close to a decade, it never operated to force an environment where competitors simply could not survive (as Microsoft has overtly and illegally done).

At & T was never predatory in either its pricing or its packaging, probably because it always operated as a monopoly with government blessing, for the most part in quite a "benevolent" manner. The break-up probably served to actually hurt most customers for quite a long time since competition was not created in the one market that matters most to most consumers, local telephone service. Certain of the "Baby Bells" (Qwest is the one I am most familiar with) have been quite successful in maintaining their monopoly status, to the on-going detriment of consumers. Eventually, after many years of absolute turmoil in the long-distance market, consumers have clearly realized the benefits of a competitive market. The greatest loss to consumers has probably been from the effective demise of what was

by far the highest quality research branch in the world, Bell Labs.

Microsoft has done no research of its own; it has created no quality products; it is not an innovator under any definition of the word; and it has implemented standards which have kept computers error-prone and horrendous to use for at least a dozen years longer than would have happened absent its monopoly. And it has done all of this, not by technology or by packaging or by pricing but by the totally abusive power of controlling the marketplace through illegal agreements, intimidation and outright fraud. Yes, it has also taken advantage of its established monopoly to apply predatory pricing and packaging, but that is not the damage it has done to the industry and to the consumer.

It is true that eventually the marketplace will remove Microsoft from its perch, but the DOJ would do consumers a huge favor, and would speed up the process by perhaps ten years, if it would adopt effective measures making Microsoft cease and desist. Placing billions of dollars in penalties on the company for a failure to amend its ways, not to mention breaking it into at least three pieces, is the only conceivable way to give any justice for the billions of dollars in both profit and in lost opportunities that it has bilked from consumers over the years. It is far too late to salvage the lost years, but positive change can still happen at a far greater rate than it otherwise will.

I have been one of the few who has insisted on using some of the alternative products which have existed over the last twenty years, just as, back in the 1970's I was one who insisted on using some of the alternatives to IBM products. I have also continually used Microsoft products, just as I also continually used IBM products at that time. So I feel very qualified to speak to the quality and the usability of a wide variety of alternatives. Microsoft has done computer users absolutely no favors, ever since the very early days of its operating system control. It has held the entire computer industry hostage for far too long.

It is not just the browser, but rather a whole range of practices; I could have gone through software product after product to show specifically how Microsoft implemented changes both to make that product no longer work (if it was clearly a better product) and to make it impossible for the developers of the product to keep up. In a nutshell, there are two primary practices (both on-going as far as I can tell): as the designer of the operating system, it provided the rules to others, while its own developers have been continually allowed to use capabilities known only to itself. And second, if its own products violated its own rules (which they frequently did and still do), it either changed the rules for the future or, more likely, it created new de facto standards outside the rules which other developers would have to modify their own products to meet. The headaches created by these two practices have meant two things: if a developer, sell your product to Microsoft if it is any good; you won't be able to issue new releases fast enough to keep up, and they'll actually target you if you really have a quality product that competes with one of

their own. If a consumer, buy Microsoft because they're the only ones who can keep their products working on their operating systems (in other words, even though another's product followed all the rules, if it worked anything less than perfectly, Microsoft uniformly said that the fault lay in the product; in fact, the fault most often lay in either the operating system itself or in the public version of what Microsoft said the operating system rules were).

Please do us all a favor, in a case you have already won, by coming up with truly rational and effective remedies, not the absurdities you are currently proposing.

Waldo E. Forbes
37 Beckton Drive
Sheridan, WY 82801
307-674-6095

CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00009986

From: David Carson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Firstly, I do not believe that Microsoft would have ever lost if the trial had been conducted by a truly impartial judge or by a jury. However, given what the current state of the case is, I believe that the proposed settlement by Microsoft and the DOJ is acceptable. Of course, I think that the states that have decided to go out on their own case is absolute folly and they should be strongly encouraged by the DOJ to drop their suits and let Microsoft get on with competing in the markets in which they choose to participate.

I know that Clinton's pursuit of Microsoft has caused me great personal losses in my Microsoft and related investments for which I will never forgive him. This stalling economy needs closure to this ridiculous case and let the high-tech sector get on with the business of making products that satisfy consumer and business needs. It's time for everyone to move on from the nightmare of the Clinton Administration which includes the pathetic pursuit of one of America's truly great enterprises (Microsoft).

Thanks very much for taking the time to consider input from public.

David Carson (former Microsoft employee and current shareholder)
16318 NE 50th Way
Redmond, Washington
425-869-2279

MTC-00009987

From: Jean Pickett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:40pm
Subject: Microsoft

I have followed this suit over the years and am thoroughly disappointed that the DOJ could take its precious time and the taxpayers' money to continue this farse. We live in a land of freedom, freedom to create and to innovate. Of course, some who haven't taken the time or made the effort could become jealous of a terrific product. How can you 'limit' a product because a competitor is jealous of it? It seems unconstitutional at best! The consumer will suffer, not Microsoft or its jealous competitors. Where do you think the money comes from to pay the

claim? From the consumers! Who do you think suffers from the less than optimum software? The consumers! It's amazing to me that a company can be held accountable because they are presenting a product to the public. Nobody forces the consumer to make the purchase! So why make the rest of us suffer because a few want to disrupt and destroy? And, in the name of justice? Why don't you people spend your time with the electric monopolies, or the oil monopolies, or the American Medical Association monopolies. These people legally force their products on the innocent! And, when have they been taken into question for it? Leave Microsoft alone so the people who choose to purchase its products can have the best combination possible without all of the added inconveniences you people claim to provide as 'benefits'.

MTC-00009988

From: DON BLASINGAME
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to stop this farce of a lawsuit that ostensibly was "in the best interest of the public", when I fact it was driven by the best interest of Microsoft competitors. Stop the harassment, let Bill Gates get on with producing the worlds best computer operating system. He produced a better mouse trap, stop standing in the way of the pathway to his door.

Don Blasingame
Tyler, Texas
<donblas@tyler.net>

MTC-00009989

From: KT/MT
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:39pm
Subject: To all at the Justice Department
To all at the Justice Department

Leave Microsoft alone—the company has done so much for the world with their computer programs, creating jobs and putting people to work and keeping them employed, it is just a shame what the Clinton era has done with it's abuse of the law, the things this past administration has done is appalling—and the two biggest offenders of the law are still out running loose and now charging the American people for the rent of their house that houses the secret service, that is guarding them, and isn't it ironic it just happens to be the mortgage payment for their Million dollar home they live in—both of the Clintons should be ashamed of there past and some day they will finally get what they deserve, some jail time.

Thank you for your time,
Keith Tuma
Brainerd Mn. 56401

MTC-00009990

From: dawn grey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:45pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I find it hypocritical to allow one world banking takeovers by the bank, electric, phone and water and then give microsoft trouble for helping the people out. Microsoft should never have been taken to court in the first place so I do not think they should suffer

in any way. Stop the other destructive take overs of individuals and business by government mandates etc. Leave Microsoft alone!!!!

Diana Rey
in care of
Dawn Grey' s email address of
heandme3@yahoo.com

MTC-00009991

From: Alexandre
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I don't know how helpful this E-mail will be but I wanted to be sure that you knew an open source company has proposed to offer free software (much like windows and office, but from another company) for the hardware (the computers) Microsoft would provide to the poorer schools of the country. That means that Microsoft will really help, and won't extend its monopoly by supplying its own software to the schools it wants to help. Also, if another company takes care of the software, maybe Microsoft can offer more Hardware. The company is Red Hat. You can get their press release here and maybe write to them for more info.

<http://biz.yahoo.com/bw/011120/202744-1.html>

I feel its wrong for a company that was found guilty of abusing of its monopoly to extend its monopoly by providing old, free computers and its own software to kids who are eager to learn. They dishonestly steal marketplaces for other companies, namely Apple, their biggest competitor in the education market, who is leader in that market, and eventually trying to be paid by saying that in 5 years their contract will be over and the schools will have to pay for upgrades.

Open source software is completely free, and just as useful and easy to use. It is as easy for children to learn a computer system not used as wide as windows because they haven't yet had contact with windows, and it is better for them to get a wide grasp at what computers are, and not just the Microsoft point of view.

If Red Hat doesn't suit the education market, you should consider other alternatives, like Linux, Apple, and other competitors. Microsoft should just provide money and hardware, not their software. —

I was advised by Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General to send you this E-mail I had sent to him earlier.

Thank you.
Alexandre Ackermans
Kythorn@mac.com

MTC-00009992

From: David Fisher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:48pm
Subject: Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

I want to first thank you most sincerely for bringing Christian dignity and honor to your held post for you have thus brought blessing to this nation. I also wish to support your efforts to end the Microsoft attack. Clinton's elitist government set out hell bent to destroy American private, free enterprise and did so

in one account by attacking Microsoft. His attack resulted in the collapse of the stock market causing me to loose all my retirement and investment savings, complete 100% loss. I know many others who lost severely as well. It is high time to stop elitist government, anti-American government policies and actions and to return America to free enterprise, return sovereignty to states and Constitutional rights to United States citizens. End the Microsoft fiasco now!

Respectfully,
Dr. David C. Fisher, OD, MPH
12921 Dale Street, #82
Garden Grove, CA. 92841

MTC-00009993

From: Virginia Jensen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of moving ahead with the proposed settlement as outlined by the Bush Administration. Enough is enough!

Virginia R. Jensen
1111 W. Placita Alvina
Green Valley, AZ. 85614

MTC-00009994

From: Dr. David A. Zatz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft has been found to have broken the law. If I broke that many laws, I'd be penalized for it, not politely requested to stop breaking laws.

What amazes me is how flagrantly Microsoft is still abusing their monopoly status. The latest appears to be a change to their file system to prevent open source software from interfacing with Microsoft networks. No surprise if all the punishment is an advisory board.

I strongly recommend that you attempt to provide some restitution to the companies damaged by Microsoft's illegal activities, and try to even out the playing field. I like the idea of making Windows APIs open. . .of requiring versions of Office—FULL versions, including Access and VisualBasic—for other leading platforms, and of having a REAL oversight panel with actual power.

We've already learned that agreements with Microsoft are meaningless. Once fooled, your fault; twice fooled, my fault. We've already been fooled once.

MTC-00009995

From: H. Jack (038) Carin Morgan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:50pm
Subject: FREEDOM
DEAR SIRS,

AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES, I IMPLOR YOU TO CEASE AND DESIST, RE: THE ATTACK ON MICROSOFT. PUNISHING SUCCESS IS THE ROAD SIGN DIRECTING OUR COUNTRY TO RUIN. THE TRANSPARENT MOTIVE OF THIS LEGAL ATTACK ON MICROSOFT BY GREEDY POLITICIANS AND SLEAZY COMPETITORS MUST BE DEFEATED, AND FOREVER PUT TO REST IF OUR FREE SOCIETY IS TO SURVIVE.

IT IS NO COINCIDENCE THAT THE PRESENT RECESSION COMMENCED WITH

THE EMERGENCE OF THIS ASSAULT ON MICROSOFT. I URGE YOU TO IMMEDIATELY TAKE ANY AND ALL NECESSARY STEPS TO REMEDY THIS WRONG AGAINST THIS VERY IMPORTANT COMPANY.

SINCERELY,
H. JACK MORGAN

MTC-00009996

From: jba@auditorymodels.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
TO: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530-0001 FROM: Jont Allen

It is critical, in my view, that MS be dealt with severely. They have broken the law. This is not the right time to "get soft" on them with a lame excuse that it is good for the US economy. What would be good for the economy is to open up the software industry to competition. Having a single source for all PC software is like having a virus. We need competition in the software industry. MS is a double monopoly. They own the desktop OS AND the applications. Breaking them up may create two single monopolies, but this improvement would lead to a much stronger software industry over the next few years. The US economy would be one of the big winners in such a breakup.

The above is my personal view. I use Linux software. I have never had a computer virus. I would like others to see the advantages of Linux. If MS has its way, Linux will be squashed like a bug. If MS is broken in two, the applications half will start producing Office for Linux, in short order. If not, they wont. This would greatly increase competition in the computer industry. I am guessing that Judge Jackson saw this clearly, and that is why he decided they should be broken up. In my view, this is the only rational solution to a very serious problem. It is hard to abandon the feeling that the unfamiliar is absurd and illogical."

—G.A. Miller, p. 5 of his book 'Language and communication'

Jont B. Allen,
973/360-8545 voice,
775/796-9844 (fax),
908/789-9575 (home fax)
Technology Leader Speech Processing
Software and Technology Research
<http://www.research.att.com/jba>; <http://auditorymodels.org/jba>
Room E161, AT&T Labs-Research,
Shannon Laboratory
180 Park Ave., Florham Park NJ, 07932-0971
CC:Richard Blumenthal

MTC-00009997

From: matt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Mr. Attorney General,
As a technician in a large data center outside Washington DC I have an

opportunity to work with a variety of software other than Microsoft's. Most of the servers we house use some form of Linux or Apache or FreeBSD or Solaris. Granted, our internal network uses NT 4.0 on the desktop and NT Server 4 on the netserv I do believe that choice was more a function of the Administrator's skillset other than lack of variety in the marketplace. Point is, I don't see where Microsoft has ANY monopoly on ANYTHING. Their product just works pretty good and so far no one has come up with anything better, competitors' marketing hype aside.

While perhaps out of the mainstream I have 8 versions of Netscape and InternetExplorer on my home system—EACH—in addition to a selection of lesser known browsers also. No better way to test how your webpages load than on the browser in question. I know browsers. Aint one better than the other at the primary task of going and getting webpages and since they are all pretty much FREE, qualify as something less than a commodity. Like dirt.

I am deeply disappointed in the amount of time and money spent on this suit and hope the judge sees fit to end it very, very soon.

Sincerely,
Matt Tracey
908 Grant Street
Herndon, VA 20170

MTC-00009998

From: Rick Wintheiser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 3:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Trial

I am an American citizen living in Europe. It is my opinion, and that of many others that Microsoft has been given a "pass" on the issue of Monopoly. I cannot comment on legal grounds but as a user, maker and creator of software I find their current status stifling in the market. When they ID an area they can simply buy their way in (see XBOX) or using FUD stop development. It was clearly documented in the trial, it is clearly documented in emails and letters, it is clearly documented in the way they behave. Please stand up to them and make sure that Microsoft is broken up or at least strictly controlled.

Best Regards,
Rick D. Wintheiser
R. Prof. Mota Pinto, 247 ? 1 Esq
4100-356 Porto Portugal

MTC-00009999

From: Mark Beecroft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:00pm
Subject: Please break Microsoft into competitive parts

Dear sir/madam,
My personal view is that the only way to ensure an effective climate for competition is to break Microsoft into parts based on product groups. For years I, as many others, have had to endure poor quality software simply because no other company has had a real opportunity to convince the market of the benefits of its corresponding product(s). A prime example of Microsoft's poor software is the Windows operating system(s). Not only is this product more costly and far

less stable than many of its competitors, it is full of security defects which make it an easy target for hackers. In addition, it is a poorly designed and less powerful than other operating systems. Every one knows there are better products (such as Red Hat's Linux) which deserve to be able to compete on equal terms. Lack of competition is holding back progress.

Yours faithfully,
Mark Beecroft

MTC-00010000

From: Paul Benson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:23pm
Subject: U.S. vs. MICROSOFT:
Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I recently received an email concerning U.S. vs. MICROSOFT. It was entitled FIVE FUNDAMENTAL FLAWS IN THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND MICROSOFT— AND WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT.

As it urged me to email your office and join in the chorus of lament against Microsoft, I felt the need to voice an opinion that is contrary to theirs. I am not saying that I support all of Microsoft actions and don't think that safe guards should not be in place, I just question as to what would be appropriate action and what would simply "whiny little children" getting their way!!

The biggest problem the industry faces from Microsoft is also the the greatest benefit that Microsoft has brought to the software industry. That is its success in marketing its DOS and now its Windows platforms. It has made it difficult for other operating system platforms to get established , yet compete. At the same success has brought stability to the software marketplace. A software applictaion development company does not have to worry about having to write for a multitude of platforms. It can simply put out a good product for Windows that fills a need, and be assured that he has a large marketplace. The only risk here is that Microsoft could develop a competing product, after it has seen the financial success of the pioneering company, and leverage its marketing skill, deep pockect, and built in user list to out compete the pioneer. Yet Microsoft's past experience has shown that what is usually done is that Microsoft will offer the original company an offer that they cannot refuse (i.e., lots of money, a position within the company, and unlimited ability to develop new products).

Over the past years it seems to me that those that scream the loudest are those who have made poor business decisions, lost market share, and would rather blame Microsoft than accept their own mistakes! Many of the claims within the email that was forwarded to me are conflicting and to cross purposes. The would be backers of this document want Microsoft to not compete with them and to include items that they deem to be useful. How would the industry be if every one could dictate to every one else what they could and could not do.

I may not agree with many of Microsoft's business practices (its bundling agreements for instance) but find that documents such as

this are why nothing practical gets done. They whine so loudly about Microsoft being a successful business, that the real problems go on solved. It sort of like one sibling yelling about his/her sibling so loudly that they become the problem and the sibling gets ignored.

Considering the inherent problems with Java, it is perhaps best if it is not included with Windows, after all Microsoft would be prohibited from fixing it and making it work with windows. Or perhaps Microsoft should be forced to include Visual Basic, Visual C++, Tcl, Python, Eiffel, Pike, Perl, Ruby, and the other languages which are ubiquitous and omnipresent within the development and internet community as part of the Windows distribution. Perhaps they should be forced to make "asp" and ".net" technologies available for Linux, Sun, and Mac platforms. A colleague wrote and had the following observations:

My experience with Anti-Trust and Nintendo certainly influence my feelings about Microsoft's situation. I am sure that Sun or Oracle, in Microsoft's position would act in exactly the same manner. I don't want Microsoft to be replaced by Sun or Oracle as the reigning monopoly. I like Microsoft products and work with people who absolutely "hate" Microsoft.

At our firm, we were always panicked that Microsoft would eliminate the need for our software by baking it's capabilities into the operating system. We were very cautious with Microsoft "evangelists" and tried to keep low key.

I personally would like to see Microsoft punished more severely than what seems to be happening but I do not want them destroyed.

The foremost concern from software developers is being squashed by the Microsoft the behemoth. The possibility of Microsoft replicating a proven proprietary software application or trade secret and including it as a "feature" of it's Windows operating system or as a Microsoft application. This practice goes on in most industries and is the foremost reason for the demise of small, inovating manufactures. They develop a proprietary product, which may be a trade secret but is not patented. A larger more established company in the field duplicates the product, introduces it into it's established distribution system, and locks the smaller company out of the market by its sheer presence. Often distributors will not buy initially from the smaller firm because they are new and the distributor is not sure of its stability, after all they don't want to invest in the development of a market for a new product if they may not be able to get the prpduct in enough quantity to statisfy the demand. Yet when the more established company duplicates the product, they immediately pick it up from them. Denying the original, innovative company the market, growth profit, and assuring the failure of the smller company. Sort of a self fulling prophecy.

However, as can be seen by the numerous suggestions as to how Microsoft should be punished. No one has a clear idea of how to solve this problem. It does not seem to lie within the "evil" nature of microsoft, but to

be more a symptom of a "systemic" problem with the innovtive process and the established, entrenched, monied market place. It would appear that the Eighteenth Century concept of patent does not serve its original intention of protecting the developer of an idea very well. The original mission of a patent was to encourage the development of new ideas by protecting them for a period of time. Now the costs of acquiring and protecting a patent are so high that many small innovators are frozen out of the process. And in an area where change is so rapid, several months to a couple of years, the patent review time which may be several years negates any effective protection which may be afforded. By the time a patent is awarded it may already have been superceded.

The real solution may be legislative in nature, leading to the adoption of an interim patent that prevents duplication of an existing product for a short period of time, (2-3 years max). That would allow the developers of the product sufficient time to establish the product and be granted a patent, and yet prevent vulture firms from stealing their ideas. With out this, innovation will be stifled, and research will be left to institutions and large corporations.

The PC and software industry owes its success history and growth to the fact that at its inception the giants of the computing industry had no faith in the establishment of a "Personal Computer" industry. Otherwise IBM, Rand, DEC and other Giants would have owned the industry and it would have been Microsoft crying about IBM's dominance that you would be reviewing (after all the first monopoly suit in the computer industry was against IBM).

I would like to thank you for taking the time to read this email and would hope that you would find it informative and useful. This is a complicated issue. My sympathies go out to you

Sincerely

Paul A. Benson

CC:richardf@clickaction.com@inetgw

MTC-00010001

From: Kevin Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:05pm
Subject: Settlement?

Dear Sirs,

I am writing this letter today on a Macintosh computer, manufactured by Apple Computer Inc. I have used the Apple brand for many years now and have found it to be a superior product to the compatible PC's on the market today. Having said that, To settle with Microsoft Corporation would be an injustice. They have ran over competitors for many years now in an attempt to monopolize the tech industry. The company was allowed to "borrow" GUI technology from company such as Apple. The steam-roller attitude was formed in those days and now they are so rich and so powerful that they feel as if they can do as they please, rules, ethics, or no. These people should be punished and with the full extent of the law!

Ask companies such as Apple, Netscape, or any other up and coming company that should cross the path of Mr. Gates Inc. Ask yourself a few hard questions:

A. How did this company get to be so rich and powerful? Was it that they produced a superior product? Compared to whom?

B. Why do they control over 95% of the desktop systems in the U.S.? Ford and GM both build automobiles but neither has ever enjoyed that type of market share. If GM or Ford couldn't do it how did Microsoft?

C. Has Microsoft evolved into another AT&T, capable of domination through high prices and limits on choice?

D. Would the market be served to allow increased competition in the technology sector?

E. Isn't it somewhat dangerous to allow mega-corporations to dictate policy to the people?

Do not settle with these people, they would not settle with you.

Respectfully,
Kevin Smith
386 Store Road
Easley, S.C. 29640
864-859-8191
Republican

MTC-00010002

From: Byron Major
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:08pm
Subject: Microsoft

Attorney General John Ashcroft,
I support the settlement of the Microsoft Suit. As a person who works in the computer industry, I would encourage this settlement.
V/R Byron K. Major

MTC-00010003

From: Phoenix Silver
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:09pm
Subject: Fwd: FW: Attn: attorney general's Microsoft case

Hello there

My name is Tushar Patel and I'm only 26 years old but I've been using computers for a very long time and have been exposed to Microsoft for years and years. I know you're busy so I'll make this as short as possible.

Licensing Office will NOT help out consumers, this fight that you've been fight for so hard should not go to waste. Office is a great product but it won't help out there monopoly. There isn't much of a market for office products compared to what can be developed on a platform. As long as Microsoft has control of the platform doesn't matter what products you license of theirs.

Window's should be the product that is licensed, just as linux is. This way other companies can integrate any products of there's into a base OS, and competition will really begin. Microsoft will of course be allowed royalties and have control over the kernel.

Take a look at the Linux model there is a lot of versions out there controlled by one guy, "Linus Torvalds" and each company that produces a version packages and bundles alot of their own software and services within their version. If windows was made to follow this model then companies such as Netscape, Corel would be able to create their own version of Windows and bundle everything from Browser's to application servers to office products if they wanted. This would

also allow for a more advancement in the windows technology.

All these points are strengthening other companies chance of competition more so than that of a licensed Office would. PC makers will also get a choice of who to purchase their OS from and be able to create deals. This in mine and alot of other consumers is a solution that helps US OUT. The only remedy that you would have to do would be to license windows, nothing else would need to be done. If no other companies want to develop or create an integrated OS at least the source-code is available to create applications for the OS.

If you would like a more detailed report or any further clarification please let me know. I will do anything that you request. On another up side this could also kick start the tech industry with alot of start-ups. I love Microsoft and I like some of there products but as consumers this is the best solution for us and other companies to compete.

MTC-00010005

From: Randy Keith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
Enough already. Get off of Bill Gates' and Microsoft's case. Let's get back to supply and demand. Quit punishing success. Let the consumer decide. If a computer company gets too much out of hand Americans will quit buying. We don't need a Big Brother holding our hand as we navigate the Internet etc.

I feel like you have punished me as much as Microsoft and Bill Gates. He has done more to advance the use of computers in the home than anyone else in the world. It's time to free up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

Randy Keith
1146 Millers Mill Road
Stockbridge, Georgia 30281

MTC-00010006

From: Susan Findley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Suit Attorney General John Ashcroft—

I wish to express my support of the settlement of the Microsoft suit. The settlement offer is fair for competitors, fair for the American taxpayer, fair for the industry and fair for Microsoft. I know you are very busy and I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Spencer Stokes
Stokes Strategies

MTC-00010007

From: Frank Frable
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Stop this irrational harassment of Microsoft. Let the free marketplace reign untethered by government intervention or unfair marketplace tactics, monopoly etc. Those that pursue the present course of undermining Microsoft's innovations and aggressive marketing are not leveling the

playing field but merely tilting it in their favor at the expense of the consumer. Let those that are the best rise to the top so that this country will maintain its vaunted position as the industrial power of the world. Let those that fall behind develop their niche' and their drive to be more competitive by hard work and innovation. The states that refuse to settle merely want a cut of the pie to cover their budgetary short fall. Profit is not a bad word. Neither is success, innovation or hard work.

Bottom line, Microsoft has not distorted the system. The consumer has benefited while the naysayers are merely suffering from self righteous astigmatism.

Frank L. Frable

MTC-00010008

From: Jane Pehl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Stop punishing company and personal success!!! It is time for liberals to get over the fact that ALL the money people make is not for THEM or their POLITICAL PROGRAMS! It belongs to those who earn it. GO GET THE CRIMINALS IN THE U.S. and leave working people alone!

Jane Pehl
San Antonio, Texas

MTC-00010009

From: auralia cimenski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Settle this case now and let the attorney General get on to more important matters. Quit picking on a productive company.

MTC-00010010

From: James Keane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,
Below please find the text of a letter that I recently sent to the Att'y Gen of Connecticut. Please know that I am not the only tech. oriented professional who feels this way. Those of us who have watched the evolution of the computer for the last two decades have been alarmed & disgusted by the conduct of this corporation & the stifling effect it has had on innovation in the computer world.

James Keane, YALE LAPAROSCOPY

MTC-00010010-0001

?? piece of software they produce, they have the nerve to talk about "Innovation" !In a hundred ways daily, despite lawsuits civil & crimmminal, they sabotage rivals, deny access or produce obstacles to su

Thank You,
James Keane Yale Laparoscopy
James Keane, YALE LAPAROSCOPY J.

MTC-00010010-0002

MTC-00010011

From: Christopher Joseph Kurecka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a college student and starter of a small computer consulting business. I have in many ways more knowledge of computers than most adults, and in all my experience with Microsoft, they have only done what is needed to sell a product.

Their technical support, though better than some other computer companies, is still simply horrid. They even charge for technical support on products that they sell at virtually 100% profit. I know that they put great amounts of research into some of their technical developments, but in many cases their alleged efforts don't result in gains for the consumer.

Microsoft makes bloated, slow software, simply because faster computers are out and they need a circular system of slowing down the CPU to demand faster CPUs to keep the market going. The cost of Microsoft products is far too high—especially when one considers that Windows itself, along with Office and other applications, are quite unstable and error-prone. If Windows cost \$30, then I might not care. But they have been steadily raising the price of Windows over the years, and I believe that if left unchecked they will continue to raise prices indefinitely.

Microsoft's plan for subscription service for Windows also frightens me. Their strategy of charging by the month or year for Windows is outrageous—it will increase the cost of Windows even more, because you pay for it whether you want to upgrade to new features or not. It will also lessen the motivation on Microsoft's part to innovate, once they have a more reliable, consistent money flow. As things stand today, people could all switch to Linux, and Microsoft would go bankrupt (not that such a thing would likely happen, but it's possible). In the subscription service, Microsoft is ensured a greater sum of money in a more consistent fashion that could cause me—or anyone else—to pay money even if they don't want Windows anymore. A good example: I like my computer to be in a dual-boot setup. I can use Linux for fun, and Windows when I need to use Office or something that I couldn't otherwise run in Linux. However, with this plan, I can keep updating Linux for free, and never upgrade Windows. With the subscription model, I would have to pay for Windows, even if it is only used as a secondary operating system.

I think that Microsoft should be forced to produce Office and their other flagship products for other platforms, such as Linux and Unix. I also think that they should be forced to restrict their pricing system, and be forbidden to ever go to a subscription payment model. Making Windows open source or something to that effect would definitely be a significant boon to the tech industry, but it would also be a crushing blow to Microsoft that I think at present their actions do not warrant (though they may at some time in the future). Thank you very much for your time to read this message, and for pursuing this antitrust investigation. Microsoft's anticompetitive behavior is definitely hurting the industry, and they don't innovate nearly as much as they like to make people think they do.

Christopher J. Kurecka

MTC-00010012

From: Bobby Hill
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 4:30pm
 Subject: Fair Justice for Microsoft

Nothing in the agreement with the justice department and microsoft terminate the illegal monopoly and denies microsoft the fruits of its statutory violation as is required under the Tunney Act. Microsoft has done more damage to the computer industry more over the last 20 years than any company has hurt any market in the history of the world. Their greed knows know bounds and they will do anything to maintain the monopoly they got by illegal means. They lied to the Justice department before which was the reason for the antitrust case in the first place. Microsoft doesn't have enough billions of illegal gotten profits, they intend to convert all they're customers whether the customer likes it or not to a rental model of software which will only work if microsoft has an illegal monopoly. This will allow profits skyrocket and allow a reduction in research and improvement of their software. Microsoft idea of security is for their customers is to stop information about security holes in its software to be shared. I'm surprise that they haven't claim a copyright violation whenever someone finds a security problem, but given time I think they will claim this. Microsoft has never been about the customer. They have been about milking the consumer for all the money from they're now adjudged illegal monopoly for all they can and maintaining they're monopoly at all costs.

Bobby E Hill Jr.

MTC-00010013

From: Robert L. Matthews
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 4:32pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
 Attorney General Aschroft,

The proposed Microsoft settlement should be adopted immediately and the litigation closed.

I am a small business owner. Information systems and Microsoft software are essential business tools. The integration of the Microsoft operating system and the suite of applications is a major factor in the financial health of my business. I cannot afford the time, expense and business risk of integration of various products from an array of vendors to run my business. Therefore, in my view the cessation of the litigation is strongly in the public interest.

Sincerely,
 Robert L. Matthews, CEO
 Elm Hill Enterprises, Inc.
 Elm Hill Box 303
 Far Hills, NJ 07931

MTC-00010014

From: Thomas Wills
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/10/02 3:45am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Thomas Wills
 6925 East Kingston Drive
 Tucson, AZ 85710-2214
 January 10, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Microsoft Settlement:

I know you've been swamped with messages telling you to support the Microsoft settlement. I disagree!

I have to spend tens of thousands of taxpayer dollars to buy software, generally by Microsoft that shouldn't have to be spent. The reasons are:

- 1) There is no real competition and if there is, Microsoft buys them out.
- 2) Because there is no competition, we are forced to buy things like Microsoft Office at obscene prices (\$12000 just to buy 100 Exchange licenses!).

Being a monopoly, Microsoft can exploit its position in the marketplace, and it does.

Don't settle for this slap on the wrist settlement. Give the consumer some real relief from the Microsoft monopoly!

Sincerely,
 Thomas A. Wills
 Information Systems Coordinator
 Pima County Wastewater Management
 Treatment Division
 Tucson, AZ 85743

MTC-00010015

From: Vince Bowler
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 4:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To Whom it May Concern,

I believe this grossly misdirected persecution/prosecution of Microsoft is a very large waste of taxpayers money. For each ounce of good there has been a pound of BAD. It was a bad idea when it was started and has only become worse each day since. It has caused much uncertainty in the market and is responsible the loss of many billions of stockholder value. Had MSFT's competitors been successful it would have caused us consumers many billions of dollars and fragmented the desktop operating systems market and cast the whole software industry into spending, greatly unnecessary billions of dollars. What an insult to the whole country.

Vincent F. Bowler,
 Farmington Hills, MI
 vfb@wwnet.net

MTC-00010016

From: Judy Hurd
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/9/02 4:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Judy Hurd
 334 Primrose
 Kyle, TX 78640
 January 9, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the

courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Judy Hurd

MTC-00010017

From: Lannie Abernathy
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/10/02 8:31am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Lannie Abernathy
 883 Hawthorne St.
 Memphis, TN 38107-4510
 January 10, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Lannie Abernathy

MTC-00010018

From: Ulice Macias
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/9/02 9:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ulice Macias
10112 Brandywine Dr.
Huntsville, AL 35803-1628
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ulice J. Macias

MTC-00010019

From: Debra Habbel
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Debra Habbel
8426 E. LaJunta
Scottsdale, AZ 85255
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of

stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Debra Habbel

MTC-00010020

From: John Bixler
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 2:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Bixler
12700 7thAve.
Victorville, CA 92392-9577
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John Bixler

MTC-00010021

From: Alex Vert
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 11:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alex Vert
1104 Minneapolis St.
Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783-3124
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Alex R. Vert

MTC-00010022

From: Theodore Howard
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 12:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Theodore Howard
25 Coles Ave
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Theodore Howard

MTC-00010023

From: LJ Bishop
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/9/02 7:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 LJ Bishop
 703 Desnoyer Street
 Kaukauna, WI 54130
 January 9, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Linda Bishop

MTC-00010024

From: Richard Crum
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/9/02 6:13pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Richard Crum
 15518 Cobre Valley
 Houston, TX 77062
 January 9, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Richard Crum

MTC-00010025

From: Marcia Sparks
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/10/02 10:03am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Marcia Sparks
 4593 Main St.
 Hemlock, NY 14466
 January 10, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Mrs. Marcia Sparks

MTC-00010026

From: David W. Kralik
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/10/02 2:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 David W. Kralik
 1920 L. Street, NW Suite 200
 Washington, DC 20036
 January 10, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 David W. Kralik

MTC-00010027

From: Edmund Tanner
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/9/02 5:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Edmund Tanner
 1209 Sims Bridge Rd.
 Kittrell, NC 27544-9125
 January 9, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Edmund Tanner

MTC-00010028

From: Gloria Solomon
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gloria Solomon
1910 NE 49th St.
Kansas City, MO 64118
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gloria Solomon

MTC-00010029

From: Jeffery Berg
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 6:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jeffery Berg
400 Crisfield Drive
Abingdon, MD 21009
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jeff Berg

MTC-00010030

From: Makinzi Mock
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 10:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Makinzi Mock
44 Buck Point Road
Bluffton, SC 29910
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Makinzi Mock

MTC-00010031

From: Greg Proch
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 8:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greg Proch

16081 SW 156 Ave
Miami, FL 33187
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Greg Proch

MTC-00010032

From: Alphild Setzer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alphild Setzer
15565 St. Therese Blv.
Brookfield, WI 53005
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of

corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Alphild Setzer

MTC-00010033

From: Wayne Capurro
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 7:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wayne Capurro
10451 Gateway Dr.
City, NV 89511
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Wayne Capurro

MTC-00010034

From: Becky Elliott
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 10:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Becky Elliott
Rt 3 hwy 946
Coldspring, tx 77331
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Becky Elliott

MTC-00010035

From: Kerry Pfeifer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 10:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Kerry Pfeifer
500 VZ CR 4601
Ben Wheeler, TX 75754
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kerry Pfeifer

MTC-00010036

From: Lou Chavez
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 7:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lou Chavez
15150 W. Ajo #2
Tucson, AZ 85735-2029
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lou R. Chavez

MTC-00010037

From: kim fiocco
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 12:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Kim Fiocco
7203 st johns way
university park, fl 34201
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
kim fiocco

MTC-00010038

From: Don Brigham, Jr.
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 11:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Don Brigham, Jr.
1002 E. Gallatin Ave.
Belgrade, MT 59714
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Don and Ann Brigham

MTC-00010039

From: Mark Maughan
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 10:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mark Maughan
4266 James Madison Parkway
King George, VA 22485
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mark Maughan

MTC-00010040

From: Ella Rinaldi
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 10:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ella Rinaldi
1565 S. Meadow Lane
Bolivar, MO 15613
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ella Rinaldi

MTC-00010041

From: Raymond Ravert
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 9:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Raymond Ravert
329 Hepburn St.
Milton, Pa 17847-2413
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Raymond R.Ravert

MTC-00010042

From: George Paradela
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 8:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George Paradela
723 Second Street
Rodeo, Ca 94572-1206
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
George Paradela

MTC-00010043

From: Albion W. Frazier
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 7:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Albion W. Frazier
12227 Brompton Rd.
Carmel, In 46033-3366
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Albion W. Frazier

MTC-00010044

From: Kathryn Hrusovsky
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kathryn Hrusovsky

33850 Gilbert Ct.
North Ridgeville, OH 44039
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Hrusovsky

MTC-00010045

From: Jasper Fortenberry
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 10:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jasper Fortenberry
4507 Silver Wing Court
Castle Rock, CO 80104
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of

corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jasper Fortenberry

MTC-00010046

From: W.Lawrence Kimber
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
W. Lawrence Kimber
106 Elmwood Ave.
East Aurora, NY 14052-2612
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
W. Lawrence Kimber

MTC-00010047

From: Ray Fleet and Mrs. Ruby Fleet
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 12:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ray Fleet and Mrs. Ruby Fleet
3606 Bon Park Ct
Dallas, TX 75228-1936
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Ray and Ruby Fleet

MTC-00010048

From: Ann Porter
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/9/02 5:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ann Porter
100 Sunset Dr.
Monroeville, PA 15146
January 9, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. The Microsoft suit can be blamed for a large part of the stock market avalanche since July of 2000.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ann K. Porter

MTC-00010049

From: Linda Boone
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 8:45am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Linda Boone
721 Taylor Ave.
Godfrey, IL 62035-2530
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

We also feel that what has been done to Microsoft could be viewed as a punishment for being innovative and creative in using one's talents to create something that can benefit many people.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Enoch and Linda Boone, Godfrey, Illinois

MTC-00010050

From: David Anthony
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Dr. Ashcroft:

Although I don't really know the detailed particulars of this case, I do know that it is questionable that David Boies was the attorney for Al Gore and for this Settlement case. There is a common suspicion among us conspiracy theorists....

To me I understood that Clinton-Gore were somehow part owners of CBS, CNN, ViaCom and Time-Warner. If that is true, it seems like the much-publicized merge of AOL & Time-Warner might mean that the hidden agenda is to bring Microsoft down so that AOL&Time-Warner would be the Internet's major contender!!!! This would then be GREED as the motive for this lawsuit. I am

hoping and praying that the truth here is revealed, and that true justice is served. I am so proud of you and all the work you have done, and this is just one more positive in this new administration. Thank you!

Sincerely

Patty Anthony
7311 Glen Haven Drive
San Antonio, TX 78239
email care of: danthony@satx.rr.com

MTC-00010051

From: KKJones2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I was a very early user of personal computers before Microsoft developed (took over from another company) an operating system. It was chaos with multiple, competing operating systems in those first years. It was far more expensive in two ways: (1) when a new computer was purchased, it either had to be the same brand or it required the purchase of a different operating system and (2) individual programs were more expensive and often not available for your brand of computer. The standardization of an operating system accepted by most users has led to reduced costs and ease of using programs, which range from technical through taxes to games. When monopolies lead to higher costs or less accessibility, then we, the public, need to be protected. In this case, we do not need to be protected. In fact, the effort against Microsoft has left us in jeopardy. Before retiring, I owned a small computerized accounting firm. I did not expect the government to break up Arthur Anderson and others in order to make it easier for me to compete. In a similar way, I do not expect the government to be a "partner" with firms trying to compete with Microsoft. I urge you to settle the Microsoft case, leaving the standards that Microsoft has created, which are a benefit to almost the entire public. Other systems are available, if one chooses them. All most of us want is to have left untouched the order from chaos that Microsoft has brought to the computing world.

Thank you for your consideration.

King K. Jones

MTC-00010052

From: Thom (038) Adele Donnelly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 4:52pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen:

It is time to let go of Microsoft. It was an ill-advised suit in the first instance, initiated by a group of Anti Big Business Haters in the Clinton Administration. Also call off the dogs in the States that are looking to extort from microsoft in the same manner that was employed in the Tobacco Case—an abuse of Federal Power that is unlike anything this country has ever seen, and I hope we never see again!

Thank You.

Thom Donnelly
Ft. Valley, VA

MTC-00010053

From: Rex Stubblefield

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, we have spend more than enough tax dollars trying to prove that our capitalistic system of government doesn't work. I live in a rural South Western Missouri community and have been working with our computer system since before UNIVAC. Thanks to our competitive business our planet and our USA is far ahead of our forefathers of only fifty years ago!

Thanks for listening.
Rex D. Stubblefield
205 S. College Ave
Marionville, MO 65705
417-258-2967
<http://www.gbgm-umc.org/1umc-marionville/>

MTC-00010054

From: s-com
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Breaking up Micro\$oft will not stop any of their practises. Forcing them to give software to schools and organizations just furthers the anti-competition, since any software given prevents the purchase of any thing else and encourages the use of only that software. This is what they want now. Why help them. In my opinion, faulty software is "profitable". That is, if the product does not work as advertised, the consumer is encouraged to replace the product. This requires the spending of more money for the "fix". If the so-called "Lemon Laws" applied to software then the faulty product could be recalled. This would remove the "profitability" factor and force the release of good products in the first place.

Thanks for letting me give my opinion.

MTC-00010055

From: jamie.jansen@pfp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:04pm
Subject: Why Microsoft must be punished.

First of all I am a MCSE in NT 4.0. This means I have passed enough of the Microsoft exams to become a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer. I am now required 2 years later to become a MCSE in 2000 which I have to study hard for, pay for, and ultimately loose more hair for because 2 years from now I will be doing it again. Anyway here is my issues:

(1) Security is terrible. Microsoft continually releases products which they claim is more secure then ever. I haven't seen proof of that at all yet. In the hacker community Microsoft is the target for practice. Just about any idiot can break into there default load (this is where their argument kicks in). They will tell you that their system is secure just not by default. That's like selling a security door and claiming it is secure but yet it doesn't have a lock and there is a big hole in the middle that you might have to fix first.

Administrators in the IT industry are pretty fed up with the fact that almost every week we are working longer and longer hours to keep our systems patched (can only be done on nights and weekends away from our

families). Then on top of it all we have our own government letting in foreigners on a H1B visa take away our jobs and driving down our wages (we work as many hours as just about any Lawyer, we cancel vacations, are paged in the middle of the night and make \$65000 annually without over time says salary studies (I personally make 20,000 less then that). We the IT industry are fed up with our companies telling us we can't afford new server hardware cause it is going to cost us a small fortune to upgrade our desktop hardware to support the next release of Windows (Somehow I think Intel is involved in this whole crime as well). I shouldn't even tell you this but did you know you can use your screen saver to get Domain Admin permission on a NT box? Sorry went off on a right angle with that one.

(2) Not Stable. Explain to me why our number one answer given on our helpdesk is reboot. Then tell me why that normally fixes just about every problem. I have a Linux machine running at home that I haven't rebooted in months. The NT servers at my site gets rebooted quarterly. The other day our DHCP service stopped on one of our machines which prevented the first floor from getting on the Network. I bet if I asked Microsoft what we should do to prevent this from happening again there answer would be "upgrade to Windows 2000" (cha-ching). I can here the money moving towards them now. Personally I never really complained that much about Microsoft. If everything was always 100 percent stable I wouldn't have a reason to be employed where I work. However they imply time and time again that there Operating System gets better and better with every release.

(3) They will not change. Did you know as I write this email they are putting plans together to crush Linux. 1 year ago they were saying that Linux wasn't a threat. Guess what? They were wrong. Linux is rapidly catching up to them in the Server market but they are training sales people to find the Linux machines within companies and supply a lot of bogus facts about how windows is superior to Linux (most of which not true). I wish a judge could walk into the court room and have a Windows NT (2000) server sitting there on a network with a Linux machine. Get ourselves a good (doesn't need to be great) hacker and prove to the judge that the quality of the software is terrible. Did you know that at one time NT used to claim that they were C2 certified. It's true. NT is C2 certified as long as it is not on a network (what good is it if it isn't on a network?).

Well I guess these are some of my biggest beefs.

Please don't settle with them supplying free software to education. This will only make things worse.

Good luck
Jamie Jansen, MCSE
Sr. LAN Administrator
(952) 703-1779
CC:rep.jim.abeler@house.leg.state.mn.us@inetgw.rep.ro...

MTC-00010056

From: DavidBowlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:11pm

Subject: Opinion on how to handle Microsoft Proposed Settlement Gentlemen,

I suggest that the Justice Department suggest to California and the other 9 states that elected to not settle—to not carry Microsoft products within their states. Maybe if California and the others realize that if Microsoft were not available, their economies would severely suffer, there would be some room for compromise.

David Bowlin
Sammamish, WA

MTC-00010057

From: Thomas J. Klinect
To: Microsoft ATR, fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

Date: 1/10/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached is the letter we have drafted for you based on your comments. Please review it and make changes to anything that does not represent what you think. If you received this letter by fax, you can photocopy it onto your business letterhead; if the letter was emailed, just print it out on your letterhead. Then sign and fax it to the Attorney General. We believe that it is essential to let our Attorney General know how important this issue is to their constituents, important this issue is to their constituents.

When you send out the letter, please do one of the following:
—Fax a signed copy of your letter to us at 1-800-641-2255;
—Email us at fin@mobilizationoffice.com to confirm that you took action.

If you have any questions, please give us a call at 1-800-965-4376. Thank you for your help in this matter.

The Attorney General's fax and email are noted below.

Fax: 1-202-307-1454 or 1-202-616-9937
Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

In the Subject line of the e-mail, type Microsoft Settlement.

For more information, please visit these websites:

www.microsoft.com/freedomtoinnovate/
www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm
Thomas J. Klinect

TPI Inc.
619-303-3292
TPI, INCORPORATED
2650 JAMACHA ROAD # 147, PMB 13
EL CAJON, CA 92019
FAX: 619-670-6157
January 7, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft, U.S.

Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Justice Department lawsuit against Microsoft. If this lawsuit had succeeded to the extent envisioned by government lawyers, Microsoft's competitors, and some on the federal bench, the real penalty would have devolved to the entire IT industry, and thus to the American economy and people.

Just because Microsoft's competitors have been unable to develop products that are comparable with Microsoft's products in

value to the consumer, it does not follow that the government should step in and, in effect, "dumb down" Microsoft in an effort to make those less innovative companies more competitive with Microsoft. We have seen this principle tried with regard to our national educational policies, and it simply does not work.

It is good for a company like Microsoft to stand on a principle of unapologetic excellence. If its products and innovations are better than anyone else's, then that is its reward for its work ethic, perseverance, and technical excellence. No laws are violated when a company develops superior products.

Similarly, if Microsoft's products and innovations slip into second, or third place then that is where Microsoft deserves to be. That is the essence of the competitive marketplace. To have the government attempt to subvert the role of these competitive forces can serve only to upset the natural dynamic of the marketplace.

The settlement now in place, one in which Microsoft has agreed to an equal pricing structure for licensing preinstalled software to hardware makers, provides a reasonable basis for closure of this matter, and I urge the Department of Justice to seek acceptance by all parties. I believe that this will best serve the interests of all of the parties, but more important, it will best serve the interests of the American people.

Sincerely,

MTC-00010058

From: RTPaeschke@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don't believe the public is served when judicial oversight or legislation is made to stifle companies that create technology to the degree that Microsoft has. The main reason we have this predicament in my opinion, is that "weakened" competitors like AOL, SUN Micro, et.al., and their legal teams purposely sought remedy through the courts as a viable competitive marketing tactic. Unfortunately for the consumer, these "do-gooders" have influenced the justice system to prosecute Microsoft for being successful. The band-wagon effect in this is huge with lobbyists, lawyers and those "weakened" competitors all reaping employment and huge sums of money. And then there is Microsoft, trying to exist by selling what we all agree are a great series of products addressing consumer preferences and providing what the market demands, and being punished for being successful at it. RTP.

MTC-00010059

From: Bryan A. Woodruff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

This email is to express our opinion on the Microsoft settlement. My wife and I approve of the settlement with Microsoft and believe that it is in the public's best interest to complete the process and avoid continued litigation. We also encourage the remaining 9 states to join the Federal government and

the other states to agree to these settlement terms.

Bryan and Lisa Woodruff,
Redmond, WA

MTC-00010060

From: Jim Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement is a giveaway that will barely hurt Microsoft. The terms are a disgrace. I hope that the abstaining Attorneys General hang in there and get what's right.

James G. Miller
1100 Irvine Blvd # 491
Tustin, CA 92780-3534

MTC-00010061

From: CAD/Pacific
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I truly wish that the federal government would simply just drop this whole case against Microsoft. To be sure Microsoft probably does not have entirely clean hands. But let the free-market kill Microsoft. Linux is an up & coming operating system. Apple Computer is making a come-back. Let Microsoft kill themselves. If the government continues its involvement, then all those persons supporting Microsoft will forever blame the government for Microsoft's failures. But if the government drops its case and allows the free-market to regulate Microsoft, then Microsoft will either change its ways or drown itself and have no one to blame but them selves.

Bill Goode
Small Business Owner in Los Angeles

MTC-00010062

From: John Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General Ashcroft,

I would like to see an end to the Microsoft suit. I think this issue is hurting not only Microsoft, but the whole computer industry. We need to put it behind us. It does not help the economy to continue this case any longer. I also feel that Microsoft is being persecuted because of the fact that they are big. They make better products than most of their competition.

John L. Wagner
780 Norfolk Drive
Carson City, NV 89703

MTC-00010063

From: ward j. burkholder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case and move on to more important cases.

Ward J. Burkholder
230 Pleasant View Dr.
Kerrville, Texas 78028
wjaybee@ktc.com

MTC-00010064

From: K (038) J Butler
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 5:28pm
Subject: Proposed settlement is fair

Dear Justice Department,

I believe that the proposed settlement between the US and Microsoft is fair and should be implemented. Further, I think the nine States should stop their independent efforts to seek further remedies, and join with the US to settle.

It is interesting that most of the opposition to settlement comes from Microsoft's competitors and their employees. Our laws were designed to make sure consumers are treated fairly, not to permit companies to gang up on a company they don't like.

Yours sincerely,

Jeremy Butler
57 Wildwood Lane, Friday Harbor, WA
98250
(360) 378-7969

MTC-00010065

From: Jim Tate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Its time to stop wasting our tax payers money on this type litigation. This country was built on FREE ENTERPRISE! If someone builds a "better mouse trap" let us be the judge out here in the market place.

JP Tate
Chairman of the Board
Culligan of Charlotte

MTC-00010066

From: Robert C. Phillips
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: The government has ostensibly pursued Microsoft case on behalf of consumers, however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy. The proposed settlement, agreed to in 9 states, encourages consumer product choice, promotes product innovation & provides non-Microsoft related computer & software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up the Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

We think the State Attorneys General should discontinue this litigation!!

Sincerely,
Bob & Carolyn Phillips
122 Raintree Blvd.
Niceville, FL 32578-3908

MTC-00010067

From: David Ure
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft lawsuit

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

Congratulations on achieving the long awaited settlement on the Microsoft anti-trust lawsuit. Your efforts and desire to find the compromise and balance for the technology industry is greatly appreciated. The lawsuit should never have happened and the economy and innovations can now begin to progress again.

As a legislator I am always concerned with economic opportunities. Utah is a technology state and we need to start generating interest again in creating new products and ideas. Resolution of concerns for the Microsoft competitors is needed. It appears that AOL, Oracle and Apple have all had their concerns addressed. I highly support the settlement and hope that you will bring this issue to a close.

Sincerely,
David Ure

MTC-00010068

From: Chris Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:40pm
Subject: Re: PLEASE DO NOT SETTLE (fwd)

Thank you for your thoughtful correspondence concerning the Microsoft antitrust case. We value hearing from citizens on matters of public interest and appreciate your taking the time to express your concerns. As you know, on November 6, 2001, the United States Department of Justice and Microsoft filed a proposed settlement. California did not join in that settlement because the settlement would not accomplish the goals we set when we initially filed the case. Nor would it accomplish the remedial goals set by the U.S. Court of Appeals: (1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future; (2) to spark competition; and (3) to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains. The judge of the federal trial court currently is considering the settlement. You may express your opinion to the court by filing written comments with the U.S. Department of Justice by January 28, 2002, at the following email address: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov Please type "Microsoft Comments" in the subject line. You may also fax comments to 202-307-1454, or mail comments to Renata B. Hesse, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 601 D Street, NW, Suite 1200, Washington, DC 20530-0001.

Again, thank you for sharing your views in this case.

Chris Williams
<maxphunk@ecst.csuchico.edu>

I am a concerned citizen, student, and IT worker. Under the currently proposed settlement, Microsoft will loose nothing and it's monopoly will remain intact. They have promised \$1.1 billion to school, \$900 million of which is Microsoft software, "at cost." Tis means Microsoft pays \$0.14 to burn the cds and writes the cost down as \$300, or whatever the wholesale price is for the specific product. DO NOT SETTLE FOR ANYTHING ELSE THAN A BREAKUP OF THE COMPANY! Period.

MTC-00010069

From: Phillip David Mosher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:41pm
Subject: Microsoft case

Sirs:

Since DOS ver. 3, I have used products produced by Microsoft. They have been quality products, designed to make our lives easier. Microsoft has beaten their competition in the market place. I now use Windows 2000 and Office XP. I am very pleased with these products.

I do not feel that the Justice Dept. has been fair in their pursuit of Microsoft. I do not feel that the Justice Dept. and the states involved have the best interest of me, the end user, in view in this case. This case has communicated one thing quite clearly—If you have good products, can beat your competitions and produce exceptional growth, the government will surely treat you very badly. Microsoft has helped our nation. Microsoft has changed the way we do things, making life easier. Why are we punishing a good thing?

I remember when the government took Kodak to task over film patents because Kodak had done too well in building good products. Kodak was forced to release some of those patents. Today Japan controls the film market. Is that what the Justice Dept. wants to do to Microsoft?

Sincerely,
Phillip D. Mosher
706—84th ST NW
Bradenton, FL 34209
prmosher@tampabay.rr.com

MTC-00010070

From: Robert H. Hacke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

Please stop wasting our money on the prosecution of Microsoft!!! Our markets and the entire economy are being affected in a negative way by this ongoing farce. It would seem that when a person or a company succeeds in this country, the government interferes to put a stop to that success. This is harming our country more than helping it.

The proposed settlement should be immediately accepted and the litigation completed!

Sincerely,
Robert & Joanne Hacke
10215 White Mt. Rd.
Sun City, AZ 85351

MTC-00010071

From: Louise Kennedy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:46pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs-

I support the Bush administration's position on the Microsoft settlement.

Sincerely,
Louise Kennedy

MTC-00010072

From: carol williamson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:50pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I SUPPORT THIS SETTLEMENT AND THINK WE NEED TO BE DONE WITH IT ALREADY..DON'T WE HAVE ENOUGH BIGGER THINGS TO WORRY ABOUT....SUPPORT PRESIDENT BUSH AND BE DONE WITH THIS ALREADY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

MTC-00010073

From: Kathy Mohnkern
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:50pm
Subject: my complaint

The only thing I want to say is I bought a computer three years ago. It got damaged and when I went to buy another one I had to buy it with the same microsoft programs I already had. So I had to spend my hard earned money one the same thing. I think microsoft should have to pay all customers back for their forced double purchases.

Thanks
Kathy Mohnkern

MTC-00010075

From: tiger2
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:54pm
Subject: MICROSOFT

I believe it is time to move along and let the American spirit of free enterprise continue. I support the Microsoft Corp. and believe the Federal and State & Local Governments should cease and desist from any further persecution of Microsoft.

Ed Hart
84-35 64th Road
Middle Village, NY 11379

MTC-00010076

From: J.C. Bowman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 5:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
1808 West End Avenue Suite 1214
Post Office Box 23348
Nashville, TN 37202-3348
(615) 327-3120 Voice
(615) 327-3126 Fax
Email: TIPP@TNPolicy.org
January 10, 2002
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 "D" Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC, 20530
Attn: Renata B. Hesse
Subject: Comment on Proposed Final Judgment

Dear Ms. Hesse

The Tennessee Institute for Public Policy joins with our fellow members of the State Policy Network, and encourages you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. We are a state-based, non-partisan policy research group dedicated to promoting free markets and open competition.

This settlement reflects a triumph of the rule of law. It is a perfect map of remedies laid alongside the areas where the Appeals Court found against Microsoft. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition on what they call "product tying" to a breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to

state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In our view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

As leaders in advancing free market competition in our respective states we believe this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration. Please include in official records and court transcripts.

Signed,
John C. Bowman
Director of Education Policy

(Electronic Signature)

MTC-00010077

From: Barbara Seels
To: Microsoft ATR,shir@pitt.edu@inetgw
Date: 1/10/02 5:59pm
Subject: microsoft proposal

As a professional educator, I want to speak against the microsoft proposal to give equipment to schools. This is another marketing ploy without the potential to cause substantive change except to drive other vendors out of the market. Microsoft will probably do this irregardless of this decree. Equipment without a context or constraints on what is given is probably going to make little difference. The schools are best when they represent the diversity in the market also.

MTC-00010079

From: Sue Fuessel
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 4:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sue Fuessel
4077 Commissioners Lane
San Angelo, Tx 76905-7557
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Odis and Sue Fuessel

MTC-00010080

From: Jonathan Wright
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 5:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jonathan Wright
576 Shady Grove Drive
Montgomery, AL 36109
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Wright

MTC-00010081

From: Don Wilkinson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Don Wilkinson 6631 Apache Run
Theodore, AL 36582
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create

new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
don wilkinson

MTC-00010082

From: Robert Adams
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 5:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Adams
10512 School House Ln.
Austin, TX 78750
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert Adams

MTC-00010083

From: Debbie G Turner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like my voice to be heard where the Microsoft Settlement is concerned. I believe the agreement reached between Microsoft, the nine states and the federal government is very reasonable and fair to all parties involved! I do not wish to have the litigation prolonged.

The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few and stifles innovation.

I say, SIGN THE SETTLEMENT "as is" and move on to more important things.

Concerned US Citizen
Debbie Turner
2690 Throatlatch Lane
Marietta, Georgia 30064

MTC-00010084

From: The Shaws
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am 63 years old. I use my computer a lot in community and church related volunteer activities. I am pleased with my Microsoft software. I believe it is time to get this litigation settled once and for all.

Robert H. Shaw, Jr.

MTC-00010085

From: John Baitinger, Sr.
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

John Baitinger, Sr.
P.O.Box 171
Alloway, NJ 08001-0171
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John S. Baitinger, Sr.

MTC-00010086

From: Bill (038) Ann Hauckes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone! They are the reason why so many people have computers in the first place. Can you imagine if everybody's computer ran a different operating system and different software? It's bad enough that we have the "Microsoft people" and the "MAC people" (and the 3 people who use Linux) not being able to communicate! So what if Bill Gates is the richest man in the world? He deserves it. More power to him! Why don't you do something about AOL/

Time-Warner or the drug companies or the insurance companies or the tobacco companies???

MTC-00010087

From: Hoffman (038) Hoffman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General Ashcroft,
Please complete the settlement of the Microsoft case and let the market place determine the winners and losers, not government.

Marcus Hoffman
P.S. I am not a Microsoft employee.

MTC-00010088

From: Sharon Herron
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the current proposed settlement!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

MTC-00010089

From: Tom Stephenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

Enough already. Any further litigation is not in the consumers interest. This is about bashing success AND money. Letting Time-Warner-AOL, Sun Microsystems and Oracle use the Justice Department to fight their market battles is ridiculous. State AG's in particular are doing a consumers a disservice. All they want is money and political recognition. Let the free market work. If MS fails the consumer they will fail without this total waste of time and resources.

Thanks,
Tom Stephenson
Surprise, Arizona

MTC-00010090

From: Joe Goodson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:25pm
Subject: Litigation

Personally, I think that the states are just trying to pull a Bill Clinton and try to snooker Microsoft out of money like they did the cigarette makers. They need to STOP litigation NOW!!

MTC-00010091

From: Aaron Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:27pm
Subject: stop attacking Microsoft

The Clinton Administration started attacking Microsoft which led to the current bear market we are currently struggling to get out of. It's a crock of ca-ca that the Reno Justice Department used Microsoft products as a tool to attack Microsoft. Why, because Microsoft is a leading innovator. Lead, follow or get out of the way as Lee Iacocca said of Chrysler. I have personally enjoyed and profitted from Microsoft products and I stand behind the company all the way. Microsoft is what the American dream is all about. Make a product people need/want, market it, and advance an industry, a nation. Bill Gates did for computers what Henry Ford did for

the car. Innovation must be allowed to reign free.

Release Microsoft from the anti-trust suit and let free competition rule!

Aaron B. Johnson
9824 Manor
Allen Park, MI 48101

MTC-00010092

From: Larry Woldt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:28pm
Subject: Private Depositions

That is my court room and my prosecutors and, one of the remaining nine states suing Microsoft is Minnesota where I live.

I do not believe in "sealed" settlements that allow companies to hide what they did by paying off someone and I certainly don't believe that a publicly traded company in a federal court has the right to hid sworn testimony.

There are a few million Americans out here who pay for two-thirds of the people involved (the judge and the prosecutor) and we pay for the courts themselves. I want to know what Microsoft is "swearing" to and believe that I have every right to have access to that testimony.

Thank You,
Larry Woldt
lwoldt@mediaone.net

MTC-00010093

From: ALWMSN528@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:28pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am a computer user who always felt I was able to purchase any software program I wanted. I have not felt that Microsoft has prevented me from doing this in any way. In my opinion the lawsuits are just screwing up the consumer by doling out multi dollars to the States. They are not interested in the consumer, they are looking for all the cash-cows they can find so the politions and the lawyers can benefit. Don' hurt us consumers any more by awarding any more funds that Microsoft has to pay to the States. Enough is enough.

A. E. Williamson

MTC-00010094

From: gary blunt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:32pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please do not allow consumers to be hurt anymore. There has been a waste of tax payers money on this and a waste of time for the department of justice. Please do the right thing.

Gary

MTC-00010095

From: Dave Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:40pm

Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice

I have written today to comment on the settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft Corporation. While I understand the honorable intentions of the

judge and court in settling the case in order to prompt the economic recovery of the nation's largest company and thereby, in theory, to prompt economic recovery of the nation, I deplore the toothless settlement that has been accepted by the Department of Justice prosecutors.

There are three things I feel must be included in a settlement that would enact real change in the operating system market and allow for true competition:

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. Microsoft's success, while due in some part to internal innovation, relies heavily on technologies developed by the public sector. The Internet and much of the networking and software technology essential for Microsoft Windows have been fostered by federal grants and Department of Defense research money. As such, any Microsoft networking protocols which build or modify these publicly developed standards must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This will prevent Microsoft from using their market position to seize de facto control of the Internet.

I trust that you will attempt to enact real and meaningful change in the operating system market. This is a true national security issue. Microsoft may be important to the nation's economy in the short term, but long term economic security can only come from a free and efficient market for operating systems and networking technologies.

I care about these issues and I vote.

David M. Jones
1142 Key St.
Houston, Texas 77009
713-880-4233
CC: Senator Gramm, Senator Hutchison

MTC-00010096

From: VBoomer1@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir

It is my opinion that much too much time, money, and resources are being spent pursuing a company that has every right to conduct its business as it sees fit. The robust

economy we have had for the last ten years is a direct result of this company, a company some anti-capitolists would like to see destroyed to feed their socialist egos. Business is what made this country of mine great, and ruining businesses is what will destroy it. I urge you to dismiss the suit against this great company and use my money, time, and resources on cases worthy of prosecution.

Sincerely,
Ronald Vandenboom
524 124th St
Franksville, WI 53126
CC: VBoomer1@cs.com@inetgw.acu—
list@capwiz.mailmanager...

MTC-00010097

From: Sherry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:51pm
Subject: stop wasting taxpayers' money on the persecution of Microsoft.

Stop wasting taxpayers' money on the decade-long competitor-driven persecution of Microsoft. America's taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies.

The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

Some of the State Attorneys General want to continue this litigation: Don't let them! I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Sherry A Jones
9021 N Swan Rd Unit B
Milwaukee Wi 53224
414.371.2305

MTC-00010098

From: Jan (038) Dick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

We feel that enough tax money has been spent trying to ruin Microsoft. The competitors who initiated the action are jealous of Microsoft's ability to produce software which is good for the consumer and have tried to get "a piece of the action." The Clinton DOJ was more than willing to pursue a successful company in order to cater to the contributors to their party.

We feel that Microsoft should never have been prosecuted in the first place and thus should be left alone now. The sooner, the better.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jan & Dick Rees
816 Woodbine St.
Willard, OH 44890

P.S. Keep up the good work. We support you all the way. God Bless you and God Bless America.

MTC-00010099

From: james jenkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 6:59pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement is a transparent sellout of the public interest and a travesty of justice. It sends the message that crime is OK, as long as the perpetrator is big enough.

The settlement has so many loopholes designed to allow the perpetrator to continue the activity that the case was all about, that it is a legal nullity.

Indeed, the perpetrator right now is, in full public view, continuing this activity, while daring the States that are continuing to pursue the case to encompass its current activity, to exploit such pursuit as a ground for further delay.

Microsoft has to date almost successfully demonstrated that infinite delay is a valid legal strategy, and that bribery of King George's DOJ is an accomplished fact.

Yours Truly,

Dr James L Jenkins

MTC-00010100

From: Paul M League
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 10, 2002
Attorney General Ashcroft
Department of Justice
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
The proposed Justice Department settlement with Microsoft encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently do actually harm the public, as well as the more pressing anti-terror efforts.

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit, and ask that you, the various State Attorneys, and the Court of Jurisdiction also do the same.

Sincerely,
Paul M. League
PO Box 7007
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
1.310.277.3244

MTC-00010101

From: Chad Bennion
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit

Attorney General John Ashcroft;
I am sending you this email in support of the Microsoft/Department of Justice settlement offer. The Lawsuit should never have been pursued by our federal government and should have been left to the Microsoft competitors to resolve. This mired issue should be brought to an end. I strongly urge your acceptance of the settlement.

Sincerely;
Chad E. Bennion
Utah House of Representatives
District 44

MTC-00010102

From: THOMAS PHILLIPS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft is being punished for being successful. This is not the American way. Let Microsoft again lead the way. We will all gain and grow with thier success.

Thomas Phillips
2525 Ocean Blvd. # H5
Corona del Mar, CA 92625

MTC-00010103

From: Minda Stillion
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have personally felt my family very affected by this long process, both in our pursuit of the American Dream, and finacially. I long for settlement to take place, so we can see the positive effect in the stock market and job markets, so that eventually confidence in innovative freedom will heal and return.

Sincerely,
Mirinda Stillion

MTC-00010104

From: Ruth Silveira
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:24pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Its time to knock off the witch hunt for and against Microsoft and Bill Gates!! Can't the Federal Gov't. find someone else to harass? This whole thing has been very costly and try as you might you didn't succeed at driving Microsoft out of business and breaking up the company that has made computers accessible to all of us. LEAVE them alone. Go after the people in our government that have shady dealings.

Ruth Silveira

MTC-00010105

From: David Tucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs:
I completely support the settlement with Microsoft, Inc.; but would have liked to see Microsoft completely exonerated without having to pay out one cent in the settlement. Market forces, not the Judicial System should be the sole determiner of what products are put on the market place; and the Democrats' consistent attempts to compromise this system is as Communistic as Marx or Lenin themselves. If ever another entrepreneur can make a better product than Microsoft then let that product come to the forefront, and we will purchase it.

Thank You,
David Tucker
Tellico Plains, TN

MTC-00010106

From: Ron
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer consumer, I believe that the action brought against Microsoft is an abomination. I use many of their products because they are the best for my use, not because I was forced.

When I got my first modem, my provider gave me Netscape software as a default when

I installed the program. They are not being sued for anti-trust.

There are several products and systems that do the same thing. Is it okay for them but not Microsoft.

My installation disk for Microsoft Windows 98, also has a folderful of other internet providers that I can opt for if I so desire. Is that anti-trust? I equate this action with those who want to take our language away and create chaos by having more than one official language.

I use Microsoft products because I like them and consider them best for my needs. I have never felt obligated or forced to use any of their products. If a computer manufacturer feels that Microsoft is being unfair in any way, they should choose a different OS for their product, and let us choose our own. Better yet, have them install the OS that the customer wants at the time of purchase.

MTC-00010107

From: Jeff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Just a quick comment on the Microsoft case-I am glad it is over. Considering the fact that the DOJ failed to provide any evidence that MS is a monopoly or restricted competition. All the case did was to further prove that any successful company can have its jealous competitors have the government do to it that they could not do in an open marketplace.

It is a good thing that the MS case will be settled at the federal level. I just hope that all of the state attorneys-general stop this extortion as well.

Sincerely,
Jeff Mills
jmills3596@mindspring.com
CC: Jeff Mills

MTC-00010108

From: Kelly Casaday
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm a former aide to former Congressman Merrill Cook and support the proposed settlement with Microsft.

Kelly Casaday

MTC-00010109

From: Spencer Stokes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft

I am writing to urge you to settle the Microsoft law suit. I believe that the federal government should not be involved in free enterprise system. As a conservative I believe that the markets should dictate commerce and not the federal government.

Please do your duty and work for the settlement.

Spencer Stokes
Former Executive Director of the Utah Republican Party.

MTC-00010110

From: Jason Frankenfield

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:41pm
Subject: Dear Judge:

Dear Judge:
I urge you to end the trial against Microsoft without taking an adverse action against Microsoft or imposing any form of sanctions on it. As a consumer, I do not believe that Microsoft's conduct has been harmful. In fact, Microsoft has brought incredible products to consumers at reasonable prices. Microsoft should be allowed the liberty to design and market its products as it likes, and to conduct its business operation without government interference.

Please dismiss the actions against Microsoft with prejudice. Please do not impose sanctions against Microsoft.

Respectfully,
Jason Frankenfield

MTC-00010111

From: Gerald E Vinella Jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Busch Administration and Microsoft to settle this lawsuit. It is not healthy for this country to allow this to continue.

Sincerely,
Gerald E. Vinella Jr.

MTC-00010112

From: Mr. SJB
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings!
I fully and unequivocally support the DOJ's attempt to settle the lawsuit against Bill Gate's Microsoft Corp. I am aware, like other Americans, that 9 states have chosen not to sign onto this plan, but I believe that, truly, "enough is enough" and its time to move on, and leave this sordid affair in the past, where it belongs.

High technology, as exemplified by companies like Microsoft, Oracle, Intel, & many, many others, cannot have its ideas, innovations, and such be stifled by "red tape", bureaucracy, lawsuits, and other wasteful government intrusions such as what was begun by the Clinton Administration. Please use this golden opportunity to end this charade once and for all, and while Microsoft does not escape unscathed, their punishment has already been delivered, and unfortunately, the national economy, the technology industry, and the consumer have all suffered along with them, both directly and indirectly.

Thank you for your time & attention to this note.

God Bless America
9.11.01

MTC-00010113

From: GARY PORTER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 7:53pm

It is my hope that the court will accept the settlement agreed to by the DOJ and some of the states. It seems a fair and reasonable response to the anti-trust case.

MTC-00010114

From: Dale Langford
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dale Langford
2001 Christine
Pampa, TX 79065
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dale Langford

MTC-00010115

From: kingsland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have used Microsoft Products for years and have been very satisfied in most cases. I use Netscape and do not feel that Microsoft has ruined Netscape. In fact, competition has probably made their (both) browsers more user friendly and reliable.

P.G. King, Electrical Engineer (Retired)

MTC-00010116

From: Steve Berryman
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 7:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Steve Berryman
101 Mohican Trail
Lake Kiowa, TX 76240
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Steve Berryman

MTC-00010117

From: JobeSims@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,
I have followed the developments of the Microsoft settlement for the past couple of years, and I am still amazed that this corporation has been dragged through so much persecution.

I am a middle school teacher in Denver, Colorado and not a computer whiz, but I feel that Microsoft has done nothing but help me. Three years ago when I purchased my first computer, I purchased a Hewlett Packard that came with the Microsoft operating system and browser. If I had had to buy all these things separately I wouldn't have know what to buy and, too, it probably would have cost me more. I was very grateful that Mr. Gates had had the foresight to guide me in this process. Since that time I have become quite proficient with the computer. I'm on the Internet now(AOL), and I'm accomplishing great things. Not only am I buying and selling stocks on line just last week a light switch went out in my kitchen and I logged on to "Ask Jeeves" and found out how to replace it myself.

If you restrict Microsoft's ability to create and innovate then you restrict the genius of mankind. They have done good things for the consumer and good things for our country. If the Department of Justice had spent the time and money pursuing terrorism and Bin Laden, the tragedy in New York could have been averted. Instead you have been pursuing Bill Gates who has contributes a lot money to better the world and help people.

The majority of people unhappy about Microsoft are his competitors. They are distraught because they could not do what Microsoft has already done.

A Colorado Consumer,
Judy J. Simmons

MTC-00010118

From: lucy zarate
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:
For the last four years I have been following the debate over the freedom to innovate. During this time my only hope has been that this Microsoft case should be settled as soon as possible. This settlement will certainly help our economy, especially in these difficult times, and it will benefit us the consumers and the software industry.

Thank you in advance for helping expedite this case.

Lucy Z. Breton

MTC-00010119

From: SCOT WOODROOF
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I would like to take this opportunity to state emphatically about how I feel about the settlement with Microsoft. This was another case of blatant assault on private industry by a so called president, and Justice Department that only served to spend more tax payer money. I applaud the manner in which John Ashcroft and the current Justice Department handled this situation to restore the tech industry and the confidence of it's investors. The down turn in the Nasdaq, and specifically the tech industry can be traced to the beginnings of this ridiculous lawsuit. Please keep this settlement in place, or we can only look forward to more of the same in the capital markets. I would like to take this opportunity to also tell you what a wonderful job our real Justice Department is doing for this great United States!! Thank You!

Scot Woodroof

MTC-00010120

From: Rev. Samuel M. Smith
To: Microsoft ATR,acu—
list@capwiz.mailmanager.net@inet...
Date: 1/10/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although I am a staunch Constitutional Conservative, I STRENUOUSLY disagree with the ACU on this point. Please DO NOT settle with Microsoft. They have done everything they could to stomp anyone and everyone who stands in their way. I would like to see Bill Gates even imprisoned for his callous and unbending attitudes.

Rev. Samuel M. Smith
Travel Advisor
Affordable World Travel & Tours
Editor, Publisher Up Way Publications
Bible Instructor Followers of Jesus Christ Fellowship

MTC-00010121

From: dvraun@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:11pm
Subject: Government Waste

It's time to drop the suit against Microsoft , stop wasting taxpayer money, and let them get on with their legitimate business of making money. Sometimes it seems that we tend to punish success and reward failure.

David Raun,
Westerville, OH

MTC-00010122

From: Brent Lattin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

I want to voice my support for the Microsoft settlement. The issues involved grow older and less relevant by the hour and the shape of the competitive landscape and economic conditions as a whole make it imperative that this case end sooner rather than later.

Sincerely,
Brent Lattin

MTC-00010123

From: CCaweaver@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this case should be settled. I have found it ridiculous in the first place. Had it not been for Microsoft most people would never have learned how to use a computer. They were innovative in getting a good program out there for the lay person. One that could be used by everyone. I have worked on DOS platforms, Windows and UNIX and know that Windows is the best. I know lots of senior citizens (I am 59) have gone online because of the ease through windows.

I have never had a problem using any Internet access I wanted through Windows. In fact I do not use Microsoft's Internet access I am on CompuServe. I find this whole legal action silly and a waste of taxpayers money and government time. We have more important things to worry about in the economy to not settle this case and get it done with.

I have been using Windows since 1988.
Yours,
Carolyn Weaver

MTC-00010124

From: zebidiah(a)attbi.com
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:22pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please end this foolishness. Microsoft is not the enemy.

Thank you,
Gary P. Beck

MTC-00010125

From: Howard H. Hatton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Drop all litigation against Micrtosoft. This company is doing a good job in the market and is much more valuable to the, economy, balance of payments, competition world wide and the people of the US than all their competetors combined. This litigation is only benefiting the trial lawyers and other special interest groups that stand to gain from this futhermore the judges in this case are not have the expertise to properly judge this. Remember that Microsoft is not only in competition with American companies but are in competition world wide.

Howard Hatton
hatton@mcsi.net

MTC-00010126

From: Tom Hemmer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:30pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dave Wilson of The LA Times writes about Apple's pre-show hype and the associated let-down at the keynote, concluding "But the company has no real model for growth. Microsoft's monopoly power precludes any massive shift away from Windows, so how can Apple sell more boxes? The best thing Apple can do is to make computers that seamlessly integrate into a Windows network." See, even brain challenged reporters know about microsoft. And you want to give them, what amounts to a subsidy in education? I bet that between all of you, you would be hard pressed to come up with two gonads.

MTC-00010127

From: Martin C. Ritter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not let Microsoft off the hook. A slap on the wrist will only embolden them. Competition as we have traditionally known it in America has already been dealt a body blow by this company which has turned lying, cheating, and stealing into "business as usual."

MTC-00010128

From: Vicki Corona
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

Dear Attorney Ashcroft: First, thank you for being the wonderful AG you are! We're so thrilled you were confirmed! We love the entire Bush administration. I think most citizens knew that God couldn't possibly allow any more slime in the White House. Second, I just received an email concerning the Microsoft "trials" and would like to add my voice to the others. Without Microsoft, I don't think any of us "ordinary folk" would EVER have been able to learn how to manipulate a computer. If anything, Bill Gates should be thanked, not sued. Jealousy always raises it's ugly, evil head when any entrepreneur is successful. He created something fabulous, useful, and easy for the masses . . . Gates should be rewarded, not penalized! Let's stop wasting taxpayer money and leave him alone to create something else we can all enjoy. Thank you and God bless you richly.

Vicki Corona

MTC-00010129

From: John Sturrock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am a washington state resident. antitrust action against microsoft should cease because it is the only comany that can compete with time warner-aol which was allowed to go thru.

John Sturrock
2308 E 9th st

Vancouver, WA 98661

MTC-00010130

From: OSCAR WENTZEL
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mr. Ashcroft,

I simply can't understand why the government continues to spend thousands of dollars to get Bill Gates. This country is supposed to be free enterprise. You work extra hard building a company, make a lot of money and then you are penalized for being greedy. Let the other software companies work as hard as Bill Gates has and they will do just fine. Just because he has instituted smart business practices, he shouldn't be penalized. If these other companies had a better product, they would be in the driver's seats.

Tough luck if they aren't as smart as Gates. Stop wasting our money. Thank you.
Mrs. Kathy Wentzel age 67
Bedford, Tx.

MTC-00010131

From: Scott Rarden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Comments

I would like to respectfully give my comments on the settlement process in the Microsoft monopoly decision.

Microsoft is trying to turn this decision from something that is a punishment into something that is a gift. With as large as the cash reserves of this company are, especially in these troubled economic times, it would have no problem paying the complete fine in cash. Instead it has offered to provide free software to the educational system.

This accomplishes three things for Microsoft. The first is that it, even if the product was only valued at cost rather than full retail, allows the company to avoid the full cost of the settlement. Given the choice between parting with cash or offering to provide copies of something they have already produced—they would have to be insane to pick the cash. The second thing is that it allows them to grasp more of the education desktop market...the only remaining desktop market that they do not have monopoly power in. This settlement would 'punish' their abuse of monopoly power by giving them the opportunity to increase their monopoly. The third thing is that it allows them to look noble for offering to 'help' the poorer schools in the nation—when it obviously is a cynical attempt to avoid taking responsibility for breaking the law while at the same time expanding the very power that led them to break the law in the first place.

I plead with you to not approve the settlement plan that Microsoft has offered. It would be against reason and justice, and would only encourage them to maintain the same practices that they have been found guilty of.

Thank you for your time, and the IT community awaits your decision for good or ill.

MTC-00010132

From: Congdon, Brad

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/10/02 8:52pm
Subject: Please accept the proposed settle in the Microsoft case
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Antitrust Division,
Please accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft.

I am a US citizen living in Washington State, and I work in the high-tech industry (not at Microsoft). The opportunity to settle this case with Microsoft is an opportunity to respect the rule of law, to restore citizen's confidence in their justice system, and to begin the process of allowing the high-tech sector of the US economy to recover and prosper once again. In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal that the rule of law prevails, not the rule of special interests; that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the rule of law that protects them. For business to thrive in America, it must know that our government uses its power to enforce the law, not to randomly punish successful companies.

This settlement serves the best interests of American business and the American public. It fairly resolves a burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond Microsoft, a case that is acting as a drag on an entire sector of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to innovate and create, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit the entire economy.

Thank you for your consideration.
Brad Congdon
8242 61st Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98516

MTC-00010133

From: Bruce Truax
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hon. Renata B. Hesse,

I am very disappointed in the Federal Government's remedy for the Microsoft Antitrust suit. Although I am a conservative and I normally do not like to see the government interfering in private business, this is one case where I think intervention is justified and necessary. I am a long time Apple Macintosh user and as the world slowly migrates to almost 100% Microsoft I find that I have less choice with regards to software and hardware options for my computer. Much of the problem is related to the method which Microsoft has used to increase the integration of their software. I must admit that this increased integration has improved the ease of use and functionality of the personal computer for

users of Windows but the method by which this is done slowly but steadily forces competitors out of the market. From my vantage point it appears that when Microsoft wants to add functionality to their operating system they tend to chose a proprietary solution rather than an already existing standard. This has happened numerous times with Java as a prime example. As these functions become proprietary, users of other operating systems suffer. For example, there are now numerous web sites which cannot be viewed by users of Linux or Macintosh computers because the site designer has chosen a Microsoft Proprietary technology for certain web site functions. As it becomes more difficult for other operating systems to obtain access to internet content, hardware and software, even the last few holdouts will be forced to migrate to Microsoft windows until they have 100% of the market.

An additional problem is related to the security of our internet infrastructure. As the operating systems on the internet become more homogenous, the opportunity for a well written, malicious virus to seriously affect the infrastructure of the internet is increasing. A more diverse population of computers and operating systems on the internet would make it less vulnerable to malicious attack.

Although I do not know what the proper remedy is for this problem, it is obvious to me that the Federal settlement is not sufficient.

Sincerely,
Bruce E. Truax
Optical Engineering Consultant
Diffraction Limited Design LLC
388 Wedgewood Road
Southington, CT 06489
<http://www.dld-llc.com>
email: btruax@dld-llc.com
voice: 860-276-0450
fax: 860-620-9026

MTC-00010134

From: Bonnie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 8:55pm
Subject: Justice?

Stop persecuting success! We need many, many more people like Bill Gates. Please stop taking away the incentive for people to work hard and succeed. The government's interfering with Microsoft has not helped the people, Microsoft or the government. Microsoft has been doing a fantastic job for its customers. Stop trying to "fix it" when in fact you are really trying to break it.

Sincerely,
Bonnie J. Brown
1503 Reaves St.
West Plains, MO 65775

MTC-00010135

From: Ingrid Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Judge Colleen Kollar Kotelly:
I am writing to ask you to overturn the Proposed Final Judgment which, I believe is the term for the current settlement in the Microsoft case. Though not a lawyer or a computer expert, it seems to me that the anti-trust laws of our country have been violated,

and yet no significant penalty has been given nor future deterrent set in place. As a home-schooling mother, I have studied along with the children, the emergence of the anti-trust laws in our nation, and see them as important safeguards of the freedom of enterprise and opportunity that we are blessed with as Americans. At this point in history, the smaller software and computer companies need the protection of these already established laws. I am hoping you will overturn the settlement and break up the Microsoft monopoly.

Thank you for your time and attention.
Ingrid A. Hill
Brighton, MA
CC:stopmicrosoft@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00010136

From: Price Rose
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get this suit settled without further delay and litigation, if possible! From the beginning I have been against the government's suit against Microsoft. It is a sad commentary that a successful business in this country has to defend itself against our own government, in addition to meeting the competition. It is also insane! There are plenty of greedy lawyers out here to file suit to "protect us consumers", if there is any reason— check the number of rich lawyers resulting from "Class Action Law Suits" that got the "consumers" little or nothing, and quite often put a company out of business.

The Justice Department suit has hurt me, a consumer, not helped me. The suit has hurt me, an investor, not helped me! The suit has hurt me, a taxpayer, not helped me! And, the suit has hurt me, a voter, not helped me. The suit has hurt employees, not just of Microsoft, but many other companies as well. The suit had the unexpected result that it hurt the competitors who were pushing for the government to sue. (I wouldn't feel bad about that, except it also hurt our entire economy!).

I am really mad that we consumers/investors/taxpayers/voters/employees/competitors, who have been hurt, also have to pay the bill for all this litigation. As usual, it is only the lawyers/law firms (and maybe some politicians) that benefit.

Those who thought this suit was a good idea to start with, and those that want to continue the ligation probably think they are very smart. I think they prove themselves either greedy, or ignorant— maybe both!

By all means, SETTLE!

Price Rose
Route 2, Box 1758,
Eastland, TX 76448
(254) 647-1473
pdrose@eastland.net
CC:acu—list@capwiz.mailmanager.
net@inetgw,ADF,david—k...

MTC-00010137

From: Rosanne Cox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to tell you that I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their

desire to settle this lawsuit. It has gone on way too long, isn't legitimate anyway, and is diverting Federal funds and wasting time as well as harming the technology market and consumers as well.

Sincerely,
Rosanne Partee
California

MTC-00010138

From: jerome kavaney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:38pm
Subject: The Micro-Soft litigation.
Nuf Already;

I support the President and Micro Softs desire to end this Lawsuit As a conservative taxpayer I want it ended.

Jerome Kavaney

MTC-00010139

From: Thomas Weir
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:41pm
Subject: tunney act

Please support the Tunney Act. Nobody but the last administration wanted to sue Microsoft, the average person could care less. Out economy started going down hill when Microsoft was sued.!!

Thomas Weir
weirsaved@earthlink.net

MTC-00010140

From: Barbara Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:40pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Enough is enough! I support the Bush administration & Microsoft in finally settling the ridiculous claims that have been put upon Bill Gates. What a waste of taxpayers money, to go after a law abiding, charity giving, altruistic, all American success story, who has EARNED every dollar he has made & given away.

Since when do we live in a country where entrepreneurship is punished?

Let's call the competitors "cry babies" & move on to the Federal Courts spending their time & money on someone or something that is truly harmful (rather than helpful) to this country!

MTC-00010141

From: Sara Scheele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to state that I wholeheartedly support the Bush Administration' efforts, along with Microsoft's efforts, to go ahead and settle this long-stretched out, expensive court case. Let's stop spending anymore of the taxpayers' (my) money, and settle this! The very people that are supposed to be protected by this case are now the ones being hurt due to the falling markets and bad press re. Microsoft. Thanks.

Sara Scheele

MTC-00010142

From: gary miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Dear Dept of Justice:

Even though I am a Microsoft shareholder, I would like to express my alarm at the weakness of the proposed antitrust settlement the Dept of Justice has reached with Microsoft. The proposed settlement does nothing to prevent further monopolistic practices by Microsoft, has a glaring gap that will allow Microsoft to deny access to Windows APIs to open source software developers (e.g., Linux), and does nothing to curb monopolistic expansion into newer technologies by Microsoft, just as it did in the browser marketplace.

Microsoft's continued march to subsume new technologies (instant messaging, media players, e-commerce, etc) into Windows XP, its retention of the right to revert all OEM alternative desktop settings to Microsoft's own 14 days after purchase, and its continued refusal to admit any past misbehavior whatsoever all demonstrate that much stronger remedies are needed, and sooner rather than later.

I am particularly concerned over the provision in the federal government's settlement agreement that requires Microsoft to divulge Windows APIs only to competitors that Microsoft determines have a "valid business plan". Whether intended or not, one effect of this provision is to handicap the "open source" movement in ever inventing a rival technology that could work well enough with Windows to threaten Microsoft's own monopoly. Open source has hatched such technologies as the Linux OS and the latest incarnations of Netscape. Yet in their earliest stages, open source technologies rarely have a profitable business plan, so the settlement would not require Microsoft to share the APIs that would tell them how to make their applications run to best advantage on a Windows machine. Small wonder future Netscapes will appear clumsier than Explorer. Without API disclosure, Microsoft's technologies, whether inferior or not, come out of the gate with a prejudicial ability to integrate more smoothly with the Windows OS, and users will be discouraged from even trying alternative technologies. This element in the federal settlement nips any open source future rival in the bud.

At the very minimum, a settlement should require that:

(1) Microsoft sell an "unbundled" or bare-bones version of Windows, without bundled applications not essential to the operation of the computer, as requested by the nine states' attorneys general in their ongoing settlement hearing;

(2) Microsoft reveal ALL Windows API so that competing developers can interact with the operation system efficiently, so that third parties could write an analog to, for example, the Passport technology that could work as well with Windows as Microsoft's version;

(3) Internet Explorer source code should be made public;

(4) Barring (3), Internet Explorer should conform to public standards in HTML, XML, Java, etc. Currently Microsoft has attempted to effectively proprietize public standards by incorporating its own nonstandard extension of them into the Windows OS and Internet Explorer, in effect mandating use of Internet Explorer to, e.g., decipher Microsoft nonstandard Java pages on the Web. If

Microsoft wishes to add its own extensions to public standards, it should do so as a browser plug-in only, and its extensions should also be provided as a plug-in for Netscape and other browsers as well, or else published.

Even though I personally own Microsoft stock, I personally find Microsoft's past behavior so egregious—and so much unchanged even after the upheld findings of monopoly practices—that I am ashamed. I hope you will join the other state attorneys general in pursuing substantial damages, and, especially, injunctions NOW against any future such behavior by Microsoft. Surely without suitable injunctions, while the settlement process drags on, Microsoft will only further entrench its current monopoly.

I only regret that Microsoft carries such influence in my own state (Washington) that my own attorney general has not joined the other states' case.

Sincerely,
Gary Miller
1707 W 9th Ave
Spokane WA 99204

P.S. I would normally write a "real" letter in hopes of carrying more weight, but understand that public safety concerns make email more reliable.

"The greatest obstacle to communication is the presumption it has already occurred."

MTC-00010143

From: Bernard R. Blais MD
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:42pm
Subject: microsoft Settlement

I strongly recommend that the settlement be accepted. To much time and money has been spent in this legal battle which was not in the best interest of the public.

Dr Bernard R Blais

MTC-00010144

From: Jason Rainbows
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Renata B. Hess,

Please reconsider the Microsoft settlement. I believe that the current settlement is actually IN FAVOR of Microsoft, and will encourage that company to continue their monopolistic practices by handing them yet another market niche held by their competitors and it will irreversibly affect the education industry and other computer software developers.

It will cost Microsoft a small percent of the settlement figure to supply their second-rate products to schools. And then, in six months the schools will have to PAY for the upgrades from Microsoft, and again every time a new upgrade is developed. It's money in the bank for them, to coin a phrase.

This will place a huge monetary burden on our already destitute education industry. Not to mention the millions that schools will have to pay for support and repairs—a staple of all Microsoft programs. And it will essentially take away a market niche just barely held onto by their competitors due to Microsoft's brutal competitive habits.

Microsoft develops poorly written programs that are easy for ANY 12 year old

computer user to hack into, and cause trouble in the form of Virus, Worms, Trojan Horses, etc. The Windows program is the most bug filled, virus infected program ever written. Costs to avoid or fix these problems will cost schools millions, and force our children to use software that simply doesn't do what it is made for, even in its most ideal configurations. The only ones to benefit from this is Microsoft. This trial has been used by Microsoft's lawyers to further its monopolistic positions. I don't know how they managed to turn this into their reward, but it seems that they've done it. If this settlement is allowed to happen in its current form, there will be no stopping Microsoft's monopoly and it will actually encourage their ominous business practices in the future.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Jason Rainbows
jasonrainbows@mind spring.com
http://www.mind spring.com/
jasonrainbows
"littera scripta manet—non omnis moriar"

MTC-00010145

From: karsten koepcke
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This was a complete sell out. How could let them get away with their blatantly illegal behavior. Any you wonder why the people are cynical

Karsten Koepcke

MTC-00010146

From: trish murray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 9:55pm
Subject: Dear Judge,

Dear Judge,

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft to settle this case as soon as possible; it is in public's best interest as we will be far better served by settlement than ongoing litigation at a much higher cost. The consumer is always the one who suffers and in this case it is a double whammy; we must pay through taxes for the governments work then we pay more for the product because the company passes the cost on to the consumer by raising their prices to cover the litigation and it discourages other business ventures because they don't want the risk, maybe that's a triple whammy. Please settle it. Thank you.

Tricia Murray

MTC-00010147

From: Carole Staebler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Howard & Carole Staebler
915 Park Rim Cir.
Anaheim, CA 92807

MTC-00010148

From: Frances Ellison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:24pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sir:

I support President Bush and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Sincerely,
Fran Ellison
178 Palisades Dr
Four Seasons, Mo 65049

MTC-00010149

From: Craig Riley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:28pm
Subject: Accept Ruling

As a Washington State citizen and as a small business owner I request that you accept the ruling on the Microsoft case. This case has done irreparable harm to our economy both here in Washington and nation wide. The anti trust attack upon this innovative industry and against this innovative company is inappropriate. The target is moving so fast in the technology sector that old views and perspectives regarding antitrust do not apply.

Please accept this ruling compromise so that we as a state and a nation can get back to business.

Thank you,
Craig Riley

MTC-00010150

From: Leonard (038) Agnes Tillerson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

This is to inform you that we are in total agreement with the settlement reached regarding the Microsoft litigation. In our opinion, this litigation should have never occurred! Our economy has suffered as a result of this litigation and our technology market has been negatively impacted. In addition to the latter, we, the taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution diverting funds from investigating truly harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies. We ask and plead that the Federal District Court determine that the proposed settlement is in our, the public's, best interest. We applaud and support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

We respectfully request that you consider our remarks when making a final decision on this lawsuit.

Sincerely,
Agnes and Leonard Tillerson
244 Osprey Circle
St. Marys, Ga. 31558

MTC-00010151

From: John Olthoff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 10:33pm
Subject: Microsoft

I feel that I should have some voice. I think that the settlement with Microsoft is useless and needs to be much stricter. In some ways, as it is, it actually benefits the company.

The company itself should be broken up and have restrictions placed on its monopoly. They inhibit progress and competition in technology.

MTC-00010152

From: Anne Ball
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/10/02 10:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. Please get the foot of government off the neck of private business so they can focus on moving this economy forward.

Thank you,
 Anne Ball

MTC-00010153

From: BISHOPS558@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 10:38pm
 Subject: Bill Gates

I don't fully understand why the antitrust suit was served to begin with. I've worked with computers for 20 years. Bill Gates is just a genius. Just because he and his company can create the BEST systems and software in the world, does not mean he has to be punished. I agree that it would help competition for software if the Windows Operating System was not limited to what can run on it. Also, I agree that he should not have "forced" those outside entities to only do business with Microsoft products. However, I have seen what running different software packages on a Windows OS can do to the system. It can limit functionability of the entire system and can cause system errors and shutdowns. I believe some changes need to be made in the market, but putting all the blame on Bill Gates for being the genius he is is not the answer.

Thank you,
 Sheryl Bishop
 Louisiana

MTC-00010154

From: Jan Marler
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 10:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 January 5, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I want to take a moment to express my support for the settlement reached in November between Microsoft and the Justice Department. I believe this settlement is in the public interest and will allow everyone to move forward. In my opinion, this case should have never been started in the first place. But since that is water under the bridge, this settlement is the best result that can occur at this time. It requires significant changes and concessions from Microsoft, including changes in how the company designs future versions of its Windows operating system. And an oversight committee will be formed to assure compliance. Microsoft has been a good company for personal consumers like myself who have used their products for years. After this entire affair is finally completed, Microsoft will be able to focus all their resources to producing the products that consumers and businesses have come to expect for years. Thank you for this opportunity to give my opinion and I hope

that no further action will be taken at the federal level on this matter.

Sincerely,
 Jan Nolte Marler
 jmarler@cfi.net
 2806 Hogan Lane
 Crestview, Florida 32539
 cc: Representative Joe Scarborough

MTC-00010155

From: John Malin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 10:45pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

It's time to stop penalizing commercial success. The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy.

Furthermore, America's taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies. The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public. Some of the State Attorneys General want to continue this litigation: Don't let them! Let the case be settled as proposed and accepted by 9 of the 18 State Attorneys General. I chose to only use some of the Microsoft products available plus products by other manufacturers and did it all without a court hearing or judgement. I'm sure there are more pressing things to be handled by the court system, especially since we have so many vacancies on the Federal Benches.

Sincerely,
 John Malin
 2242 Arabian Ln
 York, SC 29745
 803-684-9909
 bootskofcagent@earthlink.net

MTC-00010156

From: Frank J. Martin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 10:59pm

Accept this settlement and let this great corporation get back to what they do best.

Frank Martin
 Allentown, PA

MTC-00010157

From: George von Wurmb
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I like to state that I support the proposed settlement. It is time to settle this and move on.

George von Wurmb,
 Tampa

MTC-00010158

From: TUPAI35@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement.

All companys should have the FREEDOM TO INNOVATE. And that includes Microsoft. I really appreciate innovation regardless of who has the intelligence or the ability to do it.

Karen E. Small.
 tupai35@aol.com

MTC-00010159

From: Bob McDermott
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:09pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please get the government off Microsoft's back, & go catch the terrorists instead

MTC-00010160

From: Jacob J Barkman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings from Elkhart, Kansas. We are much in Prayer for you DAILY, that you will continually know how to deal with the multitude of decisions that continually come before you.

Regarding the Microsoft Settlement issue, I support the current proposed settlement of the consumer product choice that promotes product innovation.

May you and your staff have the Wisdom, Discernment, and Insight to make the best, ultimate decision.

Sincerely,
 Jacob J. Barkman
 P. O. Box 193
 Elkhart, Kansas 67950

MTC-00010161

From: Bruce Molay
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/10/02 11:21pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To: Judge for Microsoft Case
 From: Bruce Molay, US Citizen

Re: Regarding Microsoft Settlement/Case
 My Background: I am writing as a user of computer systems, a professional programmer, and an instructor in computer science. I began writing computer programs in 1968, I began writing programs professionally in 1983, and have been teaching computer science since 1976. I have seen the changes in computer technology and in the computer industry for three decades. I have also experienced firsthand Microsoft's deceptive business practices.

Regarding a Settlement: Microsoft walked all over the intention of the earlier consent decree, Microsoft has stomped on competitors and stabbed 'partners' in the back. Evidence at the trial showed many times a blatant disregard for truth. The doctored video tape had to be a form of perjury. Given the company's history, there is reason to believe Microsoft would ever follow the terms of another agreement.

In fact, as professional coders, they would take as a challenge the project of figuring out a clever way to work within the letter of the agreement while utterly violating the spirit of the agreement. Clever programmers take binary codes designed to do one thing and play with the rules to get computers to do something else. Legal agreements are just another game for Bill Gates to hack.

Finally, a settlement saves the company from having to accept or admit guilt. A settlement ignores the fact that a federal judge and the appeals court were unanimous, in detailed, unambiguous, direct rulings, about the clear violations of anti-trust law. A settlement allows Microsoft to pretend it was all a misunderstanding, something that can be settled amicably between parties trying to compromise.

Convicted Criminals Deserve Punishment: Microsoft has demonstrably damaged competition and free enterprise. Microsoft has benefitted enormously from lack of competition. In short, they killed the competition and stole money from consumers. Even if they promise never to kill competition and never to steal again, they ought not to keep of their ill-gotten gains.

I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that if a bank robber is convicted of a robbery, and then promises to stop robbing banks, and gets no jail time, we at least expect him to give the money back. Or maybe pay out as a fine.

Convicted Criminals and Weapons: I think we require background checks when people try to buy guns. People convicted of using guns to hurt people and property should not be trusted to carry them around, or at least deserve some real supervision.

Microsoft used their desktop monopoly and their proprietary file formats and APIs to prevent and destroy competition in many areas. As we speak, they are adding APIs and changing file formats and using the desktop monopoly to attack Real Networks, Kodak, and even universal email protocols that make the Internet so useful to millions. Microsoft still possesses these weapons and is still using them.

Take away their weapons. Force MS to publish all file formats and windows APIs. They do not have to publish their source code; most of us in the industry do not want to look at Microsoft's 'crown jewels', there is too large a risk of intellectual property lawsuits. Impose hefty fines and the threat of a break up if they violate the rules. Arrange to pay bounties to people who find undocumented or incorrectly formats and APIs. Pay those bounties, upon review by a truly independent board, directly from MS to that coder. Doing so will make MS think twice about the cost of each violation. Doing so will create a staff of highly skilled inspectors, something the federal government can ill afford to fund in these economic times. Offering rewards for information about a crime is has a long tradition in our legal system.

Summary: No Settlement They have broken laws, hurt people, businesses, and stayed the invisible hand of the market. Fine them, don't trust them, and please take away their guns.

MTC-00010162

From: Frank Martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:06pm
Subject: Settlement with Microsoft

I think the agreement that the Department of Justice, several states, and Microsoft is in the public interest and that the matter should be settled.

Frank Martin

P.O. Box 8586
Horseshoe Bay, TX 78657
830-598-6823

MTC-00010163

From: rlm357@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:26pm
Subject: OBJECTION TO THE PERSECUTION OF BILL GATES
DROP THE PERSECUTION NOW.

MTC-00010164

From: Shawn Jarrett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe key aspects of the government's case are wrong.

In my opinion Microsoft does not hold an "illegal" monopoly over desktop operating systems. That ignores the resurgent of Apple Macintosh and the emergence of powerful Unix-based competitors, like Linux. Consumers can purchase any operating system they want, but they choose Microsoft because it is a better product.

There is no evidence of consumer harm and none was provide in the trial and Microsoft, according to the law, is not a Monopoly. Instead we, the consumer, had a judge that made up laws as he pleased.

After reading into the definition of a Monopoly, this is my understanding what it is: A monopoly is a firm that's restricts output in order to raise profits and prices, which harm consumers. Microsoft stands accused of doing the exact opposite; it lowers its price to zero and tries to expand its market.

The more one knows about this industry, the more one will realize it was the disgruntled competitors bringing the charge that Microsoft is a monopoly.

All this, is a legal sideshow. Sun, IBM, AOL, and Oracle are touting it as the central issue, but they don't give a damn about the consumers. With Windows 2000/XP Microsoft is invading their turf on the corporate side with better products at lower prices. They want the government to make the software design decisions for Microsoft, knowing that will stop Microsoft from innovating. This will be bad for consumers, the economy and the national security if we fall behind in computer technology due to government meddling.

There is no possible way any action against Microsoft by the Justice Department and more importantly the unsettled states will help consumers. The competition and innovation in the computer and software industries are the most intense in the history of the world.

Overall, the message being sent by the trial is "If you are a dominant producer in your market, be careful how aggressively you compete. Be mindful that your rivals can haul you into court if your product is better than theirs".

To be perfectly clear, the DOJ and the Attorney Generals of the suing states do not represent my interest and the interest of millions of consumers who have and will continue to benefit from Microsoft products.

Sincerely from a concerned consumer,

T. Shawn Jarrett
704-393-9828
cltsjarrett@carolina.rr.com

MTC-00010165

From: Mino
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:40pm
Subject: Law Suits Against Microsoft:
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

The Department of Justice, Microsoft and nine of eighteen states have reached an agreement that will stop wasting taxpayers' money on the decade-long competitor-driven persecution of Microsoft. The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy.

Furthermore, America's taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies.

The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

Some of the State Attorneys General want to continue this litigation:

Don't let them!

The Federal District Court must determine that the proposed settlement is in the public's interest. Let the Court know that you support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Thank You for taking the time to read my email to you. May God Almighty Bless You with Wisdom and Discernment in all that you deal with as

Attorney General.
Sincerely Yours,
Ronald Shimono
Issaquah, WA 98027

MTC-00010166

From: Lucille Patrick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit now.

Thank You
(Mrs.) Lucille C. Patrick

MTC-00010167

From: Eric Knirk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:55pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

leave microsoft alone. go after eron, or better yet loral aerospace for transferring protected technology to china.

MTC-00010168

From: Eric Knirk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/10/02 11:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

leave microsoft alone. go after ERON or better yet LORAL for transferring technology to CHINA.

MTC-00010169

From: Carol Radford
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/10/02 10:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Carol Radford
PO Box 471
Blomington, CA 92316
January 10, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Carol Radford

MTC-00010170

From: Ron C Gunn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My little company has been harmed by Microsoft, but I can only imagine one entity that can make a worse mess of the delicate job of providing software necessary for our best chance of technological and social progress, and that is any of the arms of the U.S. Federal Government.

Microsoft is by far the least harmful entity in this fight over Governmental or Business control of this sensitive area, and attempts to make this situation better through governmental control, because of its dynamic nature, is doomed to be the most dismal failure.

Ron Gunn;
Ron Gunn Enterprises;
358 Albatross Ave;
Livermore CA 94550

MTC-00010171

From: Dave C. Hill
To: Microsoft
ATR.antitrust@usdoj.gov,senator—

leahy@le...
Date: 1/11/02 12:05am
Subject: Isn't this "Extra Special" ????

How much more are you going to allow/ "Look-The-Other-Way" before you deal with Microsoft like Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson correctly wanted to and order to split up of Microsoft ?? This company continues to make a mockery of the Justice system and anti-trust laws of this country!

Every time they get a chance, they're taking unfair advantage or "Muscling" some company or the Justice Department itself !!!

Prosecute these clowns and quit screwing around with them !!!

Microsoft failed to disclose meetings with lawmakers

WASHINGTON (AP) ? Microsoft communicated with members of Congress and their aides about its antitrust case and did not disclose the contacts to the trial judge who requested information about the company's lobbying in the case. Microsoft said this week it decided to disclose only contacts with executive branch officials in the required court filings, following the example of AT&T when it settled its landmark antitrust case in the 1980s.

The company reported to the court that its lone contacts with federal employees included Justice lawyers and two federal mediators hired to help assist settlement talks.

Legal experts, however, questioned whether the omission of congressional contacts violated federal law.

"If you specifically talk about the proposed settlement, that would seem to fall under the requirements of the plain language of the statute," said lawyer Dana Hayter with the firm of Howard Rice in San Francisco.

Both Microsoft and a congressional aide who witnessed the contacts acknowledge Microsoft officials briefed aides of the Senate Judiciary Committee on terms of the settlement just before a December congressional hearing on the case.

The Tunney Act requires defendants in antitrust cases such as Microsoft's to disclose "any and all written or oral communications" with "any officer or employee of the United States" related to the settlement.

In other cases not involving antitrust, judges have ruled that a legislator or congressional staff member counts as a U.S. employee.

Before the law named after him was passed, former Sen. John Tunney, D-Calif., said its requirements "apply equally to contact with any branch of government, including the Congress."

In its twice-a-year reports to Congress on lobbying activities, Microsoft reported spending \$300,000 on lobbying in the first half of 2001 related to the antitrust case.

Several aides of lawmakers acknowledged discussing the settlement negotiations with Microsoft representatives.

An aide to Rep. Jennifer Dunn, R-Wash., talked with Microsoft officials in September, as settlement discussions renewed.

During the same month, Dunn organized over a hundred lawmakers to sign a letter to the Justice Department and Microsoft Chief Executive Officer Steve Ballmer urging a settlement.

The lawmaker's staff called company executives for advice about appearing on a television show focusing on the case. "We just had to call Microsoft so we could understand better what the issue was," spokeswoman Jen Burita said.

Also in September, after federal prosecutors decided to abandon their effort to break Microsoft into two companies, Dunn talked to Attorney General John Ashcroft and urged an "expedient resolution that will benefit consumers."

Microsoft lobbyist Jack Quinn last year wrote to Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., seeking to persuade him to scuttle the December hearing because the company was concerned that they would "promote the biases" of Microsoft competitors.

Legal experts said congressional contacts about the settlement should have been mentioned in Microsoft's disclosure and that Microsoft could risk its credibility by interpreting the law too narrowly.

"Once a side loses credibility, then you start to question everything they say," said Bob Lande, a law professor at the University of Baltimore.

Lande said the trial judge could force Microsoft to resubmit its disclosure if she doesn't believe it is complete.

Other experts said the law was designed to widely include contacts so the public could best decide whether companies tried to improperly exert influence to win an antitrust settlement.

"The reason to have the broad language is making sure the disclosure errs on the side of inclusiveness," said Andy Gavil, an antitrust expert at Howard University. "It's for the court and the public to decide whether there was improper influence, and not for Microsoft."

In its disclosure to the court, Microsoft acknowledged speaking only with U.S. government lawyers, lawyers for the states suing the company, and two court-appointed mediators.

Microsoft spokesman Vivek Varma said the company's disclosure was modeled on AT&T's antitrust suit that resulted in a 1984 breakup of the telephone giant.

"That filing was limited to communications with the executive branch," Varma said.

The Justice Department and 18 states sued Microsoft four years ago, alleging it violated antitrust laws and illegally thwarted competition.

The original trial judge ruled Microsoft did, in fact, operate as an illegal monopoly and should be broken into two companies as punishment.

Microsoft appealed.

A federal appeals court upheld most of the findings but reversed the breakup and ordered that a new judge impose a new penalty.

Microsoft late last year reached a settlement with the Justice Department and nine of the states. Nine other states are proceeding with the case and plan to go to trial on the penalty issue.

"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-00010172

From: METALIZE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:09am
Subject: microsoft

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call “product tying” to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson’s original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft’s anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for “tying” would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court “drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft’s liability.”

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft’s behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,
Mahlon and Doreen Wixson
PO Box 3098
Silverdale, WA 98383

MTC-00010173

From: Schmidt, Jeff
To: ‘microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov’
Date: 1/11/02 12:10am
Subject: Sentencing of Microsoft

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to make a few comments regarding the possible sentence being brought about against Microsoft. This possible sentence is letting Microsoft off with barely a slap on the wrist. In doing so, you are sending a signal to Microsoft that monopolies are fine as long as you’re big enough. This is enabling them to keep their strangle-hold on the computer users of the world and stifling the competition in the computer operating system market. This lack of competition has yielded low quality, over priced products on the part of Microsoft. Their Windows operating system has deteriorated over the years to being a poorly “slapped together” product.

The number of security leaks has increased dramatically. This is making the lives of people more vulnerable to criminals. How are we to feel safe shopping online. What about our personal information, and the safety of our families. I don’t know who may be seeing my personal information. I don’t know who may be talking to my family members. All of this is because of Microsoft’s “get it out there, and we’ll fix the problems when they arise” attitude. And where does this attitude come from? From the fact that they know that they don’t have to worry about the competition of other operating systems. I realize that Linux has grasped a decent, although still less respectable, peice of the server market, but that still doesn’t cover the home user and their information. If Microsoft is let off with a light sentence, they will continue to release poorly put together, unsecure operating systems. And

because of their current market share, they are able to drag the public down any road, safe or unsafe, they want. Please, do not let Microsoft continue to be incontrol of the lives of computer users. They seem to have proven they are not trust worthy to make a quality, secure product. Thank you.

Jeff Schmidt

Former Windows user, recently switched to Linux.

MTC-00010174

From: Vincent Adeszko
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It’s time to stop wasting taxpayer money and inhibiting successful entrepreneurs. If it wasn’t for Microsoft, I and thousands of others would still be frightened of computers. When will the government and the courts recognize the huge benefits to worker productivity and consumer satisfaction that Microsoft has given to the world and to its stockholders. It has been one of the best, if not the best, innovator in technology. Settle these ridiculous lawsuits and allow business to continue to expand worker opportunities in this country and all over the world.

Vincent Adeszko
144 Canyon Rlm Drive
Folsom, CA 95630

MTC-00010175

From: Jim Kneuper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:41am
Subject: Concerned Linux user

Hello! I’m writing to you because I believe the proposed settlement is a slap on the wrist for Microsoft and a kick in the face to everyone else. Even now, they are still doing the things there were dragged into court for. Notice MSN Messenger in Windows XP? Or the Passport buggings?

I use Linux as my primary operating system. I actually do have a small (3 gigs of a 60 gig hard drive) Windows partition for the game EverQuest, which refuses to support Linux. That’s the only problem... no companies have any compelling reason to support any operating system other than Windows. Untill support comes around, nobody is going to move to Linux or any other operating system.

Microsoft is doing everything it can to stop that. Take for instance the lack of Java support in Windows XP. They want web pages to use their own language, “ActiveX”, because they are the only ones who are able to write support for it. No browser can interperate ActiveX other than Internet Explorer. And Internet Explorer only happens on Windows (and maybe Mac, not sure). If web pages want to work with Windows XP, they have no choice but to break compatibility with other OSs.

Microsoft has contened to show that it cannot be trusted, again and again. It gives this great nation a bad name, and that is the truly sad part. Please, do not let the war on Terrorism be Microsoft’s “get out of jail free” card... because, arguably, the war on Terrorism should include Microsoft.

Thank you for your time
Jim Kneuper

MTC-00010176

From: Charlie
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:20am
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

It is time to settle this thing once and for all. I think the taxpayer has spent enough on this somewhat frivolous lawsuit. Everyone has been kept in suspense long enough, and it is not good for the country at this point in time.

Sincerely,
 Charles W. Powers
 Cape Girardeau, Mo 63703
 charlee@ldd.net.

MTC-00010177

From: Dave Winchell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:42am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
 I believe Microsoft has been persecuted enough by the anti-trust prosecution of recent years. The settlement agreement reached by Microsoft, the U.S. Department of Justice, and 9 of the 18 states participating on the suit seems to be in the public interest, and should be approved by the court. The prosecution of Microsoft was driven by competitors envious of Microsoft's commercial success, and by overzealous U.S. attorneys. It has been a waste of taxpayers' money and has diverted DOJ resources away from other important issues. The case should be closed to stop the waste of public and commercial money and resources. The nine participating states that have not yet agreed to the settlement should not be allowed to impede the settlement and thus perpetuate the wasteful activity to the detriment of Microsoft's continuing commercial achievements and the public good. Please pass my support of the proposed settlement of the lawsuit to the court for its consideration.

Very truly yours,
 David G. Winchell
 8871 W. Etcheverry Drive
 Tracy, California 95304

MTC-00010178

From: John Bowen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:42am
 Subject: Bunch of Crooks

This has gone far enough! This is nothing but a bunch of Pirates who knew about computers before the government did and used their advantage to take the money and stifle software development!

They sell buggy software and provide no refund if it will not work and no customer service! I have their Millennium Edition and it has never worked. I'm sure I could spend about 20 hours and get it to work but why should I have to work on something I bought on good faith that it would work. If you want to understand how this company operates Look into Millennium edition. They put this OS out just for a payday to keep the stock from crashing and to hell with whoever bought it!!!!

MTC-00010179

From: Paul Geohegan
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 12:52am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Enough already!

MTC-00010180

From: Stephen Langford
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:52am
 Subject: Microsoft Judgement

I am writing to express my opinion that the proposed federal penalties against the Microsoft corporation are too lenient and set a bad precedent.

I find it incredible that the court, the prosecution, and the guilty party must negotiate as equals to define a settlement agreeable to all parties in this case. Microsoft was found guilty of breaking an important law. They have significantly hurt millions of Americans. How many other guilty parties get to negotiate their punishment? It sure seems like Microsoft is not being treated equally under the law. Some aspects of the penalty are not penalties at all. Forcing Microsoft to buy software and computers for schools gives them an advantage in the educational market, where competitors (e.g., Apple Computer and the suppliers of compatible software) have long had a substantial fraction of the market. The one market where Microsoft has faced significant competition is being made less competitive. Is this a penalty for anti-competitive behavior?

Microsoft has a well-earned reputation for lying, including orchestrating public support for its products in dishonest ways. A ZDNET pole over Christmas is only the most recent example. <http://news.zdnet.co.uk/story/0,,t269-s2102244,00.html> Microsoft consistently engages in questionable behavior and is not entitled to leniency on the ground of any honorable track record. If they are not punished, we will have to endure years more of the same or worse. The worst they have to fear is another long trial, with minor penalties even if they are found guilty!

Stephen C. Langford
 160 NW Stadium Way, Apt. 4
 Pullman, WA 99163-2461
 Phone: (509) 332-5844
 e-mail: langford@wsu.edu

MTC-00010181

From: Rich
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 1:14am
 Subject: microsoftsettlement
 please support the settlement for the sake of all concerned

MTC-00010183

From: Bradley Curtis
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 1:31am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Settle it and get off the stick
 B. L. Curtis

MTC-00010184

From: Tom and Karin Thomas
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 1:53am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Here we are dealing with a recession that started in 2000, and the government tortures a company that has created industry, jobs,

wealth, and progress. And they have done it because they have good ideas and know how to make them into products. Now does it make any sense at all to punish them for being successful? Stop wasting our time and money on this vendetta and end this case. Do not fall victim to the anti-business forces that drag success to the ground.

Tom and Karin Thomas
 12711 Via Perfecto
 San Antonio, TX 78233
 (210)655-6855

MTC-00010185

From: Diane Kirk
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/11/02 1:38am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Diane Kirk
 2350 Pinon Rd.
 Rescue, CA 95672-9651
 January 11, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Diane Kirk

MTC-00010186

From: Steve
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 2:09am
 Subject: Why should MS get a slap on the wrist???

Thank you for reading this.

Please do not let MS off the hook, we need to force them to better their product by promoting competition. The have an unfair and in my opinion an illegal monopoly.

Wasn't the phone company dismantled because of unfair business practice due to it's monopoly? Of course it was.

The other thing that has really changed my views on MS was when I purchased WinXP... I had some trouble installing this software to

"MY" satisfaction. I did not realize that each time I installed the software (which I paid for) I had to send off to MS an electronic registration with an electronic profile of "MY" machine. Well fine I did it (reluctantly), but what else am I going to use... So I install this OS, and registered it 3 times. I was still unhappy with something about the install, and after much work decided I would erase my system one last time, and reinstall this OS. So after I am done I try to register to Mr. Bill, and I get a message telling me that the software I paid for has been installed too many times. To make a long story short, I had to call MS to ask permission to use it and get a special code to activate something I paid for!!! Keep in mind I had done the activation prior, but that wasn't good enough.

Now correct my if I am out of line here, but if you bought software... Do you think that you should have to ask the companies permission, and further have to supply them with a reason as to why I am installing it so many times? Didn't I buy it for my personal use? It was from the same machine because they had my hard profile...

Please sanction this company in a way that will make it hurt. PLEASE!! don't give in to these thugs. They are no worse than the Mafia.

Thank you,
Steve DeDominic

MTC-00010187

From: lscross
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Justice Department: Stop wasting taxpayers' money on the decade-long competitor-driven persecution of Microsoft.

This settlement is not in the public interest.

The government has ostensibly pursued this case on behalf of consumers; however, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy.

Furthermore, America's taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies.

The proposed settlement encourages consumer product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public. Stop this litigation!

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.

Luci Cross
Olympia, WA 98513

MTC-00010188

From: Dave Jacobs
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Greetings:

In reading over the final settlement with Microsoft, maybe I am not seeing something,

but what I see allows for something that I find happening to allow Microsoft to continue with an almost akin to an absolute control of the internet. Ever since Microsoft lost their battle in Court, they have been making some changes which tend to further their path to discouraging people enough that they gain more control and thereby a monopoly by a type of intimidation. I have watched them in their influence over the net by any users who are not using their products when on the web. An example of this is that every site they own or control or every company or OEM with which they have some previous agreement can't be simply accessed by one who is not using their product. I see nothing in the final judgement which prohibits them from intimidation by making it almost impossible for anyone who does not use their IE to easily access mail or sites. Since there is not and since they have acquired more online, they have now been able to exercise much more in the way of 'convincing' people to use only them. This effectively shuts out most of the stipulations of the final judgement. The giving up of fighting with a system which is so restrictive and demanding without violating any of the provisions of the judgement will merely cause the individuals to chose to not fight it and add much more to a total control monopoly on the internet.

One only has to understand that the Microsoft Windows OS is the one in use in the majority of all OS systems used in the world to realize that the internet is being used to force a control so that a true free choice is not given to the individual users. The complaints which caused this suit were not from individual users. They were from competitors in the business. No where is the issue addressed which prevents Microsoft from using the widespread use of their OS along with their own internet sites and agreements with others to cause considerable pressure to continue with a forced monopoly. With what I see in the judgement, even more a path is allowed for them to continue to accomplish an almost total internet controlled monopoly with their OS and products.

The users of an Operating System do not always run out and pay such an expense just to buy new systems when they are introduced. Many will continue to use what they have until they find a real need due to some obsolescence. With all the Windows programs since Windows 95 to date, there is no way to avoid the requirement of wasting space on the system by keeping the Microsoft Internet Explorer (IE). It must be in the system and will always be doing something itself and including popping up at times when you are not wanting to use it.

In any site owned, controlled or where there exists an agreement for the use of their products, a user of any other system or browser has difficulty in accessing the site. In mail that is sent which has been set up by Microsoft for many companies, that mail may not even open in any browser other than IE. I have had many such examples here recently which did not exist before your suit. This would tend to indicate a path Microsoft has found to allow for a continuation of what the suit was charging, only from a different perspective; the use.

Where I prefer the Windows system, I do not prefer all that Microsoft has for use and see no need to have it waste space on my hard drive when I have other products which I would chose to use. I do not think that Microsoft should be allowed to have the type of control worldwide they have over the internet to force this situation and I do not think that they should be allowed to provide their IE as a component of the Windows OS. This should be kept out of the system and a user then has the free choice of which they wish to download or purchase and use. Any online company or site, network or ISP should be additionally required to fully support any of the available browser systems available to the individual user by the choice of the user.

Take a look back at how the Windows sysetem was prior to Windows 95. You will find a system which did allow free choice. The IE could be used or eliminated at the discretion of the user. Now, the Windows Operating System is so embedded with instructions and directions so as to disallow any free choice in any product which Microsoft owns or controls. You must keep all of theirs and then have to fight with sites and anything which on the web is under the direction, control or ownership of Microsoft if you are not using their products. It has become common now for people to even state that if you aren't using IE or Microsoft that you aren't going to be able to enter the site, gain access to some mail or view anything produced on the internet by Microsoft. This is quite a bad sign.

I know that is is rather a far fetched idea, but I feel the urge to remind all of a movie that was shown on television a couple years back and can now be found in video stores. It is fiction. It isn't real. But, I see a tremendous similarity to it and what I see happening now. A bit more advanced and overboard situation in the movie, but is it? "Net Force" Watch it and you be the judge.

Sincerely,
Dave Jacobs

MTC-00010189

From: bill mccauley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:12am
Subject: microsoft settlement

I Thought the feds covered interstate commerce.

tell them money grubing states to back off
Bill McCauley
Plano, Texas

MTC-00010190

From: Ira
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a user of the Windows Operating System I want to support Microsoft(MS) for the products they have developed. I have no interest in the marketing aspects or the policies of any company but rather the benefits of the software. If politicians who are not even aware of the real benefits of the software are allowed to continue to disrupt the development of such software future development will cease. How can people who are not technically aware of the real

technical problems that are involved in development be allowed to decide to dictate the future of the industry. The government "Experts" are bureaucrats with a vested interest in controlling private industry and not really capable of making true technical contributions to software products. Why don't the courts look to individuals like myself—not employees of MS or the government but users of the products. The industry would not have grown and flourished if not for MS so stop trying to stifle it. Poodle.25722@home.com "Your living proof that God works in strange and wondrous ways" SuzieQ.Little Bit and Ira

MTC-00010191

From: Wayne Petersen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement January 10, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW US Department of Justice Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I would like to take a moment to give my views on the settlement reached between Microsoft and the Justice Department in November. At this point, the settlement agreement is the best development and would be good for all litigants and consumers in general.

I, like countless others, have Microsoft stock as a significant part of my retirement savings. The impact of the suit on me personally has been dramatic. The impact on the entire economy is noteworthy, too. In fact, I think one can trace the Clinton recession almost directly to the date of the original judgment.

Despite my belief that this whole case should have never been brought in the first place, I understand Microsoft's desire to wrap this suit up. Now I am hoping that with the federal government's lead and continued support for the settlement, the states that have not joined the settlement (such as Minnesota) will reconsider their position. It would be extremely important for all this legal uncertainty to be put to rest for good. The settlement justly leaves Microsoft intact, while obligating the company to change its anticompetitive practices of software bundling and the way it licensed Windows.

I commend your office and the entire administration on the push to settle this case. It is good for the economy and for the government, who can now utilize scarce resources to programs that are more important in our current political environment.

Sincerely,
Wayne Petersen

MTC-00010192

From: bernita colthorp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:01am
Subject: Litigation with microsoft.

Sirs:

It is in the best interest of the United States economy to close this case against Microsoft, and allow them and the rest of the country to get on with business, and stop wasting money and time on making life miserable for

producers of the means to keep our country strong—the courts could better use their time and money on other matters—online porn, money laundering by fringe groups.

Sincerely,
Bernita Colthorp

MTC-00010193

From: Jerry (038) Mary Fields
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:30am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the government should settle with Microsoft quickly and then leave it alone. Please don't cripple the industry or spend any more of our tax money by prolonging this suit, nor by starting other similar ones. Many people in this field are out of jobs. The computer/technological industry needs stimulation and tax breaks to put Americans back to work.

Thank you for considering my opinion.
Mary Fields
820 Carter Rd
Mineral Wells, TX 76067

MTC-00010194

From: root@cycling.stures.iastate.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:32am
Subject: Please listen to the public

I am going to try and keep this as short as I can, it may be hard because this is a issue that I am very passionate about.

I am a computer science student at Iowa State University, I have developed software for many years now on a variety of platforms including, Windows and many different types of Unix and Linux operating systems. I have also had the pleasure of maintaining these systems. My knowledge and experience is nothing special, I am just like hundreds of thousands of people that work on keeping our systems as secure as we can.

I could write you many pages about problems with the current state of the computer industry and how that relates to the Microsoft Corporation. But I am not going to do that. I am going to tell you about some of the issues that I think are prevalent to not only system administrators but to every computer user.

With the increasing amount of sensitive information that is on computers today security is a major issue. Some people, including some of my closest friends, are unable to see this. This is probably one of the biggest problems that we face as a computer dependent society. They are uneducated about the risks they take every time they use a computer. Most people would probably just try and say that I am paranoid, however the truth is that my education and experiences is what makes me look paranoid but the risks I talk about are real.

So what does this have to do with Microsoft. The answer to that question is very long, there are more security holes in Microsoft's software than I can keep track of, which is why I will only focus on those that affect the most users.

I know of these holes not because I am a hacker of any kind but because I have to fix them in order to maintain the least bit of security.

This nation spends millions of dollars every year on Microsoft's software, to then

turn around and spend millions more to fix the damage incurred because of a virus that it spread. Everyone is familiar with email viruses, most people have received one and have been infected by it, if they haven't just keep using Outlook and wait a while. This method of putting viruses in emails costs this nation more every year than anyone wants to think about. I don't know the numbers and I don't think anyone truly does know them, because fixing the problem costs a lot of time and money but so does trying to prevent the problem.

In how many other industries can a company get away with selling a product that puts the buyer in danger without informing them about it. When you purchase Microsoft software do they tell you about all the security holes in it and how what damage they can do? Of course they can't predict what tools a hacker will use but once a problem is found a solution needs to be found. This is something that Microsoft is not very diligent at doing. But who can blame them for not wanting to publish this information, after all if they did how many people do you think would spend \$300 for the upgrade version of there next software, which fixed some problems but made just as many new ones. Well I will tell you who can blame them, everyone, starting with yourself. If I had a car and the manufacture knew that it could explode if someone kicked and they didn't tell me about it, they would be sued to no end. Many people say that this comparison is outrageous, but it is not, this is just how unsafe there software is. The reason people believe this is because that is what Microsoft wants you to believe and what they sell you in every ad that they have. Really, a company that big can sell the general public anything it wants.

But now for some proof.

The computer industry had its ways of making standards just like every other industry. Most of the time those standards are set by a non-profit organization, like IEEE. But because Microsoft is so huge and controls most of the market they don't feel like they have to follow the rules. Right now they can create whatever standard they want and because they sell so many systems it becomes a standard. But the problem is that there is nothing standard about it. Standards are published and available to the public, something that Microsoft also does not do. Take the HTML standard, or HyperText Markup Language. There browser, Internet Explorer has its own standards that it follows, sure it follows all of the real standards but it has included other things are are not standard, I do not know what they are because they will not tell me. But what I do know is that the computer I am currently sitting at right now has a problem with it. I am using a Silicon Graphics Indigo 2 R10000 machine running a version of Unix and using Netscape Navigator as my browser. When trying to view pages on Microsoft's own web site it will not display the content. But when I go to my Windows machine it does not have a problem at all. But the problem is not me, the problem is the site, I am convinced that it will not display the content when using Netscape.

Microsoft will call this a coincidence or a problem with Netscape, but the problem is

with Microsoft and that they have enough power to make it the truth!

This is a situation that needs to stop and this is the time to do it. We have an opportunity here to stop something that should have been stooped long ago. I don't care what Microsoft says is best for our nation. It boils down to what is best for Microsoft, if you think they care about what is best for this nation you should consider yourself one of these victims. A company does not get as large as they are by caring about anyone but themselves.

Freedom of information is a wonderful thing, and that is what makes the internet one of the most powerful tools today. I should not have to remind you of what freedom is, but I will say this, the longer Microsoft pushes on its current path the less free the internet will become. A judge would say that is speculation but I don't care, I want it to me motivation, motivation to do the right thing and just think about where we will be in ten years. Microsoft will never own the internet, at least I hope not, but if we are not careful they will control it.

Think of it as a kind of conspiracy, the amount of information you have is almost nothing when you know the truth. I can not prove that is the case here but there are millions of us out here that can feel it. I thank you very much for your time, I did not accomplish my goal of a short letter and if you have made it this far I know that you will do the right thing and put and end to this situation and open up a new and better door to the future.

I leave you with this. Microsoft is huge but programers around the world is much bigger. The progress of open source software has grown so much in the last few years and I believe me that it is just the tip of the iceberg. The future of computing lies in our hands and not Microsoft, but if we are not careful that can change.

Thanks again,
Ryan Grimm
1232 Hawthron Court
Iowa State University
Ames IA, 50010

MTC-00010195

From: ANDERSON,MIKE (HP-USA,ex1)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 6:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I strongly support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. Close this case and get the states off Microsoft's back.

I believe that the Govt has totally missed their target in this case. By having a standard Operating System, innovation as been significantly increased and software costs decreased. E.G. if every auto manufacturer's vehicles ran on a different fuel source, the cost of fuel would be much higher. Same principal for software. Without Microsofts innovations, our countries technological lead would not exist...in my opinion.

Regards :-)

Mike Anderson / IT Technical Staff
Field Support Tools/Integration &
Development
HP Services North America Information
Technology

Phone: 770/T-795-6488 (urgent voice msg pages)

After 3 rings, home office & cell phone ring simultaneously.

Email: Mike-Anderson@hp.com

The doorstep of the temple of wisdom is the knowledge of your own ignorance.

MTC-00010196

From: Jeff Clayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:40am
Subject: Against Proposed Anti-Trust Settlement with Microsoft

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding the proposal to settle the Microsoft anti-trust action through donations to the public schools: this "solution" scandalously rewards and abets the anti-competitive practices it pretends to penalize.

It is true that there would be significant benefit to the schools. However, the big winner in this affair would be Microsoft itself. Consumers, competitors, and the industry that Microsoft has so damaged by abusing its monopoly position, are in no way compensated.

* Microsoft escapes an overwhelming finding of fault with the least of penalties—it gives away product, at small cost to itself, to a market in which sales are hard-won.

* This is tantamount to a marketing seed program. The tobacco industry must wonder how it failed to be directed to make amends to injured smokers by donating tobacco products to schools.

There has not been a penalty proposed which would fail its purpose so utterly, since Brer Rabbit was consigned to the briar patch in the Uncle Remus fable.

I urge any party to this proposal, who has the will and the ability to resist it, to refuse such an ineffective, cynical and outrageous settlement.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey T. Clayton
143 Kathryn Drive
Pleasant Hill, California 94523
swivet@earthlink.net

MTC-00010197

From: Raymond Mercier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice, Antitrust Division,

I do not believe the proposed settlement with Microsoft will remedy the harm already caused by Microsoft's past restriction of trade practices. Further, I do not see in the settlement any protection for "Open Source" software providers, specifically Linux and Apache which make up a large part of the Internet's infrastructure. Far from protecting the public from Microsoft's predatory behavior, this agreement seems to simply spell out the rules under which Microsoft may continue to dominate markets and exclude competitors. The Microsoft Antitrust Settlement fails to protect and serve the American people, who deserve better.

Sincerely,
Raymond Mercier, Jr.
3 Bear Hill Road, Apartment 7

Hillsboro, NH 03244
Phone # 603-464-4934
E-mail mercier@gsinet.net

MTC-00010198

From: Wesley Watters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:58am
Subject: What I think.

Hello,

I think that as long as Microsoft continues in it's present form that there is NO competition in any software market that Microsoft enters. This is against all of our values as Americans. I think it is your duty to save us from this convicted criminal enterprise, and restore competitive balance. I also think an investigation should be started into Ashcrofts blatent selling out of America's interests in this case.

Do as Judge Jackson said. BREAK UP MICROSOFT!!!!

Thank You,
Wesley Watters
wesinpgh@nb.net

MTC-00010199

From: John J. Urbaniak
To: Microsoft
ATR,jjurban@attglobal.net@inetgw
Date: 1/11/02 8:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: U.S. Department of Justice

(I wish to have your Department submit this letter to Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly regarding the proposed Microsoft Antitrust Trial settlement. I have sent a similar letter to the State's Attorneys General who are in opposition to the settlement. Thank you.)

I am the President and founder of Aviar, Inc., a software development company specializing in Computerized Maintenance Management Systems (CMMS). I have been in the computer field since 1966.

Aviar was founded in September, 1983. We developed and marketed a DOS CMMS program called "Ounce of Prevention System." This system was very successful: We had more than 550 users worldwide, and in 1990 we were judged "Best Overall" in a user-satisfaction survey sponsored by A. T. Kearney Associates. The survey results were published in "Industry Week" Magazine, February 5, 1990.

Personally, I have written several articles on CMMS techniques and requirements which were published in major magazines such as "Maintenance Technology." I have also been invited to speak at Maintenance-oriented trade shows and meetings.

As of 1994, our company had 13 employees and annual revenues approaching \$500,000. Our growth rate was approximately 22% per year.

At that time, the PC industry was changing from the DOS character-based mode of operating to the Graphical User Interface mode, based on the mouse and graphical screens. Aviar decided to develop a new version of our successful DOS program.

We did extensive research to evaluate software platforms. We studied Microsoft Windows and IBM's OS/2 Operating Systems. It was my professional judgement at that time that OS/2 was a far superior operating platform than Windows for the

specific requirements of a CMMS product. OS/2 was more stable; less prone to system crashes and loss of data; more resistant to viruses; more efficient and made better use of system resources.

It is my judgement, as of the present time, that OS/2 is still a superior operating environment for the needs of Maintenance Management software. OS/2 is still more stable, less prone to crashes and loss of data, more resistant to viruses and more efficient than any version of Windows.

So, based on this judgement, my company developed a new version of our CMMS product, called "Oz of Prevention System" for the OS/2 platform. Little did I know that while we were working hard to produce an excellent advanced version of our well-received DOS system, Microsoft was acting illegally to prevent our product from ever reaching our potential customers.

We didn't realize that Microsoft was threatening companies such as Hewlett-Packard to prevent them from offering PC's with OS/2 pre-loaded. We didn't realize that Microsoft threatened even IBM to prevent them from offering and supporting computers loaded with their own OS/2! But these activities came out in the trial.

As of this writing, Aviar has shrunk to two full-time employees and one part-timer. Our revenues have dropped by 80%. I personally have not received any meaningful salary in several years.

It was NOT a simple mis-judgement on my part which caused this. It was Microsoft's illegal maintenance of its monopoly, combined with IBM's [forced?] retreat from the PC Operating System market.

In order for us to sell our OS/2-based system, we must also supply computers along with the software. This is because it is impossible to obtain PCs with OS/2 pre-loaded on the open market. We have to assemble machines and package them along with our software. This adds significantly to our costs, and puts us at a competitive disadvantage, even though we believe our product is superior. If we buy a machine, say from IBM, we still have to pay them for Windows, which we don't want and which we immediately remove. This is not right, not in the America which I thought I lived in.

I believe the following:

1. My company has a right to exist, to succeed or fail on our own, without being prevented access to our market by Microsoft.
2. We have the right to innovate on our own, without being forced to develop software on Microsoft's terms and conditions.
3. We have the right to grow our own markets without being prevented and hindered by the Microsoft monopoly.
4. We have the responsibility to offer our customers the very best product we can.

In my judgement, the very best product for a CMMS application will not be based on Windows, it will be based on a superior Operating System such the OS/2 platform for the reasons stated above. It is simply wrong either to

1. Force us out of business, or
2. Force us to develop for Windows, which we believe is inferior.

I believe, therefore, that the DoJ proposed settlement with Microsoft does absolutely

NOTHING to prevent Microsoft from using its monopoly to continue to restrict our customers from acquiring OS/2 computers, and thus to restrict us from competing in a free and open market. In fact, the proposed settlement actually strengthens Microsoft's stranglehold on the PC Operating System market, in spite of their illegally judged behavior.

My company will continue to suffer and my customers will continue to be denied access to what I believe is a superior product on a superior operating environment.

All we want is a chance to innovate and compete fairly. The proposed settlement does not facilitate this. I ask that the settlement be rejected and stronger remedies be enacted which allow my small company to compete honestly without being forced out of existence by the illegal actions of Microsoft.

I assume that there is enormous lobbying pressure and media hype generated by powerful pro-Microsoft entities. I am just a small businessperson trying to be moderately successful offering a superior product to my customers. I haven't done anything illegal as Microsoft has done. I pray that American Justice applies to my small business just as well as it applies to giant corporations.

Sincerely,
John J. Urbaniak, Ph.D.
President
Aviar, Inc.
Ounce of Prevention Software
1120 Perry Highway
Pittsburgh, PA 15237
(412) 488-9730 Fax
(412) 488-0190 Fax
jjurban@attglobal.net

MTC-00010200

From: john@research.att.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Ms. Hesse,

I have been working in the software and technology sector for over twenty years. I experienced programming before there was a Microsoft, I experienced e-mail, the internet and web browsing before Microsoft entered the arena, I experienced Java (TM) technology before Microsoft took interest in it. In all these cases, I can assure you that there was more competition, *both* intellectual and economic, before Microsoft lumbered into the picture. I also experienced AT&T when it was a monopoly and afterwards. As a monopoly, it was undeniably a better place to work because of all the non-work related comforts available and the job security, but the productivity of AT&T improved and its creativity did not suffer after its monopoly was ended.

Too many excellent technologies are struggling or have struggled (and lost) against Microsoft while Microsoft continues to produce buggy, bloated, insecure products that lack creativity. Most of the Microsoft "innovations"—if examined closely—are

inferior variations of the creations of its struggling competitors. For example, while Apple worked hard to merge the best operating system (UNIX and its variants) with a creative re-working of the best OS user interface (Apple's own) to produce OS X, Microsoft follows a year later with XP, which took the high resolution, large-icon look and feel of the Apple product (and even stole the "X" from the name) and grafted it onto its old, buggy NT operating system . . . the result, not surprisingly was a buggy OS with major security flaws. Yet, XP will crush OS X not because it is better or more innovative, but because Microsoft has such an enormous installed base and because—to paraphrase the old expression regarding IBM—nobody ever got fired for choosing Microsoft.

In addition to the installed base, the greatest factor that assures the continuance of the Microsoft monopoly is their adherence to closed, proprietary data formats that constantly change in minor, unimportant ways so as to frustrate competitors that attempt to interface with them. The Office Suite, with its Word, Excel, PowerPoint and other data formats, maintains its control of the office productivity tool market by making sure it is difficult for other tools to read those formats and almost impossible to write them. If a split of Microsoft along OS and application lines is completely off the table, then any other remedy should, at a minimum, require Microsoft to openly and freely publish up-to-date specifications of its data formats. Without the ability of competitors—and especially innovative, small-operation competitors—to easily read AND write Microsoft formats, real competition can never occur. Microsoft Office document formats are the lingua franca of the business world and any tools that plan to compete MUST speak that language fluently. Naturally, the views expressed here are entirely my own and should not in any way be construed to reflect the opinions of AT&T, its management, its employees or its shareholders.

Best of luck with your endeavors in pursuit of Justice in this matter,
John Mocenigo, PhD
John MocenigoE-Mail:
john@research.att.com
Research @ AT&T LabsVoice: 1-973-360-8639
180 Park Av / Bldg 103 / Rm D-225Fax:
1-973-360-8055
Florham Park, NJ 07932-0971

MTC-00010201

From: Ken Cobler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:49am
Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust settlement

MTC-00010202

From: Anthony W. Youngman
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 8:57am
Subject: Comments on the antitrust suit

Please find attached a document with my comments on the suit, as per the Tunney act. You may notice I'm a UK citizen, but as this case has international repercussions and my competition authorities are likely to get involved when the DoJ decides it's closed the case, I trust my input may have some merit.

Yours,
 Anthony Youngman
 CC: 'dennispowell(a)earthlink.net'

Critique on the Microsoft Settlement

Reading the Proposed Final Judgment and the Competitive Impact Statement, I am somewhat disturbed at what appears to be contained therein in places.

CIS II (Overview of Relief) looks pretty impressive. However, on reading the Judgement, those "strong enforcement provisions" boil down to the one line in IV.A.4 of "The Plaintiffs shall have the authority to seek such orders as are necessary from the Court to enforce this Final Judgement . . .". Given the problems enforcing the 1995 Consent Decree I expect that these strong provisions will prove very weak. Don't forget, again with the 1995 decree, that Judge Sporkin refused to sign the decree, and it was signed by Judge Jackson instead. Judge Jackson's obvious frustration at Microsoft during the current case probably stems at least in part from the realisation of how easily Microsoft skated round and bypassed the 1995 decree. Isn't the current case dealing with exactly the consequences that the 1995 case was intended to prevent?

It also concerns me that Microsoft has been convicted of breaking the law. Yet there is no attempt whatsoever at punishment. It is wealth that gives Microsoft its power. That wealth has been gained at least in part illegally. That wealth can be used to ensure that Microsoft survives the five years of the judgement reasonably intact, at which point it can resume all the destructive tactics it has employed in the past. This fear of Microsoft surviving the remedy phase moderately unscathed will be more than sufficient to permit Microsoft to threaten OEMs during the remedy phase—"When it's all over we'll come back and get you!". And while I can't offhand think of any examples, I have come across many examples of Microsoft continuing to behave in a reprehensible and probably illegal manner even during and after the trial. I am sure others will have provided you with examples. It is all a matter of trust and many, myself included, believe that Microsoft is a psychopathic corporation constitutionally incapable of behaving itself.

However, let's tackle my concerns over the remedy.

III. Prohibited Conduct.

A.

"Microsoft shall have no obligation to provide such a termination notice . . . that has received two or more such notices . . .". Justified, unjustified, questionable notices? On a simplistic reading, Microsoft is likely to make a point of quibbling at every possible opportunity. Past performance leads me to expect Microsoft to pick fights with any OEM it expects to have difficulty with, specifically to get itself in a position where it can invoke this clause. This needs to be tightened up severely.

B.

I fail to see how this protects the consumer and prevents the illegal practice of "per processor" licensing. One of most telling and effective ways that the IBM monopoly was broken was when they were forced to price hardware and software separately. Given that Windows is now supplied for the most part

as a "recovery disk" which restores the hard disk to "factory fresh" condition, it should be a condition that OEMs are charged only for copies of Windows supplied to consenting customers. How hard is it for a consumer to switch on a bare pc, put the recovery CD in the CD drive, and watch the computer "recover" itself to a "factory fresh install state"? I have no problems with Microsoft obliging OEMs to ship their PCs with an Operating System included as part of the package, just as long as this includes the obligation to offer a non-Microsoft alternative. After all, what is marginal cost of throwing in a Debian CD?

C.

"Microsoft shall not restrict by agreement any OEM licensee . . .". Why is this section so much weaker than the wording at IJIA.? You need to add wording forbidding technical or other measures as well! Bear in mind Microsoft has already used technical measures to destroy the ability of PCs to dual-boot, any repetition of this needs to be nipped in the bud. When you install NT4, it nags you to be allowed to write a "signature" to the start of the disk. If you let it, this will destroy older versions of lilo, the default linux boot manager. The cynical amongst us might assume that this was deliberate . . . It is thought Microsoft is planning similar tactics for when PCs migrate to the IA64 architecture (Intel's x86 replacement), and with its current recovery disk practice it has already implemented something similar. If you are forced to reinstall Windows (a not uncommon occurrence) a "recovery" will wipe any changes you have made to your system, including any third-party Operating System you may have installed. The sheer hassle of reinstalling linux every time Windows breaks is enough to put a lot of people off. And Microsoft has already introduced a new disk format which (intentionally?) prevents any other Operating System from sharing the disk. It is suspected that this will be the only format acceptable with the new IA64 generation of CPUs.

If Microsoft does that, the provisions granted to OEMs in section 4 will be worthless, because it will be technically impossible despite the fact that it is contractually possible. You need to add wording similar to the following:

"Both when being installed/restored and in normal/abnormal usage, Windows must restrict itself to the portion of disk allocated to it by the user. It may not assume that that portion is the entire disk unless it has positively detected the absence of any third-party boot loader or Operating System. It must also provide a mechanism whereby any third party can invoke the Windows loader similar to the existing boot mechanism where a loader loads and executes the first 512 bytes at the start of the disk or partition."

E.

"Microsoft shall make available . . . for the sole purpose of interoperating with a Windows Operating System Product, on reasonable and non-discriminatory terms . . .". In other words, Microsoft are free to discriminate against their sole surviving real competition, Open Source. By definition, any "for cost" licencing scheme discriminates against Open Source.

This section should be rewritten to say something along the lines of "Microsoft shall publish and make freely available a formal description of any protocol used by a Windows Client to communicate with a Windows server. Microsoft are free to forbid the use of their Intellectual Property to be used to enable two non-Windows systems to communicate, or to forbid the use of their Intellectual Property without the appropriate CAL (Client Access Licence). Any such CAL must be Operating System agnostic, and be supplied and charged separately from the Windows Client."

After all, to permit otherwise is surely the equivalent of allowing the English Language to be patented? And isn't it, actually, also illegal under US Federal law? I thought it was illegal to word "requests for procurement" in such a manner as only one company's goods fitted the bill. Without a clause such as thin, any requirement of Microsoft compatibility would effectively require the use of Microsoft software and as such would be illegal.

As I've worded it, there is no restriction on competitors making their software speak the same "language" (as indeed there should not be), but it is perfectly possible for Microsoft to charge a fair fee for the use of any of their Intellectual Property. Very similar, in fact, to Hewlett-Packard's Open Source printer drivers which declare prominently "For use with HP printers only. Usage with any other make of printer may infringe third-party Copyright and/or Licence agreements". By placing the obligation on the user to have a valid usage licence (eg a CAL) we can sidestep any argument over what is "reasonable and non-discriminatory".

I notice also that the Competitive Impact Statement mentions Kerberos in this section. Interestingly enough, Microsoft has already attempted to subvert Kerberos once yet this section would have minimal effect on the tactic used. Windows 2000 client authenticated perfectly to a Unix Kerberos server, yet when the Windows 2000 client was granted authorisation, it threw it away because the server wasn't a Windows 2000 server. And again, if developers are licenced, who is going to pay for a licence to distribute MS-Kerberos for linux? More reason to say the specification must be openly published and the licence fee charged to the user. Interestingly enough, Microsoft didn't use the patent/copyright trick to attempt to prevent reverse-engineering of their extensions. They wrapped the document with a licence agreement that said "if you wish to read the spec, you must agree not to implement a non-Microsoft implementation". If enforced, it would have had the effect of making non-MS servers incompatible because the client would refuse to use them, and there would have been nothing the server software authors could have done about it.

H.

1. "Enable or remove access to each Microsoft Middleware Product". Taken in conjunction with the (implied) requirements of section D, that Microsoft Middleware should not have an unfair advantage, these two requirements are mutually incompatible!

Large chunks of Microsoft Middleware are implemented as part of the OS for a reason—

they are loaded in RAM when the computer starts up, and they stay there. This means that, for example, Internet Explorer will always appear to load faster than Netscape Navigator, because large chunks of it are already loaded.

Microsoft are also permitted to use their own middleware to launch, for example as mentioned by the Competitive Impact Statement, ActiveX (should the user's chosen alternative not include that capability). But what if I the user chose that alternative precisely because it did not include the capability? Should Microsoft have the right to demand that I have the capability to execute ActiveX, even if I wish to delete it on security grounds?

This section should demand that users are allowed to de-install and delete Microsoft Middleware. It may not be advisable, and it may result in large chunks of functionality disappearing, but if the user does not want that functionality they should be allowed to get rid of it. Completely. Totally. Utterly. To allow otherwise is to allow Microsoft to continue its current practice of forcing unwanted software onto non-consenting consumers, and if that software has major security holes (like ActiveX, for example) then this is a serious issue.

And as has been suggested in various places by other people, it should be possible to get and install a "Windows Lite" which is cheaper and comes without middleware.

J. No provision of this final Judgement shall:

THIS SECTION IS EXTREMELY WORRISOME!!!

Firstly, secrecy and security are mutually exclusive. If Microsoft needs to invoke this section then it is a pretty sure-fire conclusion that the "security" implemented by the relevant APIs is shoddy and easy to break. In which case, this section should not cover it.

Given Microsoft's extremely shoddy security in the past, it should in fact be a requirement that all security protocols, interfaces and APIs are published and disseminated widely almost from the moment Microsoft start developing them.

One only needs to look at the current DMCA/FBI/ElcomSoft case to see how secrecy is incompatible with security. Some unknown Adobe programmer took a well-known security algorithm. It had several traits in common with Enigma which could easily have defeated "kiddie" cryptographers. And don't forget, Enigma was strong enough to frustrate the most powerful computers available in the early 1940s—they typically broke only 75% of messages. Okay, Adobe's method wasn't quite as strong as Enigma . . .

But this unknown programmer thought he'd be clever and add a few tweaks . . ., and succeeded in converting this technique into a Caesar cipher. This is so weak a kid can break it using pen and paper alone in half an hour—I should know—I've done exactly that and I wasn't even a teenager at the time.

This section should not permit Microsoft to use security as a pretence for secrecy in any shape or form whatsoever.

To my mind, this judgement is almost too prescriptive, allowing too much interference

in Microsoft's internal affairs. It also does little to assist competition on its merits. I personally would like to see a simple remedy along the following lines:

To restore competition generally:

Microsoft is forbidden from entering into any OEM contracts whatsoever. It must publish a price list and stick to it, but that price list may include reasonable volume discounts to take into account the economies of volume where an OEM buys a lot of copies. The price of bundled middleware and applications should also be reasonably comparable with the price of the same software as a stand-alone or upgrade purchase.

The problem with having "Covered OEMs" is that Microsoft can to some extent control who is in which group. By having a noticeable differential between the two covered groups and "the small guys" Microsoft can make it very difficult for any individual OEM to move into a more favourable category. This way, if a small OEM makes good PCs, they can grow and at the same time provide the OS of the customer's choice without fear that the system is susceptible to being rigged. If customers want Windows, they can buy it from the OEM, or as seems more and more to be the case, they can enter into a direct licencing agreement with Microsoft themselves. We need a means whereby small OEMs with no affinity to Microsoft can seriously threaten the Dells and Compaqs. Without this, the fear of future retaliation keeps the big OEMs in line, while preferential treatment of large OEMs by Microsoft keeps the small boys from getting bigger. And at the end of the decree, we will still have the problem where OEMs say "how high" when asked by Microsoft to jump.

Microsoft may establish OEM programs where entry is open at reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms to anyone who wishes to ensure their hardware works successfully with Windows Operating Systems. Such programs may not require any degree of control by Microsoft over the hardware vendor's Intellectual Property, and in particular may not seek to hide hardware specifications by way of Non-Disclosure-Agreements.

At the moment, linux in particular is hamstrung by the difficulty of getting information from manufacturers. Hewlett-Packard is a case in point, where it has been (officially?) quoted that for certain HP printers, HP was contractually prevented from telling customers how they worked. So if something changed on your computer and the printer stopped working, all you were suddenly left with was an expensive doorstep despite the fact there was no problem with the printer itself. Microsoft Operating Systems must not assume or demand sole control of the computer systems on which they run, or interfere with third-party software installed elsewhere on the system. As mentioned above. If Microsoft software assumes sole ownership of the computer it is free wilfully to destroy anything else the user may have installed. This is just plain unacceptable.

Microsoft must publish all APIs, protocols, interfaces and file formats that they provide

or use in other words, the "language" of Microsoft computing. By definition, writing an alternative implementation is not a breach of copyright. By definition, if it is encumbered by patents it cannot be an Open Standard suitable for implementation by Government. And if there are any intellectual property issues, these should be addressed by the sale of user licences, which must be priced independently of the operating system on which the software runs. Bearing in mind I thought Federal Procurement Regulations required open standards, I would have thought Microsoft should already be complying with this requirement if they wish their software to be used for Federal Government Business.

It should be a mandatory requirement that all protocols used by Microsoft Software to communicate between computers must be clearly and publically documented such that a competitor can implement a compatible equivalent. Please note that it says by implication "all software" so that communication between databases, between mail client and server, etc is all caught.

It should also be a mandatory requirement that all file formats used for transferring information between users must be clearly and publically documented such that a competitor can implement a compatible equivalent. Here we may have a patent problem, but I would have thought any attempt to obstruct compatibility was a clear breach of competition law, and possibly a breach of the constitutional justification for patents.

I'm less sure of requiring Microsoft to document internal formats such as the NTFS file system, the internal layout of their SQL-Server database, or their Exchange database. There are very good technical reasons to say they should, but I'm not sure that there are good competitive anti-trust reasons to do so.

Any such documentation must be released at least six months before the Software in question is Released To Manufacturing (RTM), and also no later than the date Microsoft start shipping the software to testers outside of Microsoft or OEM employees. RTM is defined as no later than the date Microsoft permit OEMs to ship the software to customers, or the date on which Microsoft implement a pricing regime that covers more than the cost of pressing and shipping the distribution media. The documentation must be included with the software without NDAs or restrictive licences.

Enforcement should be open to anyone. If Microsoft releases software in contravention of the decree, then anybody can act as plaintiff and seek a Federal restraining order barring distribution of the software. Upon production of sufficiently compelling evidence, then the Federal court will grant the order.

This remedy is actually pretty similar to the one applied to IBM. Effectively, it requires products to be unbundled, and specifications to be produced to enable competitors to have a level(ler) playing field. It should be a requirement that competition is restored before the order is lifted. At present all Microsoft need do is bide their time, and they have plenty of cash in the bank with which to do so.

These comments have been submitted by Anthony Youngman, a Programmer/Analyst and Database Administrator/Programmer based in London, England. Contact details:

Anthony Youngman
9 Shaw House
Victoria Street
Upper Belvedere
Kent DA17 5NA
United Kingdom
Office tel: +44 20 7351 5000
Office fax: +44 20 7351 9396

MTC-00010203

From: iiel@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:59am

Dear D.O.J.:

If it is in the public interest that you hold these hearings then the public should know. The public has a need to know.

Please televise and broadcast in every way possible the proceedings of this and other public interest cases.

Very truly yours,
Solomon Katz

Who art thou that thou should be considered above a grain of sand?

MTC-00010204

From: Johanna Stephens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. I also feel that the harassment of Microsoft has gone on too long.

Sincerely,
J.M.Stephens
Tucson, AZ

MTC-00010206

From: ANTHONY SHUMBER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:13am
Subject: Microsoft Case

To Whom it may Concern

Get off the back of Microsoft and go chase ERON they actually hurt people.

Tony

MTC-00010207

From: Ivan Prado
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:16am
Subject: Hello

HI, Just to say:

I have been using computer for many years now. I want to tell to that this past's years I have never seen a bigger monopoly than Microsoft is in the coputer world. Their domain is far reaching than just the operating system, for with that they can decide the technology for video cards, sound, digital cameras, and many other multimedia applications (no wonder they keep adding multimedia 'features') because their software other than allowing other programs to work (like a OS used to be) now adds many standars (direct X) that eliminate the possibility of independent improvements, for that and many other practices Microsoft and thier softwares are very dangerous, and they can in fact continue to expand their power and continue to force the computer industry

at their will (more or less) because the costumer base is so huge.

Their sheer strength of the number of computers running on their programs is enough reason itself to do something, for it is too dangerous, anything considered above the law that MS did, thats just a bonus and a good excuse to use against them; this dangerous corporation.

A good decision would be one that defines whats an OS, and so make that OS what it originaly was: just a program that turned on the computer and put is together, the other software companies can run their software, and every program should be a single application apart from the rest, the OS apart from all applications even if they are from MS. Device standars (like video card drivers and api) should be decided by the card manufacturer (two big players right now) and so software companies decide what products to support, or to support both. Some compatibility would be lost, but that a very little price to pay for the freedom of the computer industry. Im sure once the industry is free we would see much more improvements in multiple directions, not just a few like it is right now (like direct X)

Could you please tell me what happens to this e-mail?

MTC-00010208

From: Burton Cohen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Hearings

U.S. District Court Judge J. Frederick Motz I implore you to rule that the settlement proposed by Microsoft's lawyers does not impose the remedy that would address their misdeeds. They are giving away product that will cost them less than \$400 Million dollars but not give the schools the \$1 Billion they claim is the settlement.

Two previous courts have ruled that Microsoft has broken the antitrust laws. Their proposed settlement does not hold them accountable in any meaningful way and actually advances their illegal gains. Schools will receive product that will further Microsoft products at the expense of Apple Computer and free choice. The nine remaining states are right to reject this settlement and you should send the message that monopolists must but brought to justice just as any other convicted felon.

Here in Connecticut, our attorney general, has been one of the lead attorneys in the case against Microsoft and for free choice in the marketplace. I trust his judgment in rejecting the proposed Microsoft settlement. He has steadfastly stood up and spoken out on my behalf to ensure that individuals, companies and governments are given the right to chose the solution that best suits their needs and not one dictated by a convicted monopolist.

Your decision will affect lives for many years to come. It is a heavy burden. You must decide and demonstrate that laws and the judiciary decide on a just penalty, not a self serving industrial bully.

I look forward to seeing how you decide.

Sincerely,
Burton Cohen
TBI Computer, LLC
bcohen@tbicomputer.com

(203) 222-1878 Telephone
(203) 858-4728 Cell Phone

MTC-00010209

From: lsmith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:24am
Subject: Microsoft Case

Dear Sir,

Attached please find my concerns and suggestions regarding Microsoft. Regards,
Larry Smith
LAWRENCE G. SMITH, JR.
179 Old Orchard Lane Wayside NJ 07712
(732) 493-3299

January 10, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you to urge you and your Department and the federal government to end the political squabbling and endorse the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case. This settlement will essentially force Microsoft not only to abandon its former so-called anticompetitive practices, but will also obligate the company to share its systems and its technology with its competitors. Windows will be designed now to accept non-Microsoft software. Microsoft has agreed to license its Windows systems products to other computer makers for uniform terms and conditions. Microsoft cannot retaliate against its competitors. Most importantly this settlement will allow Microsoft to continue to exist as a corporate entity in the form that has made it a national and international technological giant. We need this company solid, solvent and at work. I hope to see the settlement in place soon.

Sincerely,

Lawrence G. Smith, Jr.

MTC-00010210

From: BLDDonW@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:30am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Donald and Elizabeth Wanderer
1033 Tilghman Court
Wayne, PA 19087-5879

January 10, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

After a three-year long court battle, I was pleased to hear that a settlement was finally reached between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. I sincerely hope that this is the end of this nonsense and that no further legal action is being taken at the federal level.

Taking into account the terms of the agreement, Microsoft did not get off lightly. In fact, Microsoft has to now make several substantial changes to the way that they handle their business. For example, Microsoft has agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows to promote non-Microsoft software programs that compete with programs included within Windows. Computer makers will now be free to remove the means by which consumers access various features of

Windows. Computer makers can replace access to those features with access to non-Microsoft software. This is more than fair.

With the many terms of the agreement, there should be no reason for the government to pursue further litigation on any level. Not only would it be redundant, but a serious waste of time and money all over again.

Sincerely,
Donald and Elizabeth Wanderer
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00010211

From: RUFUS WILSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:40am
Subject: Stop Created a problem where none exist!!!
microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov. I support The Bush and Mirosoft settlement, Stop weasting tax payer Money and creating problems where none exist.
Rufus John Wilson mrkeyman@flash.net 1-11-2002

MTC-00010212

From: Cheryl Dively
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
This email is to let you know I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. I believe the proposed settlement is in the public's best interest.
Cheryl Dively
MacKenzie Commercial/ONCOR International
Direct Dial: 410-494-6659
cdively@mackenziecommercial.com or visit our web site at: <http://www.mackenziecommercial.com>

MTC-00010214

From: Seamus J. Wilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:50am
Subject: microsoft
A great American success story. Leave them alone.
Seamus J. Wilson

MTC-00010215

From: Ronald Snyder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:56am
Subject: microsoft
leave it go.....
If it was not for Microsoft and windows ,I would not have a computer .I thank Gates for his products
Why don't they go after AOL

MTC-00010216

From: John M. Sours
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:03am
Subject: An Appeal for Microsoft.
Renata B. Hesse
Anti Trust Division
Department of Justice
I would like to encourage the acceptance of the proposed settlement of this lengthy action against Microsoft. I firmly believe that the economy needs the reassurance that the government is now free of this sort of damaging mentality. The state of Washington

desperately needs all the economic boost it can possible get, and Microsoft is the best hope we have for a turn around. We are one of the leading states in unemployment, and a new wave of pink slips are in the mill for several of our other major employers.

There is no doubt that Microsoft is an aggressive innovative company. It's history is an outline of the American dream, and a role model for all those other high technology startup businesses that hope to also flourish. I have heard Mr. Gates say that he is constantly looking back over his shoulder to see which one of them is going to be the one that closes in on him. This should be the function of a free and open market, not micro management review by big government. This action needs to be terminated once and for all for the good of the entire economy.

Please bring us some good news.
Thank you.
John M. Sours
Spokane, WA

MTC-00010217

From: Alayo, Sandra
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 10:06am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
I would like to offer my opinion that the settlement be accepted. It is time to let the company devote it's resources to innovate instead of litigate.
Sandra
Phone: 212-852-6567
Fax: 212-852-6510
email: <<mailto:salayo@girlscouts.org>>

MTC-00010218

From: Mary. Wollenhaupt@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:05am
Microsoft settlement

MTC-00010219

From: peter woods
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:07am
Subject: microsoft settlement
Really, enough is enough. I am disgusted that my money, taxpayer money, was used to fund this frontal assault on a company whose only sin was that it was more successful than its competitors. That last time I checked, it was legal for competitors to try to destroy each other in the marketplace (see Coca Cola vs. Pepsi; Hertz vs. Avis, etc.). This, in case Janet Reno wasn't aware, is called capitalism; it benefits consumers.

If the Injustice Dept under Bill Clinton were truly interested in dismantling monopolies that injure consumers, they might have gone after the recording industry cartel that has colluded for years to keep the prices of records and cds artificially high. But no, the entertainment industry new how to play the Washington game and so has never felt the brunt of our do-gooders. It's bad enough that Micosoft must settle at all; but, for God's sake, let's end this idiocy and move on.

Peter Woods
peterwoods35@yahoo.com

MTC-00010220

From: Lynn Withrow

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:05am
Subject: To whom it may concern:
To whom it may concern:

Regarding the Microsoft request to keep the content of any future depositions from being released to the news media: This is a bad idea, and would only let Microsoft continue to get away with lying and evasion.

Since this case has ramifications for the entire computer and software industry, and for the millions of us who use computers each and every day both at work and at home, I truly believe that we, the general public, have a right to be informed of what both sides in this case are saying.

Thank you.
Respectfully,
Lynn Withrow
Belpre, OH
Computer Systems Specialist for Bosley Rental & Supply, Inc. (Parkersburg, WV)

MTC-00010221

From: ralyea
To: Microsoft
ATR.fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw
Date: 1/11/02 10:10am
MTC-00010221 0001
Freehold, NJ 07728-1630
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950
Pennsylvania Avenue,
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The purpose of this letter is so that i may go on record as being a staunch supporter of the settlement which was reached between Microsoft, the Department of Justice, and nine states, with the assistance of a mediator. The settlement, reached in ear November, 2001, after extensive negotiations among all parties, extends to terms beyond the issues in the original lawsuit.

Microsoft agreed to many terms that will help the entire Information Technology industry, Microsoft will disclose the intellectual property of the various internal interface used in Windows operating system products. Microsoft will grant computer makers broa?? new rights to configure Windows to promote even non-Microsoft softly e programs tha?? compete with programs included within Windows. Beginning with Windows XP, Microsoft will make it easy to choose and promote non-Microsoft software within Windows itself.

The Department of Justice and Microsoft have spent millions of dollars baffling each other in the antitrust suit. Any additional money that may be spent will be a comple waste. The government has too many other issues to worry about right now, and cannot afford to pour money down the drain. Our nation's economy is in trouble. A healthy Microsoft will help provide the shot in the arm that it needs.

Thank you for allowing me m express my views m support of the Microsoft settlement.
Sincerely, ??

MTC-00010221-0002

MTC-00010222

From: Joe Meldrich
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 10:11am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 8314 Cricket Lake Drive Charlotte, NC
 28277-9842 Phone (704)541-8062
 Fax (704)541-5895
 Softex, Inc.

Friday, January 11, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Special interests may try to undo the recent settlement reached in the Microsoft antitrust case with the Justice Department. The reason I am contacting you is to show my firm support for this settlement.

Microsoft and the Justice Department reached a settlement after three long and expensive years in court. Both Microsoft and the DOJ spent millions on this case, and thankfully a settlement would bring an end to this flow of resources. If the special interests prevail Microsoft and the Justice Department will end up in court for another three years and spend even more resources on this case. The settlement is reasonable; there is no reason for a renewal of this case. Under the settlement Microsoft will share more information with competitors than any software company has ever shared before. A revival of this case would simply waste time and money, and benefit only special interests and those with animosity toward Microsoft.

The settlement that was reached is more than fair, and I stand behind it.

Sincerely,

Joseph Meldrich
 President

Your Converting Software Solution

MTC-00010223

From: BFSTK@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:12am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Tunney Legislation should be allowed to stand, it is a fair settlement. Let the special interest groups that oppose it compete in the market place instead of in court.

MTC-00010224

From: Chuck Greene
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:34am
 Subject: Microsoft

I find it rather amusing that Microsoft wants to block the public from knowing what their executives or whomever testifies for them. I believe most likely their motion will be denied. Microsoft with their track record with distorting the truth is probably well known, so I will assume the judge is aware of this.

Secondly, if Microsoft believes they did nothing wrong, that they are the true innovators of the industry, the same people who allowed "the open source movement to exist," what are they afraid of? Why enter a motion to deny the public to information they're entitled to?

Remember Bill Gates' deposition? That was a joke! The guy was lying through his teeth the whole time and when the public viewed his deposition, it was a joke!

I'm surprised they haven't found Bill Gates with contempt of court.

Again, this shows if it were you (John Q. Citizen) or me, we would have had the book (the law) thrown at us and the judge would have had a field day with us.

MTC-00010225

From: Tim Carlson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:36am
 Subject: DOJ VS Microsoft

To Whom it may concern,

The action against Microsoft needs to be settled immediately. In these uncertain economic times it is irresponsible to be trying to damage one of the companies that is fueling our economy to such a great extent.

As a tax payer I am outraged by this. It is obvious that there is more interest by some Government officials in enhancing their careers or catering to their constituents than there is in doing the country a service.

Sincerely Yours

Tim R. Carlson
 Snohomish, WA
 360-668-4047

MTC-00010226

From: Dick Uguccioni
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:37am
 Subject: microsoft case

end it—this country is weird—never heard of a government, except this one, that would penalize a world leading enterprise in its own country

did i hear right— 41 states have signed off ??

MTC-00010227

From: Wes Mitchell
 To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 10:38am
 Subject: Microsoft Anti-trust case
 Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530
 email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
 Fax: (202) 307-1454 —OR— (202) 616-9937

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft.

This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also

rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration,

J. Wesley Mitchell
 L & M Services, Inc.
 1600 132nd Ave. NE
 Bellevue, WA 98005
 425-637-9770
 425-637-9769 FAX
 CC: 'effwa@effwa.org'

MTC-00010228

From: Melody Berkheiser
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:53am
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 Go with the Bush and Microsoft settlement. It is reasonable. It is in the best interest of the public. It is best for every one all around, including, but not limited to our economy.
 Melody Berkheiser

MTC-00010229

From: Robert Cornell
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/11/02 10:00am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Robert Cornell
 307 Joe Cornell Rd.
 Oneonta, NY 13820
 January 11, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Robert Cornell

MTC-00010230

From: Mark Williams
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/11/02 10:49am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Mark Williams
 3957 Shadowhill Drive
 Santa Rosa, Ca 95404
 January 11, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Mark A. Williams

MTC-00010231

From: Jack Ensley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:14am
 Subject: Microsoft
 1/11/02
 Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530
 To Whom it May Concern,
 As a citizen of Washington State, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft.

I won't go into detail, but I think the proposed settlement is fair and it is time to put this quagmire behind us. In the effort to protect us, the government sometimes does more harm than good. I think this has been a case of that kind. It certainly is time to bring it to a close and this settlement seems to be a way to do it.

Thank you for letting me say my piece.
 Jack Ensley
 624 Shawnee Rd.
 Colfax, WA. 99111
 509 397 3327

MTC-00010232

From: Joe Alonzi
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:33am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Department of Justice
 re: Microsoft settlement

Over the last several years the on going suit against the Microsoft Corporation has cost us the taxpayers many, many dollars. I can see no further reason to delay this ongoing issue any longer. The agreed settlement sometime ago seems too have been accepted by both parties and now its ugly head has reared up again and I would like to see this end and get on with making our economy run and become strong again.

Free enterprise has built this nation and it will continue to grow without the courts telling them how to run their business.

Respectfully,
 Joseph A. Alonzi
 Concerned Citizen

MTC-00010233

From: Lynda Newell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:49am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Having been an active consumer of Microsoft as well as competitive products for many years, I feel strongly that the case should be settled according to the agreement reached. Having discussed this case with others, who like me, are either users at home or at their business, not one person has expressed any thought or feeling that they have been taken advantage of by Microsoft, or have paid too much for the benefits and services Microsoft has provided. While I do not agree with the governments findings, and believe the states not agreeing to the settlement are simply pursuing additional funding for their state budgets, it would certainly be best for all—the consumer, the PC and software industry, and the economy, for this settlement to be concluded, and for the remaining states to join the settlement.
 Lynda Newell

MTC-00010234

From: Gregory Slayton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:55am
 Subject: stop MS

Judge KK;
 the proposed settlement doesn't even begin to address the predatory practices of Microsoft...and will not reign them in going forward. please use your good efforts to make them play by the rules.

thanks.
 Gregory Winston
 CC:microsoftsettlemnt@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00010235

From: BillMiglino@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:03pm
 Subject: (no subject)

To Whom it May Concern:
 As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft.

This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to

state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,

William G. Miglino

MTC-00010236

From: Jean Gumm
To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/11/02 11:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jean Gumm
1122 Ross Avenue
Hamilton, Oh 45013
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jean Gumm

MTC-00010237

From: David Carlson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:06pm
Subject: Tax settlement

I support the microsoft tax settlement, and want the government to lay off and quit harrasing microsoft.

Thank you.
David & Janice Carlson,
Liberty, Mo.

MTC-00010238

From: Peter Kulda
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement January 11, 2002

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice

I think the proposed Microsoft settlement fails to achieve the necessary goals of a proper remedy: halting the illegal conduct, promoting competition in this industry, and depriving Microsoft of its illegal gains.

The United States can only maintain its competitive edge in the global software industry if open and fair competition is promoted in our country, which won't occur until Microsoft is stopped from stifling its competition. I agree with the concern that if

they are not dealt a very sever penalty that is stringently enforced, Microsoft will continue with its monopolistic practices. And if it does, I fear that the USA will eventually fall behind in software innovations which will lead to foreign nations taking much of the market share, similar to how Japan took much of the auto industry market in the 1970's.

Thank you for hearing my opinion, and thank you for your work on this important case.

Peter Kulda
Salt Lake City, Utah

MTC-00010239

From: Tom Swan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to stop penalizing commercial success. Let's get the high technology sector back into the economic engine. I agree with President Bush. Settle the Bill Gates Microsoft lawsuit and quit wasting taxpayer money.

MTC-00010240

From: John Horvatic
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:14pm
Subject: PUNISH MICROSOFT DON'T GIVE THEM MORE BUSINESS!

To whom it may concern,
Microsoft needs to be punished, and from what I have read so far is that has not happened yet! There should be a huge fine and I'm not talking millions I'm talking BILLIONS!!! Put them down for the count not just for the round. What you have agreed to do is give them a slap on the hand and tell Microsoft to go ahead and do it all over again and we promise not to bother you anymore. What kind of punishment is this? Why don't you throw some of the executive team in prison. I thought that's what you do with criminals isn't it?

Please be more aggressive with this case and don't let them get away with what they have done and continue to do. I find the settlement very unfair to Apple Computers Inc. To let Microsoft put there own products in schools and force all schools to change out there equipment will not help anyone except Microsoft spread more of there crap out into the world.

Who profits from this? MICROSOFT!

Sincerely,
John Horvatic

MTC-00010241

From: walter roubik
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:23pm
Subject: DOJ—Microsoft settlement

I want to email DOJ on the settlement, but on DOJ@usdoj.gov I can't find any opening for comments. Fo you have any suggestion?

MTC-00010242

From: DONALD L STEELE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 12:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off Microsofts back. This action was only taken because competitors were upset.
Donald L. Steele

MTC-00010243

From: dmath
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:24pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

We are at war as a country why do we have to have war within against an ali and a contributor to our country. Microsoft is a great company that provided we the consumer with an excellent product. Due to a few whiners/ competitors you the government took up a law suit that has benefited none. Settle this case and stop the stupidity!

Lynette Matheson

MTC-00010244

From: Phil Bassett
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 12:31 pm
 Subject: Settle Microsoft case <<January11.doc>> Philip H. Bassett January 11, 2002 Renata B. Hesse Antitrust Division U.S. Department of Justice 601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20530

Dear MS. Hesse:

As a citizen of Washington State, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the antitrust case involving Microsoft.

This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and

does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court. In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business would be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Philip H. Bassett

MTC-00010245

From: George Wagner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 12:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please proceed carefully with regard to the Microsoft settlement. The past has shown that Microsoft will not follow guidelines that have no enforcement, and will also exploit any limitations or loopholes that are present. Please ensure that competition is restored to the computer industry. Consumers need to be able to choose the best product for their needs, not the only product available.

Our country has been based upon fair play and equal opportunity. Let's not give up those values now.

Thank you for your time,
 George Wagner
 Computers, Support, & Consulting
 6015 Glenbeigh Drive
 Sylvania, OH 43560
 (419) 882-0472
 FAX (419) 882-0253

MTC-00010246

From: Jeffrey Doyle
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 12:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General,
 I strongly oppose Massachusetts' involvement in trying to alter the proposed Microsoft settlement.

Stop listening to competitors who are avoiding the truth.

Jeff Doyle
 Sonexis
 70 Franklin Street
 Boston, MA 02110
 (p) 617.531.8072
 (f) 617.897.7898
 jdoyle@sonexis.com
 www.sonexis.com

MTC-00010247

From: VictorWBolie@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 1:02pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Honorable Renata B. Hesse,
 Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice,

601 D Street NW, Suite 1200,
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

The Attorney General of the State of Iowa, Thomas Miller, JD, has suggested that I forward to your office my thoughts on the above case with respect to the DOJ objective (2), i.e. "to spark competition in this industry".

I am a recently retired engineering professor, with earlier experience in computers & electronics at Collins Radio Company, Cedar Rapids, IA and as Chairman of the Electrical & Computer Engineering Department at the University of New Mexico—and listed in Who's Who in America. With respect to the pending Microsoft antitrust case, I would like to offer my support for long-needed competition in the design of better and more open computer operating systems.

Forty-five years ago with the help of a well qualified engineering team I developed, with approval and cooperation from the Cedar Rapids IBM office, a computer operating system specialized to handle the mathematical equations routinely used by scientists and engineers like those at Collins. The key to its long string of successes was IBM's permission to study the detailed "innards" of their business machine processor & storage hardware, to enable the development of an optimized (and easy to use) set of simple links to the outside world. In all of the years elapsed since then, I have not seen an operating system of comparable capability and simplicity—even with the subsequent major improvements in hardware speed, memory, printers, telelinks, and mouse-controlled displays. A few software companies, under Microsoft Windows restrictions, have tried to produce mathematically adequate programs for equation computations, graphical plotting, and scientific text composition—but in my view they all lack user flexibility and are clumsy to use.

For example, for years in Windows, to even shut OFF the machine you have to press START, press SHUT DOWN, press OK. And you cannot even delete the "MSN Internet Access" icon advertising Microsoft. I have been unable to find any mathematical capability above the level of simple (and

clumsy) arithmetic. The add-on called Visual Basic is totally inadequate in my judgment. Also, real privacy and security on the internet are fictional. Cookies and unapproved sales of your interest profile should be outlawed—no one should be able to load anything into your machine without your specific approval of the text in advance every time. Almost any software specialist could quickly remedy these and other defects if he or she could have open access to the programming code at the fundamental chip level.

In order to foster the commercial competition necessary for the evolution of new ideas in operating system software, I believe that any settlement with Microsoft should require a COMPLETELY stripped down operating system that makes it easy for anyone to develop his or her own way of handling equations, data, text, graphs, pictures, sound, and interfaces to lab bench equipment. This would quickly clear out the impediments to the development of new economic growth in the computer hardware and software markets. For example, if linked to a simplified "open book" Windows operating system, an improved-and-flexibilized version of the True Basic compute & plot system developed years ago at Dartmouth would in my opinion result in rapidly expanding markets in science, engineering, and education.

Thank you for considering my rather elementary contribution. After all these years I am still hoping for a remedy that does more than simply resolving the current internet-access problem.

Victor W. Bolie, PhD
4440 Morris Street NE # 334
Albuquerque NM 87111

MTC-00010248

From: Golden, Steve
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 1:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement 7026 Via Ostones Carlsbad, CA 92009-6614 January 11, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The antitrust lawsuit leveled against Microsoft by the Federal Government was completely unfounded and totally unjustified. However, since a settlement was reached between the parties, it should be accepted and finalized by the courts as soon as the public comment period ends.

I personally feel the main tenets of the settlement go too far, are not fair to Microsoft and hurt the ideals of free enterprise and capitalism. Microsoft could easily go on fighting this thing out in the courts for years. However, Microsoft has very nobly agreed to accept and abide by the terms of the settlement instead of wasting millions of taxpayer dollars in round after round of court battle with the Federal Government.

For all intents and purposes the Federal Government won this case and should be very pleased with the outcome. The fact that Microsoft will now be forced to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows so as to promote non-

Microsoft software programs that compete with programs included in Windows is proof that the Federal Government has met its objective. Additionally, Microsoft will be forced to document and disclose its various interfaces that are internal to Windows' operating system products—a first in an antitrust settlement.

Furthermore, Microsoft must make available to its competitors any protocols implemented in Windows' operating system products that are used to interoperate natively with any Microsoft server operating system. Finally, Microsoft has agreed to a three-person Technical Committee that will monitor Microsoft's compliance with the settlement and assist with dispute resolution. The government did the same thing to Bell Telephone Company back in the late 1970%. The results were tragic and I fear that the government did not take into account the future impact and this too will have a tragic effect on technology and the entire world. It appears that the Federal Government, at taxpayer's expense, won't stand for progress and will do everything it can to penalize or destroy the guy "out front," such is the case with Microsoft. Microsoft has transformed the face of the planet for the better and should be left alone once and for all. Please finalize this settlement as soon as possible. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Steven Golden

MTC-00010249

From: Rich and Bonnie DiBlasi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:07pm
Subject: abuse
stop the foolishness already . . . leave micro.alone to go about the business of making the econ. strong again. . . .
rich d.

MTC-00010250

From: randy ellis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
To whom it concerns
I feel as a consumer that I May be able to purchase a product such as a computer, that I should be able to have certain choices of what is loaded onto my computer, application or operating system. It's bad business when I Buy a car, that I do not have a choice of interior or exterior colors, Options like A/C, P/W, P/L, sunroof, etc. I do have a choice to goto another manufacturer. but when there is shadey dealings going on that a manufacturer cannot offer dual boot operating systems or a choice, that the consumers get left out, as well hurt small business such as (Be inc.) Which I think was greatly harmed by microsoft, and Be's Operating System being a breakthrough before Microsoft's and Apple's recent released Operating Systems. I currently use it now, and have been using it for a couple of years. I think it is absolutely the best Operating System available and will never stop using it. However I do have to use my Windows98SE for somethings due to limited drivers, largely due to Microsoft's monopoly, (because the company's fail to write the

driver's because they know Microsoft rules the market). I would like to see the BeOS or equivalent back into the market place, but there is no hope of success if the following issues aren't addressed: examples: open Office file formats, Win32 APIs, make dual-boot options mandatory, etc . . ."

Thankyou
Randy

MTC-00010251

From: gclen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Approval of the Microsoft Settlement will clear the way for continued growth in an industry that has completely stalled out over the past 3 years. It should be obvious to you by now that Microsoft's innovations in software drive the rest of the industry to produce more and better hardware and software products. Without that drive, the entire industry languishes for lack of direction, which is where we have all been lately.

The release of Windows XP is a good start toward recovery. I am using the product and have to say that Microsoft has some work to do to get it into the mainstream market. Nevertheless, any new operating system creates opportunities for other innovative products which either address the new problems caused by the new Microsoft product or take advantage of the new capabilities offered by the new Microsoft product. In all cases, the release will spur competitors to develop new products. Notice that while the case was ongoing and no great innovative MS products hit the market, no other competitors emerged from the background to take the lead. The entire industry just sat on the sidelines.

I say Lets Get On With It! Approve the Settlement and let the market do what it is going to do. There are plenty of discerning software users who will give Microsoft a hard time about their products without the government involved.

Margaret Felts

MTC-00010252

From: imagsmi@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please drop this case and let this company continue to serve the people. It has a good business record, and just because it is a rich company should not be prosecuted according to the desires of others. Let them make their millions, and serve the computer age.

Wilda I. Dixon
Rockledge, Florida 32955

MTC-00010253

From: Laurence Lewitt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Attorney General John Ashcroft US Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to urge you and your office to allow the recent court settlement with Microsoft to stand on its own merits. I

strongly believe that the original antitrust litigation was a total farce and completely unnecessary. It appears that the government is persecuting successful corporations at the behest of the company's competitors. That is WRONG.

The settlement is a fair one and was reasonably negotiated over an over extended period of time. The agreement contains provisions that maintain Microsoft's accountability to the industry and, unfortunately, the to government as well. Microsoft will share information about the internal interfaces of Windows with its competitors, enabling them to more easily place their own software on the operating system.

In addition to the state support for the settlement, there are too many important national priorities that need your attention, beyond the continued review of a successful business entity. With the ongoing war, a destabilized national economy and a faltering international political environment, I would hope you would allow this settlement to move forward and concentrate on the bigger more important picture.

Very truly yours,
Laurence G. Lewitt,
69 The Circle,
Glen Head, N.Y. 11545

MTC-00010254

From: Dave Hedger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:31pm
Subject: Microsoft antitrust case

I, like most people who use computers, feel like the antitrust lawsuit against Microsoft was not well-founded from the start. Consumers have in fact benefited greatly from Microsoft and their Windows software. The lawsuit was initiated by disgruntled and jealous competitors, and joined by states who, like sharks, smelled blood in the water. The whole fiasco was a great perturbation in the economy, and contributed significantly to the bursting of the technology bubble and bear market that followed. Now it's time to admit the mistake and move on. Continuing the lawsuit is only prolonging the recovery, as investors nationwide await the result. My advice is to consummate the negotiated settlement hammered out between Microsoft and the DOJ. Do the USA a favor: let's move on.

Dave Hedger

MTC-00010255

From: Rob Steinbach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:37pm
Subject: About the proposed barring deposition disclosure for Microsoft

Dear Sirs:

If Microsoft was to get their way, allowing pretrial depositions to be prevented from public disclosure, then I think it would be a disservice to the entire justice system.

I was taught in childhood that nearly the entire American justice process was supposed to be open, with some notable exceptions, not secret courts that effectively prevent defense, or prosecution, of the defendant.

I don't believe that Microsoft's pretrial depositions fall into one of these exceptions.

Since very little of the depositions will deal with actual trade secrets, then I don't see how Microsoft could reasonably expect the judge to uphold their requests.

I urge that the judge consider the nature of the request and keep in mind the need for the most open trial she can have, as permitted by law and common sense.

Sincerely,
Rob Steinbach
Programmer/Analyst
Ideal Chemical and Supply, Co.
4025 Air Park Street
Memphis, TN 38118

MTC-00010256

From: Paul Nendick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

I'm a computer software engineering professional and am concerned by Microsoft's monopoly in my field of business. Their business practices, corporate ethos and products all threaten the Freedom of Speech.

The lynchpin for this is the popular Microsoft Word file format. Word (and other Microsoft Office) files trap each and every thought expressed in them by storing them in a proprietary, binary file format.

Only Microsoft products can correctly and consistently decipher these and no other software products can or ever will be able to do this. Microsoft has gone to great lengths to obscure and incorrectly document these file formats. Each word and thought expressed in these formats is a prisoner to Microsoft's future whimsy. Today these file formats cost no money to view, but will they in the future? Can we take this sort of risk?

I have personally investigated these issues as have hundreds of other programmers and we have all come to the same conclusion—Microsoft Office is and always will be the only software that can use these files.

There is a good discussion of this matter found here: <http://www.newsforge.com/article.pl>

To illustrate the importance of open standard formats for information exchange in binary formats such as these, one need look no further than the Internet for a shining example. I can use a Macintosh to view a webpage servered on a Sun server written by a Linux user. All this communication occurs flawlessly over a myriad different vendors' hardware. If Microsoft had understood the Internet better in it's formative stages, I'm certain we would not enjoy the remarkable open forum for ideas that the Internet is today.

A possible solution to this matter is to require Microsoft to fully support open, standard file formats for each of it's products. These formats can readily be designed in the same environment that forged the standards that hold the Internet together (IEEE) or the formats designed by the open source OpenOffice using the open XML specifications could be chosen: <http://xml.openoffice.org/>

In addition to making Microsoft support such a format(s), I believe it would be beneficial for the Justice department to

recommend that the version of file format decided upon be the standard format used by the US government for its electronic document publishing.

If you like me to elaborate on these or any related issues, please contact me at this email address or at my home:

Paul Nendick
1420 West Fulton #2
Chicago, IL 60607
Sincerely,
Paul Nendick

MTC-00010257

From: Jeffrey Liang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I applaud you for your settlement with Microsoft. The settlement is fair and in the consumers' best interests.

Microsoft may dominate the desktop market, but the PC is no longer the paradigm for computing. Thus, the anti-trust case has become almost a moot point. Government intervention would have undoubtedly shaken the software industry. In a time of economic uncertainty, drastic remedies may not be the best medicine.

As a software engineer, I may not like Microsoft. But I approve of your settlement nonetheless. Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Liang
203 E 31st St Apt 306
Austin, TX 78705

MTC-00010258

From: Myles J. Swift
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ,

I want to put in my two cents on the Microsoft case. We are a small software developer. Never has any company other than Microsoft provided so much help to an industry. When CD players were new and very expensive, Microsoft sold thousands of them to developers at a loss to start the CD market. When voice systems started to come in they did the same thing. They practically gave away what were \$500 to \$600 boards to get people started on voice programming.

Before Microsoft every computer manufacturer had a unique format. Floppy disks would only play in one brand of machine. Differing operating systems meant that we had to customize the program for each brand of hardware. Our software retailed for \$3,995 in 1982. A better product sells today for \$1,000.

With the cost of living changes the price differential is at least 8 to 1. Microsoft enabled the average end user of our products to save \$7,000 on the price of a program compared to what it would cost without standards. This makes a case for how much Microsoft has helped consumers.

If Microsoft made computers and did the complete bundle I could see the merits of the case.

Right now Sun, Apple and IBM produce and sell these items direct: operating systems, hardware, networking components and applications. Microsoft sells operating

systems and applications. Microsoft products are less expensive after distributor and retailer markup than the products sold direct by the other companies.

If their products did not have a good price/performance ratio, they would not succeed. I can see some merits in the case for how they worked with large hardware manufacturers. I cannot see any case for the public having been harmed. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Myles J. Swift
Computer Assistance Inc.
Creswell, OR 97426
auto/truck repair management
software since 1977
voice 541-895-3347

MTC-00010259

From: John R. Munn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 1:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sir/Madam;

I strongly oppose the DoJ proposed settlement with MicroSoft as it does not address the core issues of marketing misconduct and anti competitiveness. It will not result in a more competitive industry nor even in a better product from MicroSoft.

As a 30+ year programmer and a user of MicroSoft products for 13+ years I know what I am talking about technically. MicroSoft products are pretty and incorporate many innovative ideas (some great in practice and some disastrous). However, the performance and stability is such that if I had produced them and did not correct the problems in short order I would, justifiably, be replaced. With no significant market share competition, MicroSoft has no compelling reason to improve their products beyond keeping them pretty for the sales department with a new looking version periodically (without ever fixing the underlying problems).

If I as a private citizen continually violated agreements with the Justice Department (or any government agency) I would be jailed. If there were a small business which violated the laws to the extent that MicroSoft has it would be shut down and possibly have its principals jailed. What would not happen is having an agreement drawn up based on "what can you say that you will do that will sound like some action has been taken?"

While I do not advocate the destruction of MicroSoft and am ambivalent on it's breakup. I do know that effective (underlined) action must be taken to 1) restrict future unlawful action on MicroSoft's part, 2) some punitive steps for past misdeeds, and 3) provide a competitive environment for the entire industry. The current proposal addresses none of the foregoing effectively, if at all.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
John R. Munn
Miami, FL 33157

MTC-00010260

From: Bud Levinger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand that the Justice Dept. is taking public comments regarding the proposed settlement of the Microsoft monopoly case.

It is my opinion that the proposed settlement is probably about as fair as it is going to get. I further feel it is in the interest of our Country and of the consumers of Microsoft products to have this controversy settled now—rather than to drag on for an indefinite period.

So I am in favor of the Justice Dept. accepting the settlement as it now stands.

Thank you for carefully considering my opinion.

Harold Levinger
1235 Yale Place
Minneapolis, MN 55403

MTC-00010261

From: Raymond Pettitt
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Raymond Pettitt
808 Kennedy Ave.
Va. Beach, Va 23451-1142
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Raymond C. Pettitt

MTC-00010262

From: Alan Bargmeyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We are a retired couple and use our computer daily. We don't know of anyone that feels they have been harmed or cheated by Microsoft. Their products are fairly priced and extremely well designed. We were not brought up using a computer and are

thankful to Microsoft for making things so simple for us to learn and use. Their customer service is provided without charge and is available 24/7 to swiftly help us with any problems that may occur. We are not interested in having the DOJ support Microsoft competitors so they can provide "innovations" that the market doesn't want or need. Please support the current settlement and let Microsoft get on with producing the fine products we need.

While we do not believe Microsoft is cheating consumers, we do feel the oil companies are using their power to keep prices unreasonable high and the DOJ could help consumers by investigating their practices.

Sincerely,
Alan & Janet Bargmeyer

MTC-00010263

From: Steve Miller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement 9199 S. Fox
Fire Way Highlands Ranch, Colorado
80126 January 11, 2002 Attorney General
John Ashcroft US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing first to congratulate you on reaching a settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case. I would like to see you make sure this settlement is completed.

The settlement that was reached will create more competitiveness in the IT industry. This settlement requires Microsoft to share both internal interfaces and formerly secret code with competing software firms. This means that the competitors will have unprecedented access to Microsoft code and be able to compete as never before. Those that claim this settlement is weak are simply wrong.

Full implementation of this settlement should be a priority for your people.

I appreciate you taking time to consider my views on this issue.

Sincerely,
Steve Miller

MTC-00010264

From: Cottrill, Carole
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 2:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Case January 11,
2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft US
Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania
Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am a great believer in the American dream—working hard, believing in yourself, pursuing something that is yours alone—and the rewards that will result from these principles. Bill Gates, through Microsoft, followed his dream and achieved more than anyone, even probably him, believed possible. He has since been punished for this by having to spend more than three years in court. Your office too has faced hardship and expense in this case.

The Department of Justice brought an antitrust case against Microsoft three years ago, charging monopolistic practices; i.e. his products were too good; hence, people

bought too many, ignoring other firms' products. The case was eventually settled, with Microsoft acquiescing to the Department of Justice's demands, and satisfying many of Microsoft's competitors' desires.

Microsoft will, for example, share software information with its competitors and allow them to place their software on the Windows operating system. Microsoft and the Department of Justice have made an equitable settlement. The American people want to move on. I want to see an end to federal action in this case, and the settlement is the best option to end it.

Sincerely,
C. Cottrill

MTC-00010265

From: Terry Cornelisse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough! Take this settlement and move on!!!

Jim & Terry cornelisse

MTC-00010266

From: ComdoreGeo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the name of Justice, U.S. principals, and to stop wasting our tax dollars please accept the settlement now,

George J. Deutsch,
5060 Key Largo Circle,
Punta Gorda, FL, 33955
Dennis Whittaker 34
Jeweff Hill, Berkshire, NY 13736
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft,

Department of Justice
950 Penna. Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing in support of the settlement with Microsoft. The changes it requires will restore fair competition and prevent future antitrust violations.

Microsoft has agreed to release the interfaces that make Windows work with software applications to competitors, meaning that other companies can figure out how to better write programs for Windows. Naturally, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against software or hardware developers who develop or promote software that take advantage of this new information. Plus, Microsoft has agreed not to enter into any agreements that force third parties to distribute any Windows technology exclusively. Clearly, these restrictions will benefit the consumers as well as the technology sector as a whole.

This settlement is in the best interests of the State of New York, The U.S., and the economy because it will stop any anticompetitive behavior before it starts. Continued litigation against Microsoft will put millions of dollars into a case that has already seen a fair and reasonable end.

Let the IT industry concentrate on business as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Dennis Whittaker

MTC-00010267

From: Adam Shostack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice:
Doubtless you will get a large number of long, complex comments regarding this case. I'll keep this to the point.

I have read through the many documents in the US vs Microsoft case, and I am disappointed and concerned about the weakness of the proposed remedies. Microsoft has violated the spirit and the letter of the law. The proposed settlement does not sufficiently penalize them, control or limit their behavior, or deter them from future anti-competitive acts. Please ensure that the case results in a substantive penalty, and imposes strong controls on Microsoft's future activity.

Yours,
Adam Shostack

MTC-00010268

From: JonKai@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

this article below shows that MSFT has peddled for favors from President Bush on down to congressmen, and Attorney General Ashcroft..... if you approve this settlement, you will be flying in the face of the Tunney ACT..... please consider what you are doing, this settlement does nothing to keep MSFT from violating the law.... it doesn't even address all eight of the findings of the appeals court..... please use your power to stop this blight on justice.....

Microsoft Fails To Disclose Congressional Lobbying

By Robyn Weisman, www.NewsFactor.com
According to several legal experts mentioned in news reports, Microsoft (Nasdaq: MSFT—news) failed to inform federal judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly that it lobbied members of Congress in relation to its ongoing antitrust case. Court filings reveal only that Microsoft contacted members of the executive branch of the federal government, not anyone in Congress, despite reports to Congress that the company spent US\$300,000 on lobbying in the first half of 2001 alone.

AT&T Didn't; Why Should We?

Defending itself against the allegations, Microsoft contended that AT&T, when it was embroiled in its own antitrust case in the early 1980s, also failed to inform its federal judge of its lobbying actions toward Congress, despite a 1974 statute that requires companies to do so.

That statute, known as the Tunney Act, was designed to prevent companies like Microsoft and the old AT&T from peddling favors to government employees in exchange for more leniency.
jon.

MTC-00010269

From: Billie Love
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justices:
The people of the United States have had to fund this prosecution against Microsoft. I

think the settlement that has been reached is in the best interest of the people. Please don't let any of the State Attorney Generals continue this litigation. I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this litigation.

Billie Love
8665 Springhill School Rd.
Belgrade, Mt. 59714

MTC-00010270

From: Allen Wiesen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 2:56pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department and nine states reflects a reasoned approach to remediation of market inequities. We fully support the settlement, and are disappointed that the remaining nine states have not yet seen the obvious merits of the agreement.

Dr. and Mrs. Allen E. Wiesen,
Sarasota, FL

MTC-00010271

From: Rodger Sorenson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The purpose of this message is to let you know that I support an immediate settlement of the Microsoft case without any further delays and/or litigation. This issue has dragged out too long to the benefit of nobody except the lawyers and it needs to be closed as soon as possible. This is America-lets treat our innovative companies like Microsoft like we appreciate what they have done for our country.

Thank you,
Rodger D. Sorenson,
5370 W. Flying Circle,
Tucson, AZ 85713.

MTC-00010272

From: Dwight A. Ernest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:02pm
Subject: Comments in Microsoft v. US Gov

To whom it may concern,
Here are my comments in the matter of Microsoft v. US Government:

The proposed settlement does not sufficiently penalize Microsoft, nor does it sufficiently control or limit their behavior, nor deter them from future anti-competitive acts. Please ensure that the case results in a substantive penalty, and imposes strong controls on Microsoft's future activity.

Yours most sincerely,
—Dwight A. Ernest
Internet Engineering Manager
551 Main Street
Boylston MA 01505-1313
dwight@significant.com
Phone: 508.826.7335

MTC-00010273

From: William G. Wizner
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 2:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

William G. Wizner
8544 Stone Harbor Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89145-5707
January 11, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

William G. Wizner

January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to voice my concern on the recent events behind the Microsoft Antitrust case. I am against any further government action. What I do not understand is the punishing of Microsoft for producing a quality product. Under our system of free enterprise, we are free to purchase and use any computer products we wish. It just so happens that Microsoft has created far better products than other competing companies have been able to.

Can you imagine that use of the Internet by ordinary citizens would have been possible without a common platform for communications? In addition to the superior software Microsoft has created, the company has created a niche in the marketplace that in the past decade has brought a huge amount of growth to our economy, not to mention the standardization of computer software programs that have allowed computerization to become part of everyday life.

As an investment portfolio manager, I represent clients who have invested hard-earned savings into American companies like Microsoft whose financial success benefited ordinary Americans willing to invest in these companies. The additional litigation risk to shareholders has risen dramatically in this country as tort lawyers, including state Attorneys General, seek deep corporate pockets. It is no coincidence that the peak in

our financial markets coincided with the Justice Department's announcement in March 3000 that it would seek to break up Microsoft.

Microsoft has agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows to promote non-Microsoft software programs. Microsoft has agreed to design future versions of Windows to make it easier for non-Microsoft software to be installed within Windows, and Microsoft has even agreed to a technical committee to monitor future compliance. I doubt if other firms would do as much. It is shameful that companies like Microsoft should be punished for their success—whatever happened to the American dream? I urge you to support this settlement.

Sincerely,

Renee Smith

MTC-00010274

From: Donald Phillippi
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Donald Phillippi
4 Sand Island Acc. Road #40
Honolulu, HI 96819-4355
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Donald L. Phillippi

MTC-00010275

From: bdouglas@hamakua.
Central.Sun.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:02pm
Subject: Paragraph 24 -27

To whom it may concern,

Reference paragraphs 24—27 I would like to comment. Three years ago I tried to buy

a PC from Dell and did not want windows. I went to their web site and found what I wanted. So I called up Dell and asked if I could buy the PC without Windows and at first they said no but then agreed to. I then inquired about the price without Windows and it was the same as with Windows. It was explained to me by one of the sales persons that Dell was forced by Microsoft to sell a Windows license with every PC, regardless if the OS was every installed or used. So not only do they tie I.E. and other applications to the PC but the OS as well.

Bob Douglas
303 475-2769

MTC-00010276

From: peter@matrix.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR,peter@matrix.net@inetgw
Date: 1/11/02 3:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ms Hesse:

I would like to express my opposition to the proposed settlement in the Microsoft Antitrust case. I believe that the offense against the American version of doing business and against the American people is far to great for the DOJ to treat it in this fashion. I believe that the points raised by the Attorneys General of the various dissenting states are far more pertinent than those of the DOJ. While the Court of Appeals vacated a portion of the original judgment, they retained all the conclusions relating to Microsoft's exclusionary and anti-competitive acts. I believe the proposed settlement treats these acts too lightly.

Sincerely,

Peter H. Salus, Ph.D.

MTC-00010277

From: Marla Araki
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530
email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
<mailto:microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>
Fax: (202) 307-1454 —OR— (202) 616-9937

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to

state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends. Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marla Araki
John Priebe

MTC-00010278

From: jordan pollack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:14pm

Subject: ms settlement

I am opposed to the settlement. Your agreement helps Dell, Compaq, IBM, HP, Gateway, etc, the sellers of computers who have had to deal with Microsoft's favoritism and capriciousness in pricing over the years, and it perhaps helps application vendors who want to preserve interoperability across Microsoft's upgrades (like wordperfect (dead), Lotus (dead) Netscape (dead) Real (almost dead) Palm (almost dead)).

But I believe that as long as Microsoft can dictate when and how much an upgrade costs for what has become a public standard like the electric or telephone socket, the nation will continue to be fleeced. Your settlement does nothing here.

If it were simply made illegal for the vendor or a proven monopoly product to charge for an upgrade, the vendor could not profit from bundle in clones of competitive products like outlook, explorer, mediaplayer etc, expecting to get their fee from forced upgrades and market capture. They would have to compete more fairly against unbundled goods. And, instead of monopoly in every area of software through competitive upgrades, secret formats for files, we would arrive through evolution of competition at public standards for file formats (like word and html and poperpoint) and oligarchies on user interface (like wordstar, wordperfect, and word, all working on the same files, or Powerpoint, Freelance, and Persuasion, working on the same presentation format!) Finally, the old licenses on junked computers (with appropriate certification) would become valuable in trade instead of worthless.

If you do fail to close this agreement, please read <http://jordanpollack.com/softwaremarket> for a free market solution.

Professor Jordan B. Pollack
Dynamic & Evolution Machine Org
Computer Science Department
FaxPhone/Lab: 781-736-2713/3366
MS018, Brandeis University
<http://www.demo.cs.brandeis.edu>
Waltham Massachusetts 02454
e-mail: pollack@cs.brandeis.edu

MTC-00010279

From: John.Borger@sun.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:21pm
Subject: A monopoly by any other name...

Hello,

I'd like to voice my dissatisfaction over the United States v. Microsoft Settlement. I do not feel that the proposed actions will do anything to stop Microsoft from wielding their monopoly power. Every time there is a new release of the product, you see companies crushed.

Unless Microsoft is broken into separate companies (OS, Browser, Word Processing, Spreadsheet) they will continue use Company A's technology in one release, stifle them, and then do what they wish in the next release (like the Kodak issue going on in XP).

I think what was agreed upon is less than a slap on their wrist and more of a slap in the face of the consumer. Through monopoly power and extortion (which is still against the law, isn't it?) , they nearly crushed Netscape. Have you ever wondered what

happened to the Lotus Suite? It wasn't an inferior product that succumbed to superior product.

Furthermore, why should I be FORCED to pay an additional \$99 for a computer that has MS Windows loaded on it? I want to run Linux. I should not be forced into paying for something that I do not want.

Thank you,
John Borger

MTC-00010280

From: Roger Rush
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General

Please see my comments regarding the Microsoft Settlement

Sincerely,
Roger Rush
Network Source One

January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am very glad about Microsoft not being split up by the federal government. As president of a network service provider company that depends on standardization, continuity, and reliability, I believe if Microsoft had been broken up requiring me to utilize 3 to 5 different companies for my needs, doing business would be very difficult. This is because things would no longer be one hundred percent compatible.

Microsoft's operating system is a seamless product and is very easy to work with, which allows my company to operate smoothly. To suddenly be forced by the government to alter this system would, quite simply, be extremely strenuous.

I understand some of Microsoft's original adversaries are against the settlement and are trying very hard to disrupt it before the court can finalize it. I suppose this is due to the fact that the government did not break up Microsoft. These entities will not be satisfied and probably will not give up their relentless pursuit until it is. This is unfortunate, because the settlement is totally fair. For example, Microsoft will change its licensing agreements with companies, and redesign Windows operating systems to make non-Microsoft features more accessible. I only hope it is finalized as soon as possible and that you do everything within your power to see that it is. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Roger Rush
President

MTC-00010281

From: Geudner, Michael A (Michael)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:34pm
Subject: WAY TO GO- MICROSOFT IS A MONOPOLY THAT SHOULD BE BROKEN UP!

MTC-00010282

From: Harry Bardal
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Madam

I have watched the Microsoft antitrust trial with great interest. As a Canadian citizen I have been somewhat frustrated at my governments reluctance to act on what I believe to be Microsoft's anticompetitive practices. The ball seems to be in the court of the American justice system and my hope is that a fair remedy is found. I have used Microsoft's products and continue to, many are useful business tools. I do feel however that their business practices have been predatory and unfair to smaller businesses trying to compete in an already cutthroat industry. Although Microsoft succeeds in establishing standards that channel and consolidate computer usage and facilitate communication, the standards always proprietary and always seem to be vertically integrated with other Microsoft products. Perhaps more regrettably, these standards are often substandard. A phrase heard often in my area of business is "Microsoft Lock-in" It refers to the inability to use third party software in concert with Microsoft products. This combined with real virus problems and rather egregious security flaws makes many Microsoft products a necessary evil for many people even in the face of superior competing products.

I have seen some intelligent, well designed software try to compete with the Microsoft dominance and fail. Microsoft has expressed it needs to be allowed to innovate. Few Microsoft are truly innovative or remarkable and yet Microsoft's practices have quelled or absorbed other companies that have innovated. The technology sector has been a driving force in the American economy and by extension the Canadian economy and it deserves some scrutiny.

I believe that personal computers are the single most important tool of our age. They are the first example of true multi-use and not single-use technology. Many companies will have something to offer as the industry matures. I hope these companies might dare to innovate, compete and contribute to the Microsoft line of operating systems as well as Linux, Mac OS, Unix and dozens of other variants. I hope that this is allowed to flourish in a atmosphere of fair competition.

Regards
Harry Bardal
Vancouver, BC

MTC-00010283

From: Bill York
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

Upon hearing about the solutions for the settlement in the Microsoft case I was appalled to hear that a company that has committed so many grievous acts against other smaller corporations would be handed so light a sentence.

Perhaps the one part of the settlement that disturbs me the most is the fact that Microsoft donate \$1 billion in refurbished computers and software to schools to use. While at first glance this may seem like a very noble cause in truth this settlement enables Microsoft to leverage their monopoly even more.

What will happen is that the refurbished computers will consist of PC's and the software will be Microsoft based software.

Now being a software engineer myself I'm very well acquainted with the business model when it comes to producing software. There is an initial large cost up front for the design, development, and testing of the software. But once this cost has been fulfilled and the software developed the costs associated with mass producing the software, often involving copying the software code to a CD, printing of any manuals, and then the boxing and shipping of the product are relatively inexpensive. Using this cycle it is fairly easy for Microsoft to refurbish the cost of the initial investment. But because of this methodology they can easily produce a billion dollars worth of software and yet barely have their bottom line impacted because of the cheap costs associated with producing the CD, manuals, and packaging.

If you truly want to penalize Microsoft then make them pay \$1 billion dollars to be distributed to the school systems so they can spend the money how they see fit. These individual school districts can then go out and purchase a non-PC devices and software produced by other companies than Microsoft. This is in turn will help foster competition and will come much closer to realizing the goals of this antitrust lawsuit in the first place.

Thank you for reading,
William York

P.S. The comments sent to the Dept of Justice does NOT reflect my employer's opinion and is solely my own opinion.

William York
1254 Bluebird St.
Brighton, CO 80601

MTC-00010284

From: mmikowsk@demai05.mw.mediaone.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:

As I have not received a validation from my prior posting, I again respectfully submit this proposal:

I am currently an owner of an Information Systems and software development firm. Based on my firm's experience in this field, I propose the following adjustments to the Microsoft settlement:

1. PROPOSAL A
- a. OVERVIEW

The US Government (and other governments) should embrace open standards for file formats for commodity applications such as Word Processing, Spreadsheets, Database, Graphics, and Mail.

- b. PROPOSED ACTIONS

* A national or international standards committee be formed to oversee commodity file formats, much like the W3C.

* Formats be developed for Word processing, Spreadsheets, Database, Graphics, and Mail.

* These formats should be based on open, published standards that can only be extended through the committee.

* The US government adopt these standards as required for governmental correspondence.

* Software producers must show their tools are compatible with these standards before government agencies employ them.

* Software producers should be encouraged to publish their compliance to these standards.

c. REASONING

Microsoft's monopoly on the business desktop is not derived from its innate value of its operating systems, but by its anti-competative use of its monopoly to control proprietary formats used in commodity applications.

Microsoft Word, Excel, Outlook, and others employ proprietary formats controlled, and changed at will, by the company. Any attempt to use other tools to access or edit this data are hamstrung Microsofts propensity to change these formats at its whim. This is the core of its anti-competative practices.

Microsoft has shown a pattern of first embracing competing formats (such as WordPerfect, and Lotus 1-2-3) and, once market dominance has been ensured, have emphasized their own proprietary formats. This is a trend they have continued to this day. One only need to look at how their "extensions" of HTML standards are currently being used to block access from any other platform besides their own. In the past, we wrote on paper. There are hundreds of producers of pens and paper. Today, we often write in word processors and spreadsheets. Should only one company in the world control the access to the intellectual property we create? d.

IMPLEMENTATION The technology and software already exists to move this proposal to a reality in a very short time period. The US Government could change to open file formats with little pain by employing Star Office while saving untold millions in licensing costs. It can require all html document meet the W3C guidelines for HTML. The government would provide the impetus from moving its data, and that of the people, out from under the control of a private interest, and into open formats where we the people can access our own data without being required to purchase a Microsoft product to do so. e. REFERENCES

Open File Formats: <http://www.computerworld.com/cwi/community/story/0,3201,NAV65-1797-STO64689,00.html> Star Office, which employs open, XML formats with excellent capabilities: [http://www.sun.com/staroffice/6.0beta/;sessionid\\$ROHKZK4E1MJ0RAMTA1FU3NQ](http://www.sun.com/staroffice/6.0beta/;sessionid$ROHKZK4E1MJ0RAMTA1FU3NQ) The W3C group has provided standards which has allowed dozens of competing web browsers to be successfully developed:

<http://www.w3.org>

Anyware Office, which employs XML-like file formats in a product which works extremely well

Anyware Office: <http://www.vistasource.com/products/anyware/office/>

f. DISCLAIMER We own Microsoft Office Professional. We manage dozens of Microsoft OS's and Office products. We have tested (and are impressed) with Star Office. We also use Anywhere Office in an office of 5 individuals. We have no other connection

with the companies or software presented above.

2. PROPOSAL B

a. OVERVIEW

The proposed settlement for providing Microsoft access to our children's and educators' minds is counter-productive to the good of the people and the government.

b. PROPOSED ACTIONS

* Require any software provided to US schools to be compliant with the requirements as set forth in Proposal A of this comment.

* Adjust the settlement so that Microsoft is responsible for providing hardware and funding only.

* Provide an independent body for determining the software and training employed by the schools.

c. REASONING

The proposed settlement to provide Microsoft software and training only further benefits the company, while displacing other firms such as Apple and RedHat. By taking the proposed value and applying it to hardware and funding only, the public is ensured to receive the value offered by Microsoft.

d. IMPLEMENTATION

I have no additional recommendations for implementation of this remedy at this time.

e. REFERENCES

The RedHat Counter Offer:
<http://www.redhat.com/about/presscenter/2001/press—usschools.html>

f. DISCLOSURE

We own Microsoft Windows 2000 and Mandrake Linux. We use RedHat Linux as our OS for web service development.

These are fair adjustments to the proposed settlement. They will provide innovative competition the like of which the industry has never seen.

I am available for discussion of these remedies at any time.

Respectfully Submitted

26 November 2001

Michael S. Mikowski

Managing Director, Uniphied Thought LLC

Dearborn, MI 48126

Tel 313-441-2579

Mobile 313-550-8406

CC:mdlug@radiusnet.net

MTC-00010285

From: MCMICHAEL, Ron (AAS)

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/11/02 3:42pm

Subject: LET THE SCHOOLS HAVE THEIR COMPUTERS

MTC-00010286

From: carrol townsend

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 3:58pm

Subject: MY OPINION

IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT THE US GOVERNMENT THINKS THAT THE PRICE OF PRODUCT SUCH AS DELIVERED BY MICROSOFT WOULD BE LESS EXPENSIVE IF BETTER

CONTROLLED BY THE FEDS. IT SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN THE SAME ARGUMENT WITH THE BREAKUP OF THE BELL SYSTEM.

THE US GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO PICK A BETTER FIGHT, ONE THAT COULD HELP RATHER THAN HINDER.

MTC-00010287

From: Ulstad, Gary

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/11/02 3:59pm

Subject: Stop beating them up.

It is nice to have them providing jobs and paying income tax in the United States. I do not know about you but, I like US companies leading the world.

Gary Ulstad

MTC-00010288

From: thejokis@juno.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 3:58pm

Subject: Microsoft and the State of Washington

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law.

Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case. These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends. Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers;

threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. & Mrs. Thomas A. Joki,
Mill Creek, WA

MTC-00010289

From: Chuck Burr

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/11/02 3:55pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think that this entire law suit is only because a few companies did not want competition and got in bed with the last administration. That aside, the Justice Department worked out a settlement that would help many children in this country. To give millions of people a few dollars is not an impact and by the time that money would get to the same poor schools it would be ten cents on the dollar. We need to move forward in this country and it is things like this Judge's ruling that will put this country into a real depression. I say move forward. This decision disappoints me, I know the Justice spent millions of our tax money to get here and now will spend even more if it has to go forward in a different direction....

Chuck Burr

Franchise Principal

Accountants Inc. Reno, NV

"Focused on Accounting and Financial Talent"

www.accountantsinc.com

MTC-00010290

From: Joseph Gregory

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/11/02 3:46pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Joseph Gregory

11 Valley, Lane

Wilkes-Barre, PA 18707-1735
 January 11, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Joseph Gregory

MTC-00010291

From: Justin Long
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 4:07pm

Personally, I think that all of this bullshit against Microsoft is ridiculously absurd. The only reason that the company is getting sued is because other incompetent people or businesses can't compete with the best in the business. Fuck all of you, jealousy is a sin, Bill Gates started Microsoft with no believers and now he's on top of the world and everyone wants a slice of his pie...yea, more money, more problems for Mr. Gates. Leave the man and his company alone, they have done wonders for the world of technology and just because he has what everyone else doesn't assholes wanna take it away from him....Pardon the swearing, but it's just another thing that is corrupted in this whole fucked up world that isn't run by leaders, or the people, but by the necessary evil called money. It's also good that all of the matters are being handled by the ongoing joke called the justice system...you won't beat Bill Gates, he's just gonna laugh at all of you stupid fucks from his position that, no matter how much you sue him, you will never attain. Have a great day.

MTC-00010292

From: hord, george
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 4:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft the Giant with the Battle
 Axe

To Whom it Concerns;
 My primary thoughts are:
 1) Microsoft has some allies because Microsoft helped them become rich by proving coat tails for the loyal or obedient.
 2) Microsoft has CRUSHED or rendered non existent any will to compete because of their marketing practices.
 3) There has never been a question about ability to innovate—Microsoft has never been or wanted to be the innovator, just the crusher. Let someone else lead and then CRUSH. Microsoft has ALWAYS copied technology or bought it, never innovated.
 4) Microsoft should be given absolute guidelines/mandate on what is operating system software what is internet software and what is application software. If USDOJ cannot do that then set up an independent panel that makes the decisions.

George Hord

MTC-00010293

From: Wesley Harrell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 4:13pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my opinion regarding the proposed Microsoft settlement. In short, I disagree with the provisions of the settlement, and I believe the current proposal lacks any real punishment to a company that has been found guilty in the past, as well as in the present case, and if unchecked will act in a similar manner in the future. A just settlement would include, but are not limited to, some of the items I list below.

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. 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, 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.

4. No settlement should include free Microsoft software to schools, or other needy organizations. This does nothing to decrease Microsoft's control over the computer market, and in fact increases their market share.

Regards,
 Wesley Harrell
 232 NW 4th Ave
 Gainesville, FL 32601

MTC-00010294

From: Peter Lewandowski

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 4:16pm
 Subject: I thought this was a monopoly
 investigation?

If Microsoft is a monopoly the main task should be to stop Microsoft from being a monopoly, if they are not then just leave them alone. If you go to McDonalds are they not allowed to sell Pepsi products, or Taco Bell sell Coke? Even if it's a franchise most are required by the agreement to sell one or the other product not both. Now I'm not a big Microsoft fan nor do I like Bill Gates, but if Bill made America believe that they have the only operating system good for him. I personally need to use it in business and it's a corporate directive. I would rather use something like LINUX but unfortunately there is little useful business software for it and we do not have the staff to support both LINUX and Microsoft.

I have an idea that the Justice Department seemed to overlook. Don't break Microsoft up but rather make them liable for security violations that "known issues" and the cost related to businesses that have a violation. Have a "Lemon Law" for bad software. Currently if a software company has a known bug that disrupts business, or forces a business to pay a fine, they don't get charged for that. Think about it this way, if you bought a car and the brakes didn't work wouldn't you sue the manufacturer for a defective product? Why don't software companies get held to that level of liability? If Microsoft had to reimburse companies for each worker's hours who had to restart their computer because Microsoft's software was written so badly they would be a very, very small software company fast and have a very small user installed base.

My two cents,
 Pete
 Atlanta, GA

MTC-00010295

From: Rush, Brad
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 4:17pm
 Subject: Settle Now

Get it over with. Your actions are giving them justification to charge even more for their software. Let free enterprise work.

Brad Rush, CMA, CFM, CBM—
 CNL Retirement Corp.
 Office: (407) 650-1010
 Fax: (407) 650-1022
 Cell: (407) 421-1003
 E-Mail: Office

<mailto:brush@cnlonline.com>
 Personal <mailto:brad@bradrush.com>

MTC-00010296

From: Ania Lewkowicz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 4:18pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
 To:

Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice

I was very saddened by the Microsoft settlement and how it seemed that all the evidence in the world could not break through that steel wall of a monopoly. I cringe to liken this case to the O.J. Simpson

trial, where the evidence was overwhelmingly in favor of his guilt, yet it seems as though the jury was somehow "jaded" to believe his story when the rest of the world thought of it as an open and shut case of spousal murder. In a way, this MS case is no different. How is it possible to see the plethora of proven instances of monopolistic behavior, yet to let them go with no more than a slap on the hand? I truly believe that Microsoft got off VERY easy, and as a consumer, I am frustrated by my inability to determine for myself the design and configuration of the initial screens displayed on the PC's being sold today. My choice is limited to either Windows or virtually nothing. And if that's not a monopoly, then I'm interested to hear another definition explaining what exactly that is.

Sincerely,
Ania Lewkowicz

MTC-00010297

From: Pouya Yadegar
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Case.

The premise that a company that makes money did it by cheating, lying and stealing and did it at the detriment of "people" is exactly the opposite of what happens. Anybody that makes money is HELPING and more importantly has the right to pursue their goals.

Your counter to that is that "what if they do it by cheating"? The answer is that the people get to vote with their \$\$, not the government by some chaotic mystical measurement that changes from day to day. If you want further clarification of this concept please review the results of communism/socialism countries like Russia and their results vs. (for the most part) democratic countries like the U.S.

The only "monopoly" that exists anywhere is one started by the government, subsidized by the government (See Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the USPS.) Microsoft had no government help and they need to be honored for their contribution to society. The entire country and even the WORLD needs to have a yearly celebration thanking Microsoft instead of Breaking their balls. If everybody pursued and achieved what Microsoft has done the world would be such a utopian place that is not even imaginable compared to our society today.

MTC-00010298

From: Kris Brinkerhoff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:28pm
Subject: DOJ vs Microsoft anti-trust case
To whom it may concern:

I believe that Microsoft needs to be punished just like any other company found guilty of practicing a monopoly. The industry usually has to conform to what they say they are going to support or not support in their operating system. To have your hardware item listed as being "made for Windows" gives you an edge over the competition.

As for their trying to appease the government by providing PCs to lower income students and schools, they should

actually provide Macintosh computers or cash otherwise they are again undercutting competition and widening their customer base and dependence/influence upon them once again.

Also if they have a piece of software on CD they can just duplicate the software on the CD. It is pretty much like being able to print their own money. They can copy as many as they want and call it 500 million in software because they are selling the license to use the software.

The damages should be paid in monetary figures not in software which can be produced once and published an infinite number of times.

Thank you for your time.
Kris
California: microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov
Connecticut:
attorney.general@po.state.ct.us
Florida: ag@oag.state.fl.us
Iowa: webteam@ag.state.ia.us
Kansas: GENERAL@ksag.org
Massachusetts: tom.reilly@ago.state.ma.us
Minnesota: attorney.general@state.mn.us
Utah: uag@att.state.ut.us
West Virginia: consumer@mail.wvnet.edu
US Dept of Justice-Microsoft anti-trust
comments:
Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
US Dept of Justice-other sites worldwide:
<http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/contact/otheratr.htm>
Kris Brinkerhoff
—ITS Help Desk Analyst
—California State University, Fresno

MTC-00010299

From: Fritzly
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

In my opinion it is time to close this unfortunate episode that only brought to the surface the many contradictions of our system. First we had a Judge so anti MS oriented that the trial reminded me the ones in Beria's time. In spite of that I still don't see what damage was caused to the consumers by MS behavior. I am a customer, I bought in 1995 Netscape Navigator and I paid it more or less \$35 when IE by MS was already free, why? Because it was a better product! After that Netscape failed to improve their software and I switch to IE because it became a better product. The most serious issue here is that tax payer money has been and it is being used to satisfy the request of MS competitors, who unable to create a better product are lobbying to harm the competition with me paying the bill to do this! This is a real scandal and must stop. Do you really believe that people are so stupid to believe that when MS competitors speak out they do it to protect consumers? Nobody who is awakens and active in our society believe it. The same fact that the only way to bring MS in court was to use a law more than eighty years old, a law created specifically to hit a certain company, a law involving the right to use natural resources and not, as MS case, to commercialize intellectual properties. Be very careful targeting the same idea of success, being smarter is not a sin as it is not being a

mediocrity, the real sin is pretend that as you are a mediocrity everybody else must stick at your same level. History books are full of examples of what I mean.

Best regards
Stefano Colasanti

MTC-00010300

From: Jon Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:37pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello,
My name is Jon Thompson, and I am a resident of Iowa (706 South Main, Woodward.)

I've recently read that the National Department of Justice has settled with Microsoft on a punishment. In my opinion, this settlement is much too light, and it will not restrict Microsoft's existing illegal practices.

The remedy should require Microsoft to:

1. Use open standards.

Microsoft has shown that they repeatedly use a technique of "embracing and extinguishing." Microsoft will embrace an open technology, then make changes that only Microsoft products can understand. The web is an example of this. Microsoft has implemented new, subtle, additions to HTML (the web's language) that only Microsoft browsers can read.

2. Make all applications available to alternate Operating Systems. Microsoft has kept other systems (Linux and Mac OS) out of businesses by limiting the available Microsoft software for those platforms. If MS was required to make—all—software available to at least two operating systems besides Windows, it would minimize that lock of their Monopoly.

Also, this would limit the pressure that Microsoft could impose on other companies. It is well known that Microsoft threatened to drop Mac OS support for Office unless Apple used Internet Explorer as the default browser. If MS was required to support two other operating systems for all applications, they wouldn't have this power.

I hope that Iowa is not one of the states that supports the current settlement, as it is not nearly hard enough.

Jon Thompson
706 South Main
Woodward, Iowa 50276

"They that give up essential liberty to obtain temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."—Benjamin Franklin

MTC-00010301

From: Jeff Powell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:36pm
Subject: microsoft settlement case

Its to bad that the judge of the microsoft settlement case regards capitalism as more important than education. What is this world coming to?

Aaron

MTC-00010302

From: Curt Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

I support the settlement proposed by the Bush administration.

AL GORE may have invented the internet, but Bill Gates is the one who made it possible for all of us to use it.

Quit spending tax payer moneys on the pursuit of more litigation.

Curtis Johnson
2511 M-140
Niles, MI
49120
curtis.johnson@mindspring.com

MTC-00010303

From: Robert C. Marshall
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:41pm
Subject: The Microsoft Ruling

Thank goodness—the judge that ruled against the Microsoft settlement can see the some of the anticompetitive effects that would result.

The original ruling is right: MS should be split up.

When IBM was in trouble in the 1960s and 1970s, they were not treated the same way MS would be treated should they be allowed to distribute PCs to schools. In those days, the law seemed aware enough to realize that capturing dominant market share at the level of the public schools would strengthen a company's competitive stranglehold on the computer industry considerably. It would also enable them to influence the market mindset of future generations in their favor. Why would it be any different, now?

Also, what about Apple? Shouldn't they be allowed to exist and to attempt to compete?

You should take a look at a number of MS's practices. Netscape has suffered. Clearly, MS's next targets are Sun Microsystems (Java), and any commercial Linux offering that might threaten their market share in the future.

MTC-00010304

From: Biondo, Ted HS-SNS
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft case comments

US Department of Justice,
A far greater threat to our country's free enterprise system, than any adjudicated monopolistic tendencies of Microsoft, is the precedent being set by members of Congress and State Attorneys General who have placed the financial goals of Microsoft's competitors, residing in their respective states, ahead of the American consumers! These "defenders" of competition are using the powers of their office, and the courts to intimidate and dictate restrictions on businesses in order to level what should remain a competitive playing field.

Microsoft created standard operating systems and application software that has decreased the price of consumer hardware and software, not increased it. Microsoft developed software processes that have brought computers to the masses using visual format, while creating millions of jobs in associated peripheral hardware equipment by simplifying those peripheral interfaces for nontechnical users. This is bad for the consumer?

Finally, in the global arena, foreign nations have created government financed

monopolies, and now a common currency, to compete with American corporations. To remain competitive, our manufacturing industries have been consolidating and outsourcing processes for years to those very same nations, resulting in the loss of American jobs and purchasing power. One of the few remaining successfully competitive businesses the USA holds in world commerce is the software service industry. Since this software monopoly "witch hunt" was begun by those who cannot compete in our free market without using their government officials to stifle competition, our overall ability to compete in the global market will be reduced and will inevitably drive the software service industry down the same road as its manufacturing counterparts.

Investors will not risk their capital in a marketplace controlled by political whim versus business scrutiny!

Terrorists from without will never damage our free enterprise system as much as the self-serving powers from within under the guise consumer protection! The Justice Department settlement of restrictions, the ban on exclusive contracts and disclosure of APIs goes far enough. Please end this charade. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this most important case,

Ted Biondo
(815) 226-5958

MTC-00010305

From: Joe Vislocky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:46pm
Subject: Microsoft's rejected settlement

I believe the judge was acting in a well considered manner. It seems to me that to punish a company whose practices have been deemed anti-competitive by giving them the means by which to further their monopolistic strategies was ill conceived in the first place. I know in my mind and many of my colleague's, it appeared that certain parties in the government had switched sides and were in fact in collusion with Microsoft.

Joseph S. Vislocky
IT Director
Wilmar Corporation
jvislocky@mcwil.com

MTC-00010306

From: Roger Lathrop
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

Yet another Federal Judge has misunderstood the Microsoft situation. I have owned apples and IBM compatibles. I've worked with dos, Windows, & Linux. Microsoft simply has a superior product. I was very happy to have a free browser included. In point of fact, I prefer Netscape, so I downloaded that with Microsoft's free browser and was in business in a few minutes.

My state (Iowa) has made a bad decision based on politics and not on fact. The settlement should be approved because the suit is ill founded and harmful to our economy. If anyone cares what this one individual thinks, there it is.

Roger Lathrop
Davenport, Iowa

MTC-00010307

From: GDingioan4972035@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:51pm
Subject: WHEN WILL QUIT WASTE TAXPAYERS MONEY AND END THIS GAME

i do not own any stock in microsoft but i feel this legal drag on microsoft has gone enough with no one benefiting at all only remedy is money so why not agree to number and wrap this hell we are sick and tired of it and i will still use microsoft so what is gained from something old like this case microsoft has agreeded to admit some fault and will pay for it what else can you get nothing but waste alot of tax payers money you can't brake it up for appeal court said this already i just find it strange that we are a real bad recession and you are going after the engine in the car without microsoft there is no recovery and you will see real defects we can not afford another 2001 but unless this is not settled and quickly then we will

mr. bush has already said he wanted closed quickly now please end this game we have enough problems then the ego game by 9 district attorneys who are only looking for policial gains only
thank you
george g. dingioan
gdingioan4972035@aol.com

MTC-00010308

From: Bob and/or Jan Thune
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft

Get off of Microsoft' case. Once again government is wrecking a vibrant US industry, just like they did the Automobile Industry (where I made my living).

This is NOT about protecting the consumer. Even the DUMBEST person knows that you are not abusing the customer by giving something away something for free. It just can't happen.

This case is about "wanna be's" spreading money around Washington, and Washington sucking it up just like they always do.

Somewhere this has to end..... End It !!!!!!!!!!!!!

I hope Gates moves his business to Canada just to show you idiots !!!!!!!!!!!!!

Robert and Jan Thune, Lecanto, Fl.

MTC-00010309

From: Dan Jerry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:52pm
Subject: Recently, a friend of mine asked

what I thought of the Microsoft case. Recently, a friend of mine asked what I thought of the Microsoft case.

Me: "Do you think the mafia is profitable?"

Him: "Sure".

Me: "If you could invest in stock in the mafia, that would pay dividends, might you do it?"

Him: "Sure!!"

Me: "Suppose you did that; you put most of your investment cash into mafia stock; and it paid handsomely."

Him: "Yeah!"

Me: "The mafia is reputed to give a lot of money to churches, little old widows, and

help neighborhood families in need. That's a good thing, right?"

Him: "Right".

Me: "Do you think the maffia, -over all, is a good thing for society?"

Him: "Well, no..."

Me: "Well, considering you invested a lot of money in the maffia stock, where now do your loyalties lie? Do you think the Justice Department should leave the maffia alone, because they give a lot of money to churches, etc., and pay you a healthy dividend? Or should the Justice Department do what is necessary to prevent the maffia from doing harm?"

In case you don't understand my alegory:

Sure, Microsoft gives away millions to schools; -for a fantastic tax deduction no doubt. Microsoft, it has finally been officially determined, also stifles competition, strong-arms vendors, and generally, -acts like the maffia! Break them up!

Dan Jerry

Actively involved with the "micro computer" since 1978, and an avid industry historian and intentional observer.

553 Beartown Road
West Chazy, NY 12992

MTC-00010311

From: Daniel A. Myerson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 4:55pm
Subject: Settlement

The attack by the justice department was unjust. How could any settlement be called unjust in those circumstances? Dan Myerson

MTC-00010312

From: Mark Overholser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:01pm
Subject: Get off their case!

I'm sick of you jack-booted courtroom thugs at the Department of Justice pursuing this poppycock at a time when there should be PLENTY of legitimate bad guys out there for you to spend OUR money chasing.

Get off Microsoft's case. That company may not be the friendliest "neighbor" in the corporate 'hood, but they put many thousands of people to work and pay their corporate taxes on time...and if people don't like the company, they don't have to buy its products.

Clinton's gone now, it's okay for you to stop wasting OUR money on YOUR ideologically-driven left wing witch hunts again.

MTC-00010313

From: Rglandiel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:02pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am a supporter of Microsoft. This alligation has gone on too long. Microsoft has made sufficient changes to there software and operating procedures. Do you want the last ounce of blood?

Robert

MTC-00010314

From: Andrew Warren
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Andrew Warren
POB 476
New Tripoli, Pa 18066
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
A J Warren

MTC-00010315

From: Richard L. Joslin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:04pm
Subject: Short sighted vision relative to Microsoft fiasco

It appears to me that the United States Justice Department has been very short sighted in what the Microsoft Corporation has done for the "home user" and to the overall balance of payments to the US Treasury. Go ahead and kill them off and create a reason for them to leave the U. S. and you will be responsible for more of a problem than settling the case now. The Clinton administration created the mess to cover up for the presidents wrong doings and get the "heat off" him and now you are just proliferating a non problem. Where else could a small time user like me get a desk top software setup so cheaply and made in the USA? You guys are not solving the problem, just adding to it in my opinion.

You are all alike. Kill any one who makes a dollar and at the same time take away the little guys software while pretending to represent him.

Richard L. Joslin
18416 SE 280th St.
Kent Washington,
98042
Registered Republican voter

MTC-00010316

From: Thomas Hill

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:05pm
Subject: settlement

I believe that a dollar amount from Microsoft should be reached for the schools and let the teachers decide which computer systems (Microsoft or Apple) to use. It is imperative that money be provided to the "poor schools". These kids from low income families are falling further and further behind the rest of the nation relative to technology knowledge and many of these kids are intelligent and deserve an opportunity to compete at a higher level.

Although I am not an owner of Microsoft stock, I am the CEO of a company that spends over \$100,000 annually on software (most of which are Microsoft products) and hardware. I would not approve the purchase of any other office software other than Microsoft's. I believe the current settlement with the Justice department is satisfactory while nine (I think) States are trying to hinder Microsoft so that competitive companies in each State will have a better chance at survival. I think the Justice department should ban these States from further litigation against Microsoft. Let software companies compete against each other and the best products will win. This is the way our economy is setup to work!

Thomas W. Hill
<twhill@ugaalum.uga.edu>

MTC-00010317

From: Kent, Mike
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 5:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a computer professional and computer software and hardware professor, I am concerned that the proposed settlement will amount to little more than a slap on the wrist to Microsoft. In fact, the proposed settlement may well allow Microsoft to strengthen its hold in the education market. Microsoft is a monopoly. It has used its dominate position to stop its completion.

The remedy must be to break up the company or destroy its ability to crush its competition in illegal and monopolistic ways. There is fledgling and growing competition to Microsoft. In the past Microsoft has been able to crush its completion by intimidation or illegal ways.

Please act. The future of innovation and diversity in the computer industry may well depend on it.

Thank you for your consideration in these matters.

Mike Kent
Department Chair
Computer Information Systems
San Jacinto College, Central Campus
mkent@sjcd.cc.tx.us

MTC-00010318

From: Carl Friedberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:15pm
Subject: Proposed settlement
Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street, NW, Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530
 Facsimile: (202)616-9937 or (202) 307-1454

Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

Dear Renata Hesse,

I am a physicist who has worked with computers, computer operating systems, and applications, since 1961. I am not a legal specialist. I have read carefully the proposed settlement between some of the states and the US, and Microsoft.

I am astounded that, although found guilty of violating the Anti-Trust statutes, there is no direct provision for any punishment of Microsoft.

The only recourse I have is to initiate civil litigation against Microsoft in the hope of recovering treble damages. Because of the difficulty and expense of such litigation, this recourse is of little use or value to any user who has suffer damage from Microsoft's Windows monopoly, and the resulting lack of choice in the desktop marketplace.

We, the users of desktop computer operating systems, deserve better from our government. Where is Microsoft being punished for willful, illegal actions? Forcing them to open up certain Windows and Middleware APIs is not punishment; it is merely an attempt to slow them down from increasing their 95% dominance in the marketplace to 100% dominance.

I hope the Honorable Judge of the US Court will take into account the concerns of those states which are not parties to the proposed settlement, and punish the guilty party here. Microsoft deserves significant punishment; there is none, that I can see, in the proposed settlement.

Restraining future monopolistic activities is essential, because Microsoft is a huge force in this marketplace, and has reaped enormous improper gains.

Just look at the amount of cash Microsoft has accumulated, which can be used at will to thwart legitimate competitors. Even a casual reading of the US tax code suggests that the amount of cash amassed by Microsoft exceeds a reasonable number, and should instead be distributed as dividends to shareholders (and taxed). This solution, while perhaps a bit stretched in legal terms, could certainly be held over Microsoft's head as a stick—and they could agree to declare some dividend (perhaps only \$10 or 20 billion dollars per year) as a token of punishment for their illegal behavior. What a punishment!

I hope you will consider some appropriate form of punishment, in addition to the proposed restraints.

Thank you.

Carl E. Friedberg, PhD
 President & CEO
 Comet & Company
 New York NY
 www.comets.com

MTC-00010319

From: FDissen@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:15pm

Subject: Microsoft Decision

I agree with the Court's decision.

Period!

Fred H. Dissen

6208 Clearbrook Drive
 Flowery Branch, GA 30542

MTC-00010320

From: Mary Salaja

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:23pm

Subject: microsoft case

What are you thinking. Since when does the criminal get to decide and possibly profit from committing a crime. You need to look past the fact that MS is a corporation and focus on the fact that it has been convicted of a crime. Therefore, the PUNISHMENT should make certain that it is not in a position to continue its CRIMINAL activities. Besides, isn't competition suppose to be the American way.

J. Salaja

MTC-00010321

From: Jim (038) Widget Webert

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:24pm

Subject: MSFT settlement

Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530
 email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
 Fax: (202) 307-1454 —OR— (202) 616-9937

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft.

This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an

assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly. I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,

James Webert

POB 2776

Friday Harbor, WA 98250

MTC-00010322

From: dorothy smith

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:29pm

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

A SWIFT SETTLEMENT IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF OUR COUNTRY.

MICROSOFT CUSTOMERS AND THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER. PLEASE END IT. KINDEST REGARDS.

God Bless You!

Dorothy C. Smith

dorothysmith—2000@yahoo.com

MTC-00010323

From: Gene Williams

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:35pm

Subject: My experience with Microsoft

11 January, 2002

Ref: My experience with Microsoft

Dear Justice Department,

I use Microsoft's word, excel and access software programs and Microsoft's OUTLOOK 2000 email program. I use these every working day and also at home. My job is to support agents in 75 countries.

I urge you to take a strong hand with Microsoft and force them to be more compatible with competing software companies and to cease the practice of forcing upgrades to their software products. Their marketing practice of designing their products so that upgrades are forced on their customers is, very often, unnecessary, expensive, causes delay and increases the cost of doing business.

A specific example is Internet Explorer 98 which I have on my home computer. It will not access secure websites (I cannot use it to order goods and services online). I have to use NETSCAPE to place orders online. I cannot upgrade Explorer 98—Microsoft will not let me. Two computer repair services have advised me that I must wipe my computer clean and then reinstall Explorer 98 or install a later version.

Another example is the practice of upgrading Microsoft word in such a way that attachments to email sent to recipients who have a lower version of Word cannot open the attachment; they must purchase a word attachment for their computer in order to open the documents in your new version of word. These practices are petty, demeaning and are low level marketing tactics unbecoming of a major US company.

Best Regards,

Gene Williams

Marketing Director

GLOBALTEL

1801 North Military Trail, Suite 203

Boca Raton, Florida 33431-1811 USA

Tel: (561) 999-9116, Extension 112

Tel: (800) 219-9545, Extension 112

Fax: (561) 999-0518

E-mail: Gene@GlobalTel.com

Website: www.GlobalTel.com

MTC-00010324

From: james arnstein

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:43pm

Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Dear Sir,

I think the DOJ and the 9 states entered into the anti trust settlement is obsessed to see how far they can carry out this case. Microsoft has had sufficient penalties levied against it. It seems to me that we all need to get on with our "business at hand,". Everything that continues to go on now, seems like a "cheap shot" at Microsoft as long as it is forced to "tippy toe" around until the settlement is completed.

James Arnstein

MTC-00010325

From: Majkmushrm@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm

Subject: Microsoft's punishment

Gentlemen.

I find it remarkable that the government thinks that an appropriate punishment for a convicted monopolist is to effectively

increase their sales by a billion dollars and give them free access to markets they had previously been unable to force their way into. If the government isn't going to break the company up and is considering a \$1B fine, I would offer the following suggestion.

1. The \$1B has to be all cash, not one single microsoft product. The money should all be spent buying Apples, Suns, and tech support for non-Microsoft operating systems (getting rid of those microsoft worm, virus, and crash prone IIS machines would probably do the net a world of good). This would give Apple (where microsoft stole most of their really good ideas) a boost. Getting the schools out of the cost cycle associated with microsoft's monopoly inflated prices and into Linux would give them a more virus resistant system and help them in the long run (Linux is about \$75, Windows about \$400—go figure).

2. Microsoft should be required to make a version of all their software (i.e. MS Office, etc) for all operating systems i.e. Apple, Linux, Unix, Sun OS etc. Most application providers provide versions of their products for various different operating systems but not microsoft. This would force them to make less tightly interlinked software (and would actually improve it's performance) as well as help break the vertical monopoly they currently enjoy.

3. The government is a major purchaser of microsoft operating systems and software. Under normal circumstances, the government will not purchase things that do not conform to standards (IEEE, ANSI, ISO, etc). I cannot think of a single microsoft product that does not violate one standard or another. Indeed, one of their monopolistic strategies has been to make extentions, i.e. modifications to standards, to make them unique to microsoft and, therefore, incompatible with products that do meet the standards. This was the basis of a lawsuit from Sun over Java. Microsoft's response was to eliminate Java from their latest operating application, doubtless figuring that they had adequate muscle to ignore all the applications that use Java. When it comes to microsoft, the government is ignoring their own rules regarding standards compliance. The government should stop doing this. They should tell microsoft that they will not purchase a single MS product that violates a widely accepted standard. I doubt that microsoft could afford to lose the government's business and it would break that monopolistic practice.

Jeffrey P. Harrison

900 South Third St.

St. Charles, Mo. 63301-2402

MTC-00010326

From: hawk eye

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:50pm

comw on get it over msn gives away services to the talking about giving away comptures to education, seems like the government neds to worrie about what is not working with inside its self I know i work for the government fix what is not working right ,clean it up, the ppl of the US are tired of the government going after something that is working right,did u all think that msn might

just laying off ppl if u hit them hard come on go after real crime, what about polution from big companys ,wish the government spend as much time going after that than msn get real ppl let msn give education free comtures and tell then what not to do

MTC-00010327

From: Rich Faltisco

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:50pm

Subject: Keep Going After Microsoft

Dear Friends,

The latest version of Microsoft Windows—XP—points out all that is wrong with Microsoft.

First, the price keeps going up and up for the operating system. Now literally priced fixed at one hundred dollars, what real alternative does the home user have to XP? And certainly privacy has been thrown out the proverbial window. I really don't like big brother Bill Gates ready to gather all kinds of information on my computer if i load up XP. Thirdly, Windows is a programming nighmare. I don't believe anyone but Microsoft knows all the hooks to the code.

Stability—IBM's OS/2 was a stable operating years ago. I believe Microsoft could have done this with Windows years ago, and not now with XP. Several years ago i loaded up IBM's Os/2 Warp in parallel to Windows. As i did so, I got a message from Microsoft asking if i really wanted to do this. Pretty bizarre and pretty small, i would say. And i think that is the attitude still indicative to Microsoft today.

Thank you for your time,

Rich Faltisco

MTC-00010328

From: hydet@hotmail.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:46pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have spent some time looking at the Settlement between the DOJ/State AGs and Microsoft. While i have serious doubts about the wisdom of bringing this lawsuit in the first place and whereas i have some reservations about the strength and precedent of the remedies I certainly want this whole nightmare behind us. It s time for those of us in the high-tech industry to get back to work. Thanks. I know it took a lot of sweat and long hours to produce. Americans are grateful for that. Tim

MTC-00010330

From: ricardo—wenger@hotmail.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:46pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft/Justice Department settlement is a great things for consumers worldwide. I congratulate both Microsoft and the DOJ for finally being flexible enough to get there. It is important that the balance of innovation and customer benefit as well as openness of Windows is there. Congratulations again on the settlement.

MTC-00010331

From: arlanbarber@juno.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the ruling between Microsoft and the settlement of November 2001 be the end of all litigation proceedings.

MTC-00010332

From: jdunik@simplexgroup.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that the entire antitrust suit should be dropped. However as this is obviously not going to happen I fully support the quick resolution of this case and the proposed settlement. Any additional punishment of Microsoft would be a crime in my view simply because I feel that they did no wrong. Additionally I feel that this entire antitrust fiasco was an entirely anti-competitive move by both the DOJ and Microsofts comptitors such as AOL and Sun. Additionally I feel that this case was one of the primary causes of the current economic downturn. Thank you for your time.

MTC-00010333

From: signerector@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

THIS SETTLEMENT SHOULD BE ACCEPTED BY ALL PARTIES INCLUDING THE VARIOUS STATES. THE SETTLEMENT IS MORE THAN FAIR TO COMSUMERS AND MICROSOFT S COMPETITION.

MTC-00010334

From: ray@rcjsoftware.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft and our free enterprise system alone! This case should have never been in the first place. Let the consumers decide in the marketplace which companies are the winners and which ones are the losers. I resent government interference in thinking they know better than us who have been in the information technology business for years. We are talking about a \$99 operating system that nobody is forced to buy if they don't want it (the IRS takes much more than that away from us by the use of force and coercion and we don't get anything back in return). Consumers can always use the free operating system called Linux along with its free web browser. Any new features Microsoft puts into their operating system is purely for their own survival. Live and let live! I thank Microsoft for driving down prices so that the common person can understand and afford technology. If you punish them then our government is no better than a communist dictatorship which desires to own and control all business! The shame of it all is that Microsoft's competitors refused to offer better products at lower prices and instead resorted to government coercion and force. What a sad day for American liberty! If government is truly looking out for the consumers as they say they are then leave Microsoft alone! Answer this question—how many complaints have you heard from the consumers themselves (the very persons government claims to be protecting)?

MTC-00010335

From: starflt@sat.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft's competitors seek more litigation for obvious reasons. Their products simply don't stack up to those of Microsoft. So they use this method to attempt to weaken one of the best of United States companies. Consumers around the world are better off because of Microsoft. The settlement is fair and equitable. Let's end this ridiculous and costly litigation.

MTC-00010336

From: dhughes@admin1.umaryland.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A fair and reasonable settlement.

MTC-00010337

From: gtotoday@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

it is in my belief that Microsoft is being as fair as possible. I DO NOT THINK IT'S RIGHT THAT OTHER BUSINESS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF MICROSOFT'S HARD EARN'T ADVANCEMENT IN TECHNOLOGIES. IF THESE OTHER COMPANYS WANT TO HAVE SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS THEN LET THEM ESTABLISH THERE OWN TEAM OF TECHNICIANS AND CREATE THERE OWN TECHNOLOGIES INSTEAD OF CRYING FOUL AND WANTING SOMEONE ELSE'S ALREADY FORMED TECHNOLOGIES. YES IT'S TRUE MICROSOFT HAS MANY ADVANCEMENTS BUT THEY EARN'T THEM THE HARD WAY THEY WORKED FOR THEM. I THINK IT'S WRONG FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO WANT TO BREAK A BUSINESS UP BECAUSE A CERTAIN INDIVIDUAL HAS A PERSONNEL AGENDA AGAINST MICROSOFT. I WATCHED AT&T BROKE UP BY GOVERNMENT AND LOOK ITS COSTING EVERYONE MORE MONEY. WHICH I BELIEVE IS WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. OTHER BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT WANTING A PIECE OF SOMEONES HARD EARN'T MONIES. Is it Bill Gates fault that he is successful? yes it is!! he and his company worked hard for there achievements. so that's my story and let it be said that if other business and people want to make microsofts profits then let them earn them the old fashion way! work for them themselves and not try to have government step in when it is really not of concern to government unless they too found a way to make free money from others .

respectible
Robert A Werner

MTC-00010338

From: alneffsr@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We don't want to go backwards with technology. Leave Microsoft alone and let them go ahead with new software

technology. It's not Microsoft's fault that they have better programs. If I wanted to go backwards I could go with the other programs anytime. Thank You Al Neff Sr.

MTC-00010339

From: chris—crabtree@shoneys.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern: The times and the technology have moved on. You should too. Let's stop listening to those companies who have trouble competing on an even playing field and have done with this. Thanks!

MTC-00010340

From: bobschor@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to voice my support for the Microsoft-Department of Justice settlement. I believe the settlement is fair and provides a reasonable end to curbing antitrust behavior of Microsoft while allowing them to continue to innovate in a very competitive and sometimes cutthroat arena of the computer software business. I applaud the DOJ's willingness to settle this case during our current economic recession and move on. It is clear that the dissenting states have prevented the previous attempt to settle this case out of court. I feel the settlement is fair. Thank you for your consideration. Robert A. Schor M.D.

MTC-00010341

From: bradley—bobbs@xontech.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please put an end to the ridiculous harassment of Microsoft already and go bother someone instead who is actually doing something wrong! Thank you.

MTC-00010342

From: dolores@freunds.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop trying to CRIPPLE Microsoft. The software innovations by this incredible company have added fuel to our economy creating jobs and allowing workers to be more productive. Workers like myself who use Microsoft software everyday and appreciate the beauty with which its applications work together. Sincerely Dolores Freund

MTC-00010343

From: rsd@electronink.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is too easy for Microsoft to disregard and continue monopolizing our lives. Microsoft needs to be punished for destroying the consumers right to freedom. Make Microsoft feel some of the pain they have leveraged on others for so many years.

MTC-00010344

From: rudzinsk@innercite.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Bring this case to an end and don't permit state DAs to go off on their own anti-Microsoft crusade.

MTC-00010345

From: bemlmorrow@erols.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is fair if anything it is unfair to Microsoft. I think it is a darn shame when a young boy can make the American dream come true and the vulchers of other companies (competitors) can use our legal system to try to eliminate the competition. As a matter of fact the legal system should penalize the competitors and the lawyers that are bringing the suit against Microsoft however I realize that Judges are lawyers so we know that the fair thing will never be done. The only way it will ever be fair is to get the money grubbing lawyers out of it and let a non-lawyer good American citizen make the ruling.

MTC-00010346

From: david@amazonherb.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

America is the land of opportunity in which your future lays in your hands. Granted Microsoft has engaged in vary tough marketing practices in a vary cut throat business. Welcome to America where the best are the best and second place is second place. The competitors of Microsoft are trying to use the Justice Department to restrict the leader to gain marketshare. If the actions that Microsoft's competitors are taken then a precedent will be set that will lead to other outrageous lawsuits clogging the courts and harming the free market. There is nothing stopping anyone from developing and deploying a better software than Microsoft. It is just no one has developed a better software. When that is done and history leads us to believe it will be done then America will have a new #1 software company. Stick to what Microsoft has done wrong and apply constraints to Microsoft to prevent just those areas of operation are not repeated.

MTC-00010347

From: ctgreg1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

please for the sake of fairness and economics settle this suit now cg.

MTC-00010348

From: fwcourington@foxinternet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The plaintiffs clearly have no concept of ethics they are not interested in fairness justice or the well being of their fellow citizens or of the economy. They are crude gold-diggers out for a quick buck. Surely the buck stops here.

MTC-00010349

From: pasqualini@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement with Microsoft and hope this matter can be brought to an end without Microsoft's competitors being able to sabotage the proceedings as they have been doing. For the good of our country and technological innovation let's move ahead and put this behind us.

MTC-00010350

From: bob@arnoldsmithins.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is in the best interest of this country to get this case settled with all parties concerned and move on. The case never should have been brought.

MTC-00010351

From: Monfieth@rushmore.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs, I am opposed to any settlement with MS that does not allow full access by the customer to software of his choice, this would be like telling a person what brand of trailer he could tow on the end of his truck, and what kind of hitch he had to use. I also use plug in drives for different accounts, and do not want to have to repeatedly contact MS for reactivation. Also the open software movement, would be where Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, and Benjamin Franklin would be today.

Respectfully Lee Dambrosky
Rapid City, SD

MTC-00010352

From: scott@chiefindustries.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In our opinion this whole charade has been an enormous waste of taxpayers capital deployed in a misguided effort to protect a few companies like Sun Microsystems AOL-Time Warner and Oracle Corp.

Please end this waste. Thank you Scott Cuddihy

MTC-00010353

From: marc@africagems.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle-this thing has gone on long enough and it offends me that my taxpayer money is going to support this ridiculous case

MTC-00010354

From: cshank5585@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off Microsoft's back. Settle now. Settlement is fair.

MTC-00010355

From: grlatham@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel any more litigation against Microsoft should be dropped totally and forever. We now know that Janet Reno was more interested in going after MSFT than bin Laden. The whiners in Silicon Valley need to be told to build a better mousetrap if they want to compete. The consumer (me) is the only one who will be harmed by any further litigation. Meanwhile the attorneys are the only people who win.

MTC-00010356

From: drwhom@valleyalley.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let Microsoft alone. Together we can fight political corruption throughout our government.

Thank you

MTC-00010357

From: clfhif@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

11 Jan 2002 The settlement agreements are fair and equitable. Now let's approve them and get back to business.

MTC-00010358

From: davidlsiegel@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft antitrust litigation as soon as possible. The drain on your resources and the world economy is immeasurable. Let's get it over with and move on.

MTC-00010359

From: fighterpilot1@home.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion it is time to drop all complaints against Microsoft. The Microsoft Company has done more to increase productivity and efficiency in the American workforce than any other single entity in the entire history of the United States. The entire case against Microsoft by a group of misguided Attorneys General and competitors who lacked quality products signifies one very important fact to me: if you can't beat the competition find a lawyer who will do his darndest to sue. I don't think that is the American way. Our world dominance in computer software is due to the excellent foresight and long term strategic planning of Microsoft. Any and all legal action against the Microsoft Corp. should be immediately terminated.

MTC-00010360

From: concetta2882@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I AM WRITING THIS AS I BELIEVE IN WHAT EVERYONE CALLS THE AMERICAN WAY . WE HAVE ALWAYS BEEN THE PROMOTERS OF FREE ENTERPRISE AND INITIATIVE. MICROSOFT AND BILL GATES TOOK THIS ENTREPRENEURIAL TACT AND

HAVE NOW BEEN PUNISHED FOR IT. I DO UNDERSTAND THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS BUT FEEL THAT THESE LAWS WERE MADE AT A TIME THEY WERE NEEDED. A LOT OF LAWS BECOME OUTDATED. I BELIEVE SOME OF THESE ANTI-TRUST LAWS HAVE DONE JUST THAT. THE LAW IS THE LAW HOWEVER SO JUSTICE WAS SERVED AND SENTENCE PRONOUNCED. LET THIS REST. THE COMPETITORS ARE JUST SORRY THAT THEY WERE NOT THE ONES WITH THE IDEAS. ALL THESE ANTI-TRUST LAWSUITS HAVE DONE NOTHING BUT HURT THE CONSUMER AND THE ECONOMY. THE DEREGULATION DUE TO ANTI-TRUST LAWS HAS COST THE CONSUMER AND COUNTRY TREMENDOUSLY IN GAS ELECTRIC COMMUNICATIONS AND NOW TECHNOLOGY. WHEN WILL IT END. I PERSONALLY THINK ONLY WHEN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT OF OUR COUNTRY DEEMS THESE ANTIQUATED ANTI-TRUST LAWS NULL AND VOID AND WHEN THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT OF OUR COUNTRY MAKES LAWS THAT PREVENT FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS. THANK YOU FOR ASKING FOR THE EVERYDAY CONSUMER S OPINION.

MTC-00010361

From: w—baron@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wholeheartedly support the settlement as currently negotiated with the DOJ. I believe that both parties have made concessions and the settlement appropriately reflects the substantially narrowed ruling as handed down by the unanimous Appeals Court. It is time to move on. The hold-out states are simply acting in the interests of Microsoft competitors based in their states and are not acting on the behalf of the consumer. It is in the interest of consumers to have this case settled and behind us all. Let innovation and competition flourish again in the tech industry without the heavy hand of government interference. Werner Baron

MTC-00010362

From: ronsp@gte.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement approved by the Department of Justice and 9 state attorneys general should be approved. While I think the settlement is burdensome and harsh on Microsoft I think it is best to close this case and concentrate our regulation efforts on things that REALLY matter to consumers—such as home energy prices gasoline prices in the northwest United States monopolies in the cable television industry etc.—rather than trying to punish a successful company for being successful. I would sincerely hope that in the future federal anti-trust statutes are used to protect consumers rather than to help failed competitors compete.

MTC-00010363

From: jason.langdon@haverstick
consulting.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Thank you for taking the time to hear my opinion. Let me begin by mentioning that I have worked in the online design industry for over five years. In my opinion Microsoft has been an extremely productive and dynamic company determined to deliver solutions to the largest and smallest problems alike. I know the value of their innovations firsthand. That is why I feel it is important that the case against Microsoft be closed as soon as possible. We are at a point as a country and a global community that we need the innovations that companies like Microsoft offer now more than ever. The agreement addresses all of the valid concerns that initiated the action against Microsoft. Let's please move on and let Microsoft get back to strengthening the economy.

MTC-00010364

From: JAMES GRAVIS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft settlement that was reached. Thank you.

James C. Gravis,
15707 Echo Canyon Dr.
Houston, Tx., 77084-3116

MTC-00010365

From: George
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:02pm
Subject: MS

I agree with U.S. District Judge J. Frederick Motz statements—and he is absolutely correct when he states Microsoft overcharges for its products. It is gross anti-competitive behavior. There are many excellent software companies who are unable to compete until the playing field is level.

George Cochrane
Tooele, Utah

MTC-00010366

From: George S. Forde, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please see attached letter
CC: Microsoft's Freedom To Innovate Network

8401 Seminole Street
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19118-3725
[215] 242-8332 (voice)
georgetorde@HOME.com
[215] 242-1475 (facsimile) PA Atty. ID # 02820
[215] 284-1739 (cellular)
Sunday, 27 January, 2002
FACSIMILIE & E-Mail 1

Honorable John Ashcroft
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear General Ashcroft,
Public opinion regarding the settlement of the antitrust case between Microsoft and the US Department of Justice has been solicited. I offer this opinion as one who has been an interested user of computers for personal and business purposes since 1978 (before there

was a Microsoft). This has made me a bit of a student of industry and, eventually, an investor in technology. So, I must admit to significant [for me] holding in MSFT—as well as in companies that might be considered to be its antagonists in this matter. Still, I am not an apologist for Microsoft and believe that, on balance, I must agree with the presentation of this settlement made to the Judiciary Committee by Mr. James of your office on 12 December.

Microsoft is a monopoly. Paradoxically, I believe it got there, in part, with the help of competitors like Apple, 2 IBM 3 and others who just failed to properly market sometimes superior product. Contrary to its claims, 4 the company is not particularly innovative, and its first offerings of its [E.g., MultiPlan, DOS, Windows, Excel, Explorer, and so on] have been acquired and, at first, poorly implemented compared to others [Such as VisiCalc, Lotus, or Resolve; CP/M and MacOS; Netscape...].

However, Microsoft rather than being anti-competitive is hyper-competitive. It learns from its mistakes and is increasingly better at execution of the ideas, whatever the source, and it continually improves on them. It delivers what the consumer demands [eventually] at a [hopefully] reasonable cost. For its own good, Microsoft cannot afford to have the rivals all go away, though many have. Neither the Department nor the defendant got all the marbles at end of this case. That's the nature of a legal settlement. What has been crafted seems, to me, to serve the best interests of the public and the industry.

* Note: Due to the Excite@Home bankruptcy, this address will be inoperative after 2/28/02; from 3/1/02 forward (possibly earlier), please use georgeforde@Comcast.NET.

1 Signed original available on request

2 Which bundled the MS spreadsheet "MultiPlan" with the first Macs.

3 Which opened the PC Jr to DOS.

4 But do really like Mr. Gates, based on a couple of brief encounters at a local users' group and more distant observation over the years. He and Microsoft have done a great deal for all computer users.

One thing to remember is that, while the focus of the case has been the "Wintel World," and allegations of maintenance of the OS monopoly; however, the market is much larger than that. For example, while I use both Widows and MacOS, I very much prefer the latter, but I use the same Microsoft applications [I.E. and Office] on both platforms.

I am concerned, therefore, that a separate settlement by the non-joining states—if it follows the path offered to them by Microsoft—would actually weaken the effect of this settlement by making those states accomplices in plan to cannibalize the Apple [and other] share of the education market. No need to spell out the obvious here, but, if the states want compensation, it should be paid outright or in the form of grants to technological projects and spending not defined by the defendant. If possible, those states should not be allowed to make a separate peace that would undermine this one.

Sincerely,
George S. Forde, Jr.
cc: Senator Rick Santorum
(facsimile only)
Microsoft's Freedom to Innovate Network
(facsimile only)

MTC-00010367

From: berlinmc@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to approve the settlement. I believe this lawsuit was more about milking political support than about protecting the consumer. GET IT DONE for the sake of us all!!

MTC-00010369

From: lotojarich@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my strong belief that this settlement is in the best interest of everyone—the technology industry the economy and especially consumers. Since the settlement newspaper editorials from across the nation and across the ideological spectrum have endorsed the settlement. Please don't let a few special interest groups prevent this settlement from going through. Sincerely Rich Otterstrom

MTC-00010370

From: jeffat@carolina.rr.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Government's settlement is fair and no further action should be taken. It seems everyone wants to make a name for themselves as a giant killer. Its sad. I believe in our Justice System and the ruling should stand and no further actions should be taken. Thank you for reading my opinion.

MTC-00010371

From: the—immortal—
cthulhu@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I whole heartedly support this settlement. I do not believe that Microsoft illegally leveraged its dominance in the software industry to harm competitors but I steadfastly believe that the education system could use the one billion. If they want to invest in the future of America yet again I'm behind it.

Don

MTC-00010372

From: knstreck@pionet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this lawsuit with Microsoft and let them get back to providing jobs and opportunities for its workers. Without companies like Microsoft we wouldn't have good jobs for people. Let the free enterprise system work. Thank you.

MTC-00010373

From: mefoley@in-touch.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have followed this case fairly closely and I am still unable to determine just who was damaged! From the beginning it has appeared that Microsoft's competitors have used the courts to provide a competitive advantage for themselves. My earliest involvement with microcomputers was with an Imsi 8080 which I built from a kit back in 1977. The very best software available for that machine was Microsoft Basic. The name Microsoft has always provided me with quality products at what I considered very reasonable prices. In fact I believe that it was Microsoft's vision of Windows that enabled the microcomputer revolution in this country and the rest of the world. It was a point and click interface that could be made to run on just about any IBM generic computer. Apple had a similar (some may say superior) interface but it was only available on Apple's pricy equipment. Microsoft's hard work brought computing to the masses by putting Windows on the desktop. I am a happy consumer. I have always used Microsoft Internet Explorer and I have never been overcharged by Microsoft or damaged by using it. That's the point!! Who has been damaged? Microsoft's competitors? If that is the case will the Federal Courts go to bat for me when I have to bid against one of the Big Five accounting firms for auditing work? I doubt it and I would not expect it. This whole case appears to be another case of the state pigs feeding at the trough of private profits. It sickens me!

MTC-00010374

From: jkwasassociates@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Microsoft settlement as published on the web. The settlement is fair and adequately addresses plaintiffs original complaints.

MTC-00010375

From: mainseq@thevine.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The government's case against Microsoft has never had more than marginal merit. The case has now been brought to a reasonable and fair conclusion and should not be pursued further except as specifically dictated by the settlement.

MTC-00010376

From: bill.reilly3@gte.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get government out of our economies greatest opportunity for growth and advancement so that capitalism can thrive.

MTC-00010377

From: ddanh2000@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The only thing this lawsuit is doing is impeding the progress of the technology sector it is only a matter of time before other countrys are leading the way and dominating

what we are taking for granted. We should always go forward and never go back.

MTC-00010378

From: benrwhick@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It seems to me that this litigation has been going on long enough and been a great detriment to our economy. It is time to bring it to a close.

MTC-00010379

From: jmd@cybermesa.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I absolutely believe that Microsoft has been a positive contributor to the American economy and certainly affected my work in a most positive way. I am getting tired of Microsoft competitors drawing out settlement of a case that never should have been brought in the first place. The objections of Microsoft's competitors are completely self-serving and never related to the matter at hand.

MTC-00010380

From: tom.moore@iname.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The US economy has been on hold too long already. Please approve the settlement so everyone can move on to more important things.

MTC-00010381

From: guyc@concentric.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is more than fair. Settle this thing NOW!

MTC-00010382

From: bpeterson@hopconsulting.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with the settlement the Justice Department negotiated with Microsoft. The computer industry business community and consumers need this issue settled today. Please do what you can to lay this matter to rest. Thank you Bedford Peterson
HOPCONSULTING.COM

MTC-00010383

From: edaveforeman@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am strongly supportive of the settlement the government and Microsoft reached. It is time to bring an end to this litigation.

MTC-00010384

From: paul sidler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Sirs: We support the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case. Please stop wasting taxpayers' money and stop penalizing success. Thank you,

Paul & Mary Sidler

MTC-00010385

From: kevinmcd@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has proven to be a great innovator. A settlement has been reached. Go with it. The sooner that the cloud hanging over this great company is handled the sooner our national economy can start moving again. The economy of the country has been downhill ever since the Clinton/Reno Injustice Dept. began its attack against Microsoft. It's time to put that abuse of power to rest.

MTC-00010386

From: hn94306@sbcglobal.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As consumer I benefit greatly from the cheaper and cheaper PC and software prices from Microsoft. Let the competition take care of itself in the market place. Microsoft competitors should compete on merit and not use political influence to prop them up. I am so sick and tired of seeing a great company being damaged by the misguided previous Justice Department.

Sincerely,

MTC-00010387

From: rrshouse@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I favor the Microsoft Settlement. Please proceed.

MTC-00010388

From: moonlitstars@prodigy.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer I believe it is time to end the litigation against Microsoft. I believe that the settlement currently agreed upon is enough. The marketplace is changing and I believe it's time for Microsoft's competitors to compete instead of litigating against them.
Thank You

MTC-00010389

From: kentbraun@home.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Quit wasting tax payer funds fighting about ways to impede business and start working together on ways to improve it.

MTC-00010390

From: joseph@errico-associates.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is an odd time that we live in where companies that fall short in innovation and marketing skills attempt and often succeed by having the DOJ do their dirty work. I feel that any delays in this action and/or further punitive action towards Microsoft will have a harmful effect on me the consumer. Microsoft has always in my opinion offered

me affordable and good quality products. And the marketplace is always the best judge. If in fact consumers did not believe this OS/2 WordPerfect AmiPro Lotus etc. would all be the market leaders. Linux may in time actually succeed at this.

MTC-00010391

From: mikeziegler@arrowfastener.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I applaud the long overdue settlement and completely agree with it. The suit has hurt the economy in many ways and should have been settled years ago.

MTC-00010392

From: pmills@mc3inc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the current settlement proposal is more than reasonable. It has never been shown that the consumer was in any way harmed by Microsoft's actions. Certainly they are a tough competitor but it is clear to me that the consumer has been enormously well served by Microsoft.

MTC-00010393

From: R.Austin@computer.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly believe that the settlement agreement reached in the antitrust case against Microsoft is both a reasonable and fair solution to the matter and urge you to support it rather than continuing the litigation process.

Best regards.

MTC-00010394

From: rotruck@electronicpartsco.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A settlement that is very tough on Microsoft has been reached but the competition of Microsoft will not stop. The only reason for all of this was brought by Competitors of Microsoft who could not overtake Microsoft in regular business methods so they got the government to cost Microsoft a lot of money and to stop them from doing research and development. They had to stop regular business and just defend themselves from the government who is acting on behalf of Microsoft competitors. Enough is enough. Put a stop to this and let one of our major resources go back to developing and manufacturing.

Thanks.

MTC-00010395

From: intcon@harbornet.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft law suits should all be settled basis the Nov. 4 2001 settlement proposal or the actions of the nine remaining states be thrown out of court as they actually

represent the efforts of competitors to harm Microsoft.

MTC-00010396

From: Yochanon@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs and ma ams I m not a high educated man. I m not a rich man. I don t begrudge any of this against anyone. I m happy where I am and don t need anything more but the decision brought against M\$ is in my opinion far too lenient almost to the point of it being ludicrous. I just can t see any punishment being done to a company who *KNEW* it is/was doing wrong by letting them advertise their software OS in millions of schools. And this is exactly what I see it to be. A slap on the wrist and a way for them to take over even more areas so that if this problem was to pop up again down the road it would be even harder for the DOJ to fight. Why is it that an honest working man if he were found doing what M\$ has done and because he doesn't have anything near the money to protect himself like M\$ does would be darn near burned at the stake and ruined for the rest of his life? I see the government falling to its knees in just plain weariment and letting M\$ just go about its business as long as they behave themselves from now on . This scares me and it should scare all peoples of this country. Why not just make *more* new laws saying they can't do that and if they do it again we'll slap em on the wrist again (this was some of my sarcasm). I know my word don't mean much but this is *my* country I have to live with the ridiculousness of the decision so far and have to suffer for it all because someone with a lot of money can get away with whatever they want. I'm sorry if this seemed like a rant...maybe it was a little but I didn't mean for it to offend no one. I just wanted to be heard and for the average Joe to be heard once again since it is us Joes who make up the majority of this country. Thank you for hearing me out. Take care and be well. John Berger

MTC-00010397

From: lake@mediaone.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Before Microsoft made my life easy with its fine products I would be tearing my hair out with competing products that never worked. I get great support and service from Microsoft and am happy as can be with the company the way it is. I understand the case and the government's reasons for prosecuting it but I hope with all my heart that brave little Microsoft will not be broken up. It will be no favor to me and my small business to have more confusion in the marketplace. Regards Peter Lake

MTC-00010398

From: csina@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the gov't settled the controversy and with the economy as it is I believe it will

be more beneficial for the country to proceed with other pressing issues. thank you

MTC-00010399

From: jleffelaar@guate.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
100% in favour of the settlement

MTC-00010400

From: leatherneckdi@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

One administration goes after Microsoft with a zeal. The next one comes in and says NO we don't have enough. Why would the Gov't be interested in a private corporation in the first place. Screw Clinton and his legal team of Janet and thier zeal to attack Microsoft. And to the Attorney General of California wait till election and see how loud I scream over your actions against Microsoft.....

MTC-00010401

From: greeko@capital.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Envy and greed although basic to ceratain human beings should not be the determining factor for MICRSOFT by tring to stymie it s creativity. Time for government regulators to use common sense as we go head on with international competition that would certainly be jumping for joy if they landed MSFT to bolster their economy and work force. By the downsizing of industry with its job creating opportunities we are witnessing layoffs that will be impacting our tax base which sustains all the services that everyone thinks they are entitled to. Paying lawyers to practice their trade is what is compounding our problems with their skillful tactics manipulating the system and adding their costs to companies that pass the costs on to us consumers and taxpayers

MTC-00010402

From: Mary Crockett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:07pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I am oposed to the government doing any more to prevent Microsoft from continuing to provide superior products to us the consumers. The government has spent more than enough money harrassing Microsoft. It is time for them to leave Microsoft alone.

Thank you
Chuck Crockett

MTC-00010403

From: LLHubbard@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Since when is it against the law for a company to make money? Please leave Microsoft alone as it was doing just fine. Example of a problem incurred by the above settlement: I just recently purchased a new computer with XP Home edition and it is missing some of the utilities that Microsoft included in their other editions and is still

in XP Pro. This utility is not on the market by other suppliers and therefore I am unable to purchase and install it on my XP Home edition computer.

Thank you

MTC-00010404

From: SIMONE MALONEY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The arguments that I've heard on this case, that Microsoft prevents competition, seem unfounded to me. When I purchased my computer about 4 years ago, I was asked what system I wanted. Having experienced Microsoft windows on the original Apple computer, I could not refuse to have windows installed on my computer. I don't know much about other systems except for DOS but I know I wanted the system that I was most familiar with. Had I learned about other systems, my selection might have been different but it's rather unlikely. I believe Microsoft built "a better mouse trap". Let the competition deal with Microsoft. Save my tax dollars.

Simone Maloney
171 Russell St.
Manchester, NH 03104

MTC-00010405

From: KV1030
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

To the judge of the federal trial court hearing the Microsoft Corp. case, I am writing to express my views on the proposed settlement with Microsoft Corp. The current settlement which is being pursued by the U.S. Department of Justice and some of the participating states does not in my opinion offer the protections required of such a settlement for either consumers or competing companies. I believe much stronger remedies are called for to prevent further abuses by Microsoft Corp., correct ongoing anti-competitive behavior by this company, and deprive Microsoft Corp. of its illegal gains. I believe the states which are dissenting from the current settlement have reasonable concerns regarding the current proposal. I am in favor of more stringent remedies to control Microsoft Corp.

Sincerely,
Mark Hartelt
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

MTC-00010406

From: Jacques Dupuis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft case

To Whom It May Concern:

As a consumer I am curious to know just how many consumers have you had testified at the Microsoft trial. Speaking for myself, I remember having to pay \$500 to \$700 dollars for DOS software like Word Perfect or Word Star. With Microsoft you can buy an entire

suite of software for much less than that, Microsoft Office. Where did the consumer is getting hurt here? Please do me a favor and resolve your Wars on Drug and go after "real" Criminals to really protect your taxpayers (consumers). Some States don't even have enough money to have all the prosecutors needed to prosecute our criminals and now you are looking to make criminals of anyone that is successful and who is keeping its customers (consumers) happy. I just wish our own government could do as good of a job as Microsoft does. By the way, why don't you turn all of your attorneys and prosecute government violations of our Great Constitution that have been violated by agencies of the government. The free marketplace has always and always will do a much better job than any Government can ever hope to achieve. Give it up!!!

Jacques Dupuis "I would rather have a mind opened by fact than one closed by belief.

MTC-00010407

From: James M. Tarpley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft

I agree whole heartedly with your recent decision regarding Microsoft's absurdly self serving settlement offer.

James M. Tarpley
216 Sea Isle Point
Atlantic Beach NC 28512-5936
voice: (252) 247-7813
eFax: (425) 984-8843

MTC-00010408

From: Craig Juel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I believe the whole antitrust case against Microsoft over the last three years has been a colossal waste of time and money. The central issues of the case are no longer of consequence. I do not support the breakup of Microsoft am in support of the settlement because this needs to end as soon as possible for our IT sector to return to normal. Under the terms of the settlement I am glad to see that Microsoft will be increasing its relations with computer makers and software developers for the sake of stopping the "muscling out" strategy, which might have occurred in the past. I am also happy to see that a three person technical committee will be formed to monitor Microsoft's compliance with the settlement and assist with dispute resolution. The nine states that still oppose should be urged to drop the suit. The best interest of the public will be served when free enterprise is allowed to be on its way and jumpstart our economy out of recession. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Craig Juel

MTC-00010409

From: Massoud Javadi
To: Microsoft ATR, Senator Gramm, Senator

Hutchison,Rep...
 Date: 1/11/02 6:23pm
 Subject: Oppose Microsoft Settlement
 Renata Hesse
 Trial Attorney
 Antitrust Division
 Department of Justice

I have written today to comment on the settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft Corporation. While I understand the honorable intentions of the judge and court in settling the case in order to prompt the economic recovery of the nation's largest company and thereby, in theory, to prompt economic recovery of the nation, I deplore the toothless settlement that has been accepted by the Department of Justice prosecutors. There are three things I feel must be included in a settlement that would enact real change in the operating system market and allow for true competition:

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. Microsoft's success, while due in some part to internal innovation, relies heavily on technologies developed by the public sector. The Internet and much of the networking and software technology essential for Microsoft Windows have been fostered by federal grants and Department of Defense research money. As such, any Microsoft networking protocols which build or modify these publicly developed standards must be published in full and approved by an independent network protocol body. This will prevent Microsoft from using their market position to seize de facto control of the Internet.

I trust that you will attempt to enact real and meaningful change in the operating system market. This is a true national security issue. Microsoft may be important to the nation's economy in the short term, but long term economic security can only come from a free and efficient market for operating systems and networking technologies.

I care about these issues and I vote.
 Massoud Javadi
 806 Oakley
 Houston, TX 77006
 CC:president@whitehouse.gov@inetgw

MTC-00010410

From: Fernando Cerda
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:24pm
 Subject: Microsoft
 Please, leave Microsoft alone!!!! You have been too harsh on them already. Bill Gates has changed how the world works!!! Are you punishing him because he has built an empire on his brain power?
 Lorian Cerda-Donoso

MTC-00010412

From: PMoraff@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: (no subject)

Dear Sirs:
 I am contacting you to express my desire that the action against Microsoft go no further. Besides the fact that it is unfair to Microsoft and it's shareholders, it cannot be the best thing for the US economy. Enough already!

Best regards,
 Paul Moraff
 4 haynes Avenue
 West Islip, NY 11795

MTC-00010413

From: nemesis enforcer
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:32pm
 Isn't it obvious what's going on? They aren't trying to monopolize, they are conquering the world. While this anti trust suit goes to shambles, its a distraction as the big 'M' buys up other companies to gain world domination in the computer industry. I cant believe my tax dollars actually pay some of your salaries. Look at the headaches from the at@t break up, the dereg of CATV etc. Is it really creating competition? Didn't you read the article about a \$250 a month cable TV bill from aol? Penalize the company...they should be forced to refund every registered windows product to its owner in full. Did you know that not only Microsoft Csr really sucks, the phone call is paid for by the consumer, and they keep you on hold for an hour before they say hello.

MTC-00010414

From: pierce@westernfinancialgroup.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Enough is enough. The Microsoft settlement is fair and will help the nation s technology and economy to move forward. The government s legal action against Microsoft has been dragging on for years and at last a fair settlement is at hand. Please stop the endless cycle of litigation now.

Respectfully submitted
 Lawrence W. Pierce

MTC-00010416

From: charles@reinstatler.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please end this legal assault on Microsoft as the Justice Department and most of the States want to do. Do not allow a handful of

MS competitors to use their intrastate political influence to undermine the best interests of the rest of American consumers.

MTC-00010418

From: fredlawyer@prodigy.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement reached is eminently better than ongoing litigation and uncertainty. Judge Posner correctly realized that resolution of this dispute is far more important than undue condescension to the collateral demands of bit players and special interests. Please approve and adopt the settlement achieved.

MTC-00010419

From: sue@peeco.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like the Microsoft suit completed. Microsoft has done a great deal for this country and the pending agreement should be accepted. thank you

MTC-00010420

From: mgb—bas@mediaone.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Cut out the nonsense and allow this settlement to go to finality. Yjr settlement should be approved totally and completely.

MTC-00010421

From: casamarina@juno.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this issue & let us move on.

MTC-00010422

From: mrappel@cwnet.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to get this matter settled. Consumers have been helped by Microsoft technology not hurt. I write a column on computer technology for a legal newspaper and have seen the tremendous advantages of Microsoft software for lawyers as well as all consumers. The lawsuit is based on a faulty premise that consumers have been injured. We should put this whole matter to rest and let the computer world get on with producing better and better products.

MTC-00010423

From: dac@magiccablepc.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let our courts put this case to closure. Only the companies that are not as advanced as Microsoft want to keep it open and active. It is at the stage it is a sheer waste of the courts time and the taxpayers money.

Cordially
 Dick A. Campbell

MTC-00010424

From: dalehanks@juno.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is another example of Microsoft's illegal and unethical tactics. The justice department really fell down on their job in this case. Microsoft has gotten away with murder and has been hindering innovation unless it is done Microsoft's way and fills Microsoft's pockets. Now is the time to stop this monopoly; find a way to let the innovation and technical leadership of others be successful.

MTC-00010425

From: karen1108@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Unlike a company such as Enron, Microsoft contributes to the quality of living of individuals around the globe. They are a company whose very existence pivots on constantly evolving technology. Leave them alone. Unless obvious blatant violations of monopoly laws take place, allow them to explore new fields without interference from jealous competitors.

MTC-00010426

From: Scoobedo13@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Consumer choices, not government management of innovation, are the best marketplace regulators. New regulations and unnecessary lawsuits against technology companies will stifle innovation and result in consumers paying higher prices. I am in favor of ending the Microsoft matter as soon as possible and getting on with business.

MTC-00010427

From: aldel@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Tell the cry babies to go home and create something. Enough is Enough!

MTC-00010428

From: fj568@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I THINK THE GOVERNMENT IS JUST TRYING TO GET SOME OF THE MONEY FROM MICRO-SOFT. THE GOVERNMENT IS LOOKING FOR A GOLDEN CALF.

MTC-00010429

From: jgolden28@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop wasting money and causing consumers problems. Drop your hounding of Microsoft. Start investigating Emromgate.

MTC-00010430

From: aub-barb@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

please go ahead with the agreed settlement. Further action is not needed.

MTC-00010431

From: arnobob@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let a fair impartial court make a fair judgment on this big problem without any outside influence.

MTC-00010432

From: lona50@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is time this suit against Microsoft is settled so that they can get on with the good work they have done so long. It seems to me that if their competitors build a better mouse trap, then they won't have to worry about what Microsoft does. Whatever happened to free enterprise?

MTC-00010433

From: cortath@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement with Microsoft is more than fair. If a company invents and develops a product, I do not think that the competition should have the right to capitalize on someone else's hard work. I think that Microsoft should now be left alone by those jealous want-to-be competitors and government agencies.

MTC-00010434

From: darccc@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A decision of the court has been rendered....MOVE ON! Why is it that the vocal minority do not accept rulings that do not favor their agendas? If our government continues to involve itself to the extent of involvement in the Microsoft case, we can expect to see bright minds discouraged from creating the future. Is this what our government wants? I'm tired of listening to the government and the power hungry who continue this fight. To them, I say: Get a life!

MTC-00010435

From: Weltonhouse@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement that has been offered. As a former teacher who had to use Macintosh products, I know that the advent of Windows-based software was a financial boon to the classroom. The same products in the Mac format were many times higher priced. Windows brought software to the teacher and consumer in varieties which were affordable. At home, we were lucky to have word processing and a spreadsheet. The array of affordable products brought with the coming of Windows gives lie to the charge that Microsoft has hurt the consumer. The states that have not settled have business interests that hope to flourish by hurting Microsoft rather than by competing through the marketplace.

MTC-00010436

From: AlitoRAF@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement was more than fair. It is unfortunate that because Microsoft and Gates did not make the required contributions to Clinton and Company's campaign coffers, that the Justice Department initiated this action in the first place. It is time to stop this nonsense now. Enough is enough.

MTC-00010437

From: cbstaz@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Accept the settlement in the Microsoft case to allow the country to continue to recover from slow recession.

MTC-00010438

From: bobruss@airmail.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough taxpayer money has been spent already to benefit the opponents of Microsoft. The proposed settlement is more than fair in support of a flawed judgement. The California AG should be prosecuted for his irresponsible pursuit of this judgement while being paid off by MS competitors.

Bob Russell

MTC-00010439

From: blayman3@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair as it is. Please keep it from being changed.

MTC-00010440

From: JWebb71561@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

End this case now! America's strength is free enterprise. Competition! Winners and losers! The government (bureaucrat) can't tolerate competition!!!!

MTC-00010441

From: boblemon@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Proceed with the settlement. This seems to be the best for every one concerned.

MTC-00010442

From: llwurst1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let the decision stand!

MTC-00010443

From: vandewater@infowest.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Having no personal risk in this case, I do have some considerable interest. I have been using computers for years. When the PC

started to become popular the biggest complaint was cost limited software availability and compatibility. When Windows was introduced the average user embraced it because it opened away to eliminate many of the above concerns. I recently purchased my 3rd Pentium Series Machine. The first was a 100Mhz Pentium with all of the major available bells and whistles. Six years ago that machine cost over \$3 000. This November I bought a 1.9Ghz Pentium 4 with bells and whistles that would reduce my original Pentium to nothing more than a bad door stop. The cost was in the low \$2000 range. 19+ times the computing power 6 times the memory 80 sized the hard drive capacity 16 times more video storage and the list goes on and a state of the art Microsoft Operating System XP. The point of the story is that as a consumer I have not been hurt at all quite the contrary. I have a choice of software that staggers the imagination and all of it is cheaper faster and better than what was available even 6 years ago. I have no doubt that Microsoft took advantage of its position of prominence and power. Does everyone at some time. Usually! Let s check out the White House for some recent examples. To me the settlement on the table should be approved and we should all move on to more interesting innovations and concerns. Justice will be and has been served. It is time to get out of the media s glare and just move on!

MTC-00010444

From: bbeckman@gdinet.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this soon. The agreement seems to have been hashed out and is merely waiting for the final nod. Microsoft has been an asset to the industrial world. Let s get on with it please. I am very happy this did not happen when the automobile was first invented. Th threat to the buggy whip manufacturers would have had all of the caves in Kentucky full of buggy whips because of the unfair competition to their industry.

Thank you.

MTC-00010445

From: Buddy578@Juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Justice Dept is wrong and Microsoft should be broken up.

MTC-00010447

From: patmackne@erols.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly support Microsoft in its negotiations with the government and think far too much time money and effort has been spent on this case to the detriment to the consumer.

MTC-00010448

From: lottza—wivez@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Microsoft will have to live under terms that are equalbe and just. Don t let competition taint the judicial process. Finalize the settlement.

MTC-00010449

From: Stephen T. Spray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:41pm
Subject: Hats off to Judge Motz

Congratulations to Judge Motz for stepping up to the plate and stiking a blow for business competition. When the guilty party is allowed to be the architect of their own punishment, then you get the kind of deal that Microsoft was going to use to increase their control of the market and stifle the competition.

Any user of Microsoft products, as I have been for years, knows how they have built in to their operating system programming to preclude or greatly limit users who wish to use any competitive product, such as the Netscape browser. The frustration to any intelligent user can lead to out and out anger, at the ways they constantly tout and build in methods to make their own products easier to use, and limit or deny ordinary users the ability to effectively procure and use competitive products.

Microsoft contends that they have been good for competition, but that would be exactly like contending John D. Rockefeller was good for competitive pricing in the oil industry. Baloney is baloney any way it is packaged.

Stephen T. Spray
Huntsville, Alabama

MTC-00010450

From: Debbie Tropiano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Debbie Tropiano
1305 Brianna Court
Cedar Park, TX 78613
January 11, 2002
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 too am opposed to the settlement as I feel that it inadequately punishes Microsoft for their behavior, has too many loopholes for Microsoft to use to continue the same behavior and insufficient penalties if they don't abide by the settlement.

Sincerely,
Debbie Tropiano

MTC-00010451

From: rima
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:49pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I fail to see how settling a court case without punishing the offender, or even stopping the criminal behavior, is anywhere close to being in the good of the country. It makes one wonder how much microsoft money changed hands, to make the settlement happen.

Jon Rima

MTC-00010452

From: Ken Woodmansee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:54pm
Subject: comments

Alternates to Microsoft Windows, such as Mac and Linux, will never be successful until standard Microsoft applications like Microsoft Office work equally well for all operating systems. When the same company owns the operating system and the applications, there is no incentive to create compatible versions for your competition. Microsoft's applications have become the defacto standard for most businesses. Even though Microsoft Windows is greatly inferior to other available operating systems, there is no choice for the consumer because the applications needed for performing the most common tasks are not available for other environments.

Ken Woodmansee
Director of Engineering
Cordell, Inc.—“Network Solution Experts”
<http://www.cordell.com>
Email: kenw@cordell.net
Phone: (626) 966-4402
FAX: (626) 339-2582

MTC-00010453

From: Holmes, Loren T
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Treatment

Why are you being so soft on these Microsoft liars and crocks? They need to be split up so that can't keep others from being inovative.

MTC-00010454

From: djt@netfocus.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let Microsoft continue to do the job that they have been doing. They have earned everything that they have (Bill Gates risked his future to build the company so he deserves the profit). If his competitors cannot keep up or pass him—tough. That is called smart business and he has earned it.

MTC-00010455

From: hwithera@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After reading all the Microsoft competition gobbledegook parroted by the Justice Department in their case against Microsoft I think the settlement reached between Microsoft the Justice Department and 9 of the 18 states arrayed against Microsoft is a more than adequate punishment for a company which literally outcompeted its competitors. I don t know what is going through the minds of Justice Department officials when they take the word of failing competitors against one of if not the most successful company in the United States Microsoft and attempt to impose penalties which handicap Microsoft and provide Microsoft s intellectual property to their competitors so that those competitors can MAYBE compete successfully against Microsoft. The 9 states which did not accept the settlement are those states in which

Microsoft's main failing competitors have their home offices and those states are bowing to pressure from those companies to eliminate their competition for them. Microsoft has always provided some of the best most innovative software at reasonable prices to their users. Those that say otherwise obviously have an axe to grind. The settlement reached between the Government 9 states and Microsoft is MORE THAN FAIR to the prosecution will benefit educational institutions and will be beneficial to those crybaby corporations who were unable to compete fairly with Microsoft.

MTC-00010456

From: ldwplw@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave as is I believe it is more than fair.

MTC-00010457

From: joelmassey@attbi.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to settle this case. It is not the role of government to penalize successful companies so that competitors can succeed with inferior products or marketing. The remaining opposition to the settlement are still in it for the purpose of rescuing the competing companies in their states. The only outcome of continuing the suit is detrimental to the consumer. The role of government is to protect consumers not to punish them. I strongly recommend that the agreed upon settlement be implemented as soon as possible so as to prevent ever-escalating cost to the taxpayer as well as the technology consumer.

MTC-00010458

From: bobskopek@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a retired person who has used the Microsoft programs on my former business and now home computer. Those groups who oppose the settlement agreement should thank Microsoft for the development of computer software and thus gave them the opportunity to participate in software development. Now they want to destroy the company that made this technology possible. I support the agreements reached in the settlement agreement put forward by Microsoft. Thanks for registering my support.

MTC-00010459

From: jimwelsh@bellsouth.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to stop needless expense and give a kick start to our economy by accepting the agreements reached between many of the States and Microsoft.

MTC-00010460

From: cardude5@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get on with the settlement!!

MTC-00010461

From: mtdorainfo@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement agreement is fair and adequate. Going on and on hurts technology advancement and impedes research in the interest of the public. Enough is enough—lets call it quits and standardize the settlement for all parties based upon the federal agreement

MTC-00010462

From: rjy@mcsi.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Accept the proposed settlement and put an end to this stupid law suit by competitors against a successful company.

MTC-00010463

From: wilbertg@home.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Without Microsoft there would be not be a hi-tech industry. The IBM like companies wants to see to big business like Banks Insurance companies and other Government sponsored contractors because the non-value added in these contract can Bankrupt the public. Microsoft is the heart and sole of the HOME Hi Tech market and has been the only serious investor in this market. I do not own one share of Microsoft stock but I have always recognized their leadership in promoting the sale of every high tech company's hardware. Through their evolution of the software the Hard Disk drive technology exceeded expectations the video card market now sell cards for more than some computers the 19 inch monitor sound card makers motherboard and memory chip makers all sell for less than 5-30% of their 1992 prices. ZEROX UNIX V OS2 Mac OS and many other Windows competitive operating systems can only blame their R&D investments and management. Let Microsoft continue to help our country grow and spend more energy on ENRON Terrorist and many other subjects that are trying to destroy our way of life. Microsoft has made America proud and unless you believe that they are also hiring A. Anderson to do their accounting we should leave them along without enforcing any consent decree. This Eugene Crew wants to steal money from the the Microsoft company. California does not want computers for their students they want money that they will distribute. Sound familiar? Sounds like the energy crisis that they regulate!!! Well sorry that this comment arrived too late.

MTC-00010464

From: dfa42@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There has been too much money and time spent on this so-called case in the first place. The problem with the Microsoft competitors is nothing but sour grapes and jealousy that they couldn't break up a fine company and

make a profit out of it for themselves. What they really want to see is the collapse of Microsoft so they can grab for themselves what is left over and this is the only way they can see of doing it. Settle this now because it these other companies get their way the cost of this technology will go through the roof if they get their hands on it.

MTC-00010465

From: bob3n8r1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Re: Microsoft Settlement This settlement is a tough fair and reasonable compromise and is in the best interest of everyone.

MTC-00010466

From: mistymeadow82@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already! I am a retired Marine having served 26 1/2 years. I fought for this country because above all else it was a country that rewarded those who were willing to step into the arena and give their all for the benefit of others. No greater example of this exist than Bill Gates and Steve Jobs. It is beyond comprehension that Microsoft is being penalized for being innovative. Not only have they made it possible for virtually EVERYONE to be able to use a computer but have done it without the greed we see in the companies and politicians who are attacking them. Please use some common sense and end this unjustified attack—not for Microsoft but for the good of this country I hope we both love.

Thank you
Kindly
Joe and Sandy Sucha

MTC-00010467

From: fultonswe@rcia.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

All people/parties who have pursued this case against Microsoft are guilty of FRAUD WASTE and ABUSE of Tax Payers Money. They should all be made to reimburse (with triple damages) the American tax payers and Microsoft.

MTC-00010468

From: spider@arachnplex.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have worked with Microsoft products for years—I have also worked with products from Sun and Netscape among others. I find the Microsoft suite of servers and OSs far more valuable and innovative than Sun products and their browser blows Netscape's away. This isn't because Microsoft is some monopoly (It's not—you're free to write your own OS right now break out the assembler books and have at it) but because the products serve a wider audience BETTER than their competitors. Why is Microsoft's browser BETTER than Netscape's (oops I mean AOL's of course) if Microsoft is this slothful behemoth that isn't good for consumers as their detractors say? Because

those attacking Microsoft can't win in the marketplace so they want to use the court system like a bunch of stooges. Don't let this happen. Any action by the government against Microsoft will follow in Judge Jackson's path of bias and be HURTFUL to innovation not helpful. Leave competition to the marketplace instead of letting a bunch of lack-luster whiners insult competition in the courtroom.

MTC-00010469

From: ewadding@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement agreed upon between the DOJ and Microsoft is fair and it is time we all move on.

MTC-00010470

From: duanebat@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly favor the settlement. Long drawn out litigation in a dynamic fast changing industry such as software obviously hurts the public by diverting management attention away from innovation to serve the public and diverting monies to lawyers that should be spent on innovation. The best minds of Microsoft the Justice Department and responsible state attorney generals have now agreed. The only disagreement comes from some attorney generals such as the AG in my state of Massachusetts who are subject to powerful political pressures from Microsoft competitors whose interests do not necessarily concur with the public interest.

MTC-00010471

From: carolshukle@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The waste of time and money caused by litigation over Microsoft needs to come to an end. The settlement seems like a fair solution. What Microsoft has done for the last 10 or so years is make personal computing accessible and affordable for the average consumer as well as creating a standardized platform for almost everyone who uses a PC. Microsoft has in no way hurt consumers. It is to the benefit of the national economy to get this thing over with.

Sincerely
Carol Shukle

MTC-00010472

From: thomask@iland.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

How can it be that Microsoft's business practices are illegal? Sure they are heavy-handed yes they could be toned down I'll agree with that. Yes they are tough yet that is good for the industry as a whole. Their competition should stop complaining and start competing. If a software company wants to beat Microsoft do it on the store shelves not the courts. The competition simply needs to (in simple terms) out program and improve upon the available technology. Develop new and better ways of doing things and stick to

it. Unlike in the past when a software company would develop a great program then their support would vanish and the product would stagnate up until now Microsoft would step in and basically finish the job that others left by the wayside. Take for instance Netscape it took over 4 years for them to finally improve upon the program meanwhile Microsoft kept driving the platform forward with their Internet Explorer. Simply put the competition needs to stop whining and hire better programmers come up with new and exciting products. Microsoft's business practices don't affect me as a consumer as a matter of fact I simply prefer Microsoft products because they are quality products and should troubles exist the support is second to none always has been

K. Thomas

MTC-00010473

From: dotjim50@earthlink.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement is correct. It is time we stopped bashing successful companies in this country when there is in truth competition.

MTC-00010474

From: Patsy.Sampson@worldnet.att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have reviewed the proposed settlement of the Microsoft case. I believe it is a fair settlement for all parties. In the interests of the public & the technology industry I hope it will be accepted soon so this case will be ended.

MTC-00010475

From: chet—
rizzuto@maxxconnect.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Ms. Hesse: I honestly believe that Microsoft has gone through enough trying to prove that they are not pirates dishonest or trying to break up other companies. They have been unable to compete and by now should recognize that declaring a truce would be the best way out. The ENRON debacle is one that should be pushed to the front. Many politicians and other government officials are involved and undoubtedly are going to be excused for their actions. The average American is disgusted with what is going on in the country today. Stop the Microsoft debacle and get to more important things.

Respectfully
C. R. Rizzuto

MTC-00010476

From: llefort36@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Simply: Leave Microsoft alone. No user to my knowledge complained about its business practices. I seem to recall that Netscape did therefore the govt took action. It's a bunch of sour grapes. I applaud Microsoft for all of its products.

MTC-00010477

From: camfam99@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair. Please finalize the settlement.

MTC-00010478

From: TateMT@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think Microsoft should be left alone. The Government really messed up our telephone system when they messed with Ma Bell.

MTC-00010479

From: cjarsenault@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Word on the street is Microsoft did not donate enough money to the Polititions and the Clinton Group. That is the only reason this Company was envolved. As a Sales Person and see the Federal Government going after any Company Me and many people in my sales terretory are loolng at a Big Brother Type of Government. Now that the Dirt bags are out of the White House The Federal Government should let all people do Business and let the Market handle competition not federal Government

MTC-00010482

From: Bill Pratt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Honorable Federal District Court Judge,

Please find for Microsoft and their proposed settlement. I believe to do so is in the best interest of the public. As a taxpayer, I have watched and waited too long as our tax dollars are misspent on this case. It is my strong belief that these additional States which refuse to settle are doing so only for their own selfish monetary purposes and not in the best interest of their people or the United States. I believe it is time to close the book on this. I strongly support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. Please make the correct decision on behalf of the American public and settle this case.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
R. William Pratt
7020 Roundelay Rd. N.
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068

MTC-00010483

From: Wendy Viramontes
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wendy Viramontes
1520 Jody Avenue
Lebanon, PA 17046
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Wendy S. Viramontes

MTC-00010484

From: Fred H. Greenwood

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/11/02 6:26pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Fred H. Greenwood

7 Kirkwood Road

West Hartford, CT 06117-2830

January 11, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Fred H. Greenwood

MTC-00010485

From: Nancy Marie Regets

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/11/02 6:27pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Nancy Marie Regets

167 Millrace Circle

Aiken, SC 29805-9381

January 11, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Nancy Marie Regets

MTC-00010486

From: advanzio@netscape.net@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 7:06pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I agree with the judge that Microsoft does not deserve the ability to increase their marketshare by giving away their product. Giving away their product is like letting little kids have a taste of free drugs. You know Microsoft will benefit by upgrades. Let Microsoft compete in the market, just as everyone else does.

Regards,

Rick Redfern

714.894.0407

MTC-00010487

From: Les Lohmann

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 7:15pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Renata B. Hesse:

As a U.S. citizen living abroad, I am very concerned that the proposed settlement with

Microsoft does not begin to address the harm done to the software industry nor does it create an environment where anticompetitive behaviors will be stopped.

In order for the software industry to recover, the retail software (especially the word processing, spreadsheet and browser software) must be separated from the operating system. No paper wall will achieve this -the company must be split in two (at least).

Interestingly, the stockholders of MS will benefit far more under this scenario based on the results of significant breakups of the past. The economy of the U.S. will benefit and the market for software and related services will grow.

During this period of recession, permitting recessionary forces, such as anticompetitive monopolistic behavior, can only hurt us all.

Leslie John Lohmann

mailto:llohmann@tkc.att.ne.jp

fon/fax: 81-3/5987-0723

2-26-6 Nukui

Nerima-ku, Tokyo 176-0021

MTC-00010488

From: Judy Sarris

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/11/02 7:24pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm tired of the antitrust politicians wasting our money on suits that have no value and are meaningless in a free market economy anyway. The only place there can be a real monopoly is if the government intervenes and restricts competition. As long as there is a free market, the best/highest value/most desirable product will ultimately win. Only government can give a monopoly to a company or companies and keep this from happening. The government should not be in the business of siding with or bailing out companies that could not compete in the marketplace so are looking for the courts to do for them what they couldn't do for themselves.

Microsoft has done more for the average technology consumer than any company in the history of the industry. They have built better software, provided better service, and done it for less than any competitor. They have increased the quality and reduced the cost of desktop software faster than any other product of any sort has ever done. THAT is why Microsoft is the giant it is—because its products and service are better than the alternatives.

The government wasted billions of our dollars pursuing IBM for naught. By the time anything happened, IBM was no longer a dominant player. The same could happen to Microsoft if they let the competition get ahead of them. As long as they know that (and they live and breathe it every day), they will continue to build more value for the consumer. Leave them alone and let them do it.

The anti trust cops who claim to have the consumer's interest at heart are hurting those same consumers more than Microsoft ever will.

1. The drain on Microsoft's time and resources detract from their ability to build the software we all want and can't get from lesser rivals.

2. The drain on Microsoft's finances reduces the value of their stock which is one of the most widely held in the nation.

3. The government is wasting billions of our tax dollars to support this boondoggle and to effectively subsidize competitors who can't compete on the merits. DROP THIS SUIT!!!

Judy

MTC-00010489

From: KCREASON88@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:23pm
Subject: Microsoft School System Donation/
Settlement

DOJ:

It is important to maintain a level playing field and I'm sure that MSFT pushed the envelope...but: try to keep in mind that no other platform, system, inter-connectivity is as productive as MSFT, whether student, business or military, its not even close! To even point students in the direction of Apple, Linux to some degree, is stagnating the analytical growing mind.

I started 35 yrs ago with a sliderule & punch cards, I know whereof I speak!

Dirk Tucker
Naples, Fl

MTC-00010490

From: Dennis Matthias
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:29pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:

I strongly support the Justice Department settlement with Microsoft. We both use Microsoft Windows at home and at work. It seems a fair settlement and I believe it is time to move on and let U.S. companies continue to lead the world in technology.

Yours Truly,
Dennis and Virginia Matthias
4105 Heritage Hill Lane
Ellicott City, MD 21042

MTC-00010491

From: michael_31475@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If Clinton worried more about the terrorists instead of picking on Microsoft we would not be in the War that we are now in. Enough of picking on a wonderful company—let s end this unfair treatment...mwc

MTC-00010492

From: dorisprc2@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Accept the settlement and let Him get on with his life. He was smart enough to give all this before others even thought about it. Let Bill gates alone Now.

MTC-00010493

From: Bob.Typo.ITU@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it s time to let Microsoft alone and accept the Judges decision. They have done wonders with Dos and Windows.

MTC-00010494

From: Bob Wiley
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/11/02 7:41pm
Subject: Please settle the case with Microsoft!
To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court. In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for

those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Robert L. Wiley III
Managing Director
Sound Capital Partners
701 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 264-2110

MTC-00010495

From: COakley@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Personally, as one who has been in the computer industry since the days of the Apple II, I feel that Microsoft has done far more to aid the computer industry and this economy than it has ever done to harm it. I remember all too well the days of the "tower of babel" because of this or that small company attempting to develop some form of proprietary software... Apple, in many ways, still is a closed system. But, as there was a finding of monopolistic practices, let the federal case stand.

From where I sit, it appears as though the states are simply looking for a revenue source for their own uses and have less interest in "justice" than in seeing how deep Microsoft's pockets can be... IF there were monopolistic practices engaged in, it is the consumer and private business who took the hits... and I don't hear anybody talking about helping out the actual injured parties (assuming that there really are any) in this case.

Furthermore, while Apple makes a decent product, I find it fascinating that, in the imaginary name of "competition", our students are being taught using computers that hold a relatively small place in the overall population of desktop systems installed in home, government and workplace environments. The states apparently desire to believe that allowing Microsoft to actually put state of the art systems in the schools would further displace Apple... so, rather than focus on what is actually the right thing to do for the education system and the citizenry served by it, they would prefer to keep us safe from Microsoft and pocket the money instead (... kinda' reminds me of all the states who legalized lotteries and "riverboat" gambling under the pretext of it helping the education system and then failed to inform that, while

the funds may actually be applied to schools, the existing school budgets would be offset by all or a portion of those proceeds raised by "legal gambling"....

Further, I find two great ironies in the whole Microsoft case: 1:) Microsoft became a monopoly because of government contacting and purchasing practices (I worked as a contractor and had some familiarity with the procedures) in the first place, while the government was not the sole reason for this, their demand for the interconnectivity of the Microsoft products and the standards provided were key to the demand made for the product... 2:) The original impetus for the case was brought by AOL and Netscape... two who have become one and a veritable monopoly in their own right... So... needless to say... my opinion is, make the original federal settlement binding on all states.

Thank you for your time...

James Winkler
Metamora, Illinois

MTC-00010496

From: Scott Grant
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:47pm
Subject: microsoft monopoly

I agree strongly with not allowing Microsoft to donate computers for compensation in the lawsuit against it's anticompetitive tactics. The windows operating system is an inferior system which is maintained by Microsoft's monopoly power. The company consistently misuses its power and needs to be controlled.

Scott Grant

MTC-00010497

From: David Balts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:57pm
Subject: my opinion

Dear Justice Department,

I just heard of the denial of acceptance of the proposed Microsoft settlement. While I can understand the concerns put forth by the companies that object to it, I feel it was a settlement that helped most concerned.

While no one, me included, wants to see any company get away with overcharging customers, I also see a lot of good in the settlement. It would benefit the neediest of schools while still leaving Microsoft a viable intact company.

Unfortunately there are, and always will be, people that won't be happy until Microsoft is broken down and crushed into the dirt. And then I wonder if they would still even be happy. They seem to be only looking for someone to tear apart their competition so they can thrive. A view I'm sure they wouldn't have had they become the software of choice. While competition is good, I believe these companies and individuals only want to gain ground at Microsoft's expense.

Believe me, as someone who was around using computers through times when there was no major player or standards I can remember that it was no fun. No one's software, or even information, could be shared with anyone else without great pains and lots of problems. We all cried out for some kind of standard. I, for one, was glad

to finally see a standard spread through the industry. Unfortunately for those whose standard wasn't chosen, it was Microsoft that rose to the top.

While most Microsoft products are hardly perfect, (and who's are?) they do allow many different people running many different programs to communicate and share data together. I would NEVER want to go back to the days of everyone doing their own thing with no standards available.

This has become a case of the best product available becoming the most widely used. But to some it has just become a 'tear down and rip apart Microsoft at any cost' situation. And its funny how those that weren't chosen as the majority standard tend to be yelling the loudest. It was just a clear case of the public choosing the best that was available at the time and using it. Now instead of developing something that can compete or even win out over any Microsoft product, all the competition wants to do is yell foul and hope the justice department eliminates or severely restricts their competition.

Believe me, the American people are smart. If they see something else developed that will do what they want done better than they are able to do it now, they will choose that product and use it. No matter what Microsoft or anyone else tries to do. Don't diminish the peoples ability.

This situation reminds me of the break-up of the telephone system. While looking good on paper, trying to give other companies a chance and the consumer more choices and thus lower costs, it has done nothing but the opposite. We are all paying more and most people throw their hand up in disgust when it comes to figuring out what's best. And some companies don't even wait for the consumer to decide. They just grab all the new customers they can any way possible and the consumer usually ends up frustrated and paying in the end. Plus the system has never worked together as well as it used to.

I realize these situations can be very different. But in some ways they can be very similar.

Please keep the consumer in mind when you make your decisions, and not the desires and demands of those too involved to decide effectively. Most of Microsoft's competitors now feel that if they complain loud enough someone will finally listen and rule in their favor. While I'm not advocating letting Microsoft off Scott-free, I do feel both the good Microsoft has brought the consumer must be considered along with the bad.

I use Microsoft products, along with other brands, and chose each because I felt they did what I needed to have done the most effectively. And I did this ONLY after looking at everything available. Some companies don't like it because Microsoft still offers some of the best products available. If other companies develop better software I, and the American public, are smart enough to choose what's best for our needs. That's the way this great country works.

We don't need someone to make our decisions for us, especially the Microsoft competitors that seem to be complaining the loudest.

Thank-You.
David E. Balts

224 S 16th St, #2
La Crosse, WI 54601
608-784-6703
Age: 43
dbalts@centurytel.net

MTC-00010498

From: ILWalls@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 7:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My vote is to put an end to this problem and let us get on with life.

Sincerely,
Louise Walls # 519
10-10 So. Rockwood Blvd
Spokane, WA 99202

MTC-00010499

From: john.w.schroeder@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:02pm
Subject: Good Microsoft Decision Today

Judge Motz, c/o Robert Wolinsky,
Thank you for your courage in the Microsoft opinion released today. Although I'm a Microsoft shareholder, I don't believe Microsoft should be allowed to undermine Apple by turning an antitrust penalty into a marketing triumph and give away Microsoft products to schools. A more appropriate penalty might be an award of \$\$ for those same schools to buy Apple products, or a mandatory rebate of some amount to all Microsoft customers. Having seen the press reports of today's decision, I have faith that you'll do justice.

MTC-00010500

From: Elizabeth Pearson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Elizabeth Pearson
638 Hawthorne Av
Elmhurst, IL 60126
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more

entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Pearson

MTC-00010501

From: joseph brumm
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:03pm
Subject: To Whom It May Concern:
To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed antitrust settlement with Microsoft. Microsoft needs competition. Without competition Microsoft will have no reason to ever improve its products. Microsoft's products, in my opinion have steadily degraded as the company grew. After all, if there is no steady, present, competition, why would they need to improve their products.

Microsoft has, over the years destroyed any competition that has ever come against them. The reasoning, it's good business. But our nation was founded on a set of ethical values. By this ruthless practice, Microsoft abides by none. They consistently make what I consider to be libelous, slanderous statements about any competition that ever points their way. For technology to advance, competition is a necessity. Else the tech industry will be like George Orwell's Animal Farm. The pigs (no harsh implications toward microsoft intended) will keep telling us how much better our life is.

And we will be forced to believe them. Because we have no basis for comparison any longer.

I cannot make suggestions as for their penalties, as I do not know all the matters of fact or law, but the penalties should be severe. At least enough so Microsoft cannot merely shake them off and continue with a monopoly. Thank you for your time, consideration, and willingness to listen, I submit Very Respectfully, Joseph Brumm

MTC-00010502

From: Michelle Haynes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached please find a letter in support of the settlement reached in November.

Thank you.
Michelle R. Haynes
Tel. 407-539-2702
mrivehaynes@cfl.rr.com

Michelle Haynes
400 N. Phelps Avenue
Winter Park
FL 32789

January 7, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you today to express my support of the Microsoft anti-trust settlement that was reached back in early November, and I am relieved to see this old dispute finally come to an end. Microsoft has pledged

to share more information with other companies and give consumers more choices. Microsoft will design future versions of Windows to make it easier to install non-Microsoft software, and Microsoft cannot strike back against companies that take advantage of that. If fact, the settlement stipulates that licensing agreements for the top 20 hardware firms must be on equal terms, except for volume discounts.

This settlement will not only make it easier to conduct business for Microsoft competitors, but it will also allow this company to move forward. This settlement will benefit all. Thank you for settling with Microsoft, and I urge you to use your influence to appeal to the states that have not yet settled as well, including Florida.

Sincerely,
Michelle Haynes
CC: Representative Ric Keller

MTC-00010503

From: RRP52@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT CASE

WHY ARE YOU WASTING OUR MONEY
. . . COULD BE USED FOR OTHER THINGS
MORE IMPORTANT . . . JUST A BIG
WASTE AND YOU WONDER WHY PEOPLE
DON'T HAVE ANY TRUST IN THE
GOVERNMENT? WHY DON'T YOU LET
THE PEOPLE DECIDE . . . NOT A BUNCH
OF LAWYERS WHO STANDS TO MAKE A
LOT OF MONEY
RUFUS RICHEY

MTC-00010504

From: Darek Czechowicz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:14pm
Subject: Microsoft

Microsoft is great Company. All we should be proud that Microsoft was created and exist in America. All people in the world wants one operation system—Windows. I used for so many years Lotus, Paradox, I switch to Microsoft because these products are better than competitors products.

Regards,
Darek

MTC-00010505

From: Kenneth Owen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT—NO MORE
PROSECUTING

Stop spending money on the PROSECUTION of MICROSOFT. They are in the marketplace and they deserve to reap the benefits of their labors....

Thanks,
Kenneth E. Owen
6705 Jameson Road
Amarillo, Tx 79106

MTC-00010506

From: vwlee
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:32pm
Subject: Viewpoint on Microsoft AntiTrust Case

I think the negotiated settlement is fair and the litigation should not be dragged on to benefit a few influential competitors. This

antitrust case has taught Microsoft a lesson and Microsoft's conduct will be different. It's in public interest to not waste tax dollars on cases that do not benefit the public. A case in point—the class action suit against Microsoft took a wrong turn and denied underprivileged children from getting billion dollars worth of free computers and only to benefit a few powerful lawyers.

A concerned citizen,
Ven Lee
10728 Riviera Pl N.E.
Seattle, WA 98125

MTC-00010507

From: Hal Schmidt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:44pm
Subject: The Microsoft and Enron Deal

It seems that both Microsoft and Enron, because of their might, done whatever they wished to do to the general public and other sectors. I am glad the ruling today was against the Microsoft giant. Yes! The preliminary suggestion of providing software to school would erode Apple Co. longstanding help to school and their share of the computer dollar. Thank God for this ruling today.

Hal Schmidt

MTC-00010508

From: Steve Bodis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached is a letter concerning my support of the settlement reached between the Department of Justice and Microsoft.

3987 S 900 E
Apt. 123
Salt Lake City, UT 84124-1175
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

Microsoft and the Department of Justice have finally reached a settlement to the antitrust case brought against Microsoft several years ago. This was reached after a long, litigious battle, costing both sides enormous amounts of money and time. I support this agreement. Microsoft has agreed to a wish list drawn up by its competitors, basically: Free intellectual property in the Windows internal interfaces, nondiscriminatory licensing, no retaliation for using non-Microsoft software within Windows, and a committee to ride herd on Microsoft's living up to the agreement.

This country has been through some very difficult times, but we have rebounded and with the new year, I think everyone is ready to move on. Settling this antitrust case is one way to move on, allowing us to concentrate on more important things such as the economy. And regardless of what you may think of Microsoft, the company is the engine that propels this economy. When Microsoft was served with the antitrust lawsuit, the NASDAQ plummeted. The economy has yet to recover. Microsoft, from what I know of the settlement, has more than acceded to the demands of the Department of Justice. Any

further litigation would be very damaging. I personally think competitors of Microsoft held too much sway over the indictment against the company and I would hate to think these same people would impede us from moving forward and putting this case to rest.

I support this settlement. I ask that you do also.

Sincerely,
Istvan Zoltan Bodis

MTC-00010509

From: FRANKLIN D MATSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:50pm
Subject: Get Tough on Evil Microsoft

USA.Today has a link saying a person could sent their thought on the Microsoft case to the DOJ. I personally think that this big business evil company is just getting it hands spanked. They have been found guilty and should be punished accordingly. The government spent millions of dollars on the case and thus should extract billions and lots of them from Microsoft including extracting lots of money from the management at MS.

MTC-00010510

From: Gerard Terpening
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 8:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
21161 Greenboro Lane
Huntington Beach, CA 92646-7020
January 10, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to you today to state my support of the recent settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice in regards to the antitrust dispute. Microsoft is a leader in the technology industry. Over the past decade, Microsoft has consistently provided consumers with innovative, user-friendly products. Their success in the technology industry is proof of their excellence in the field.

While I do not agree with the litigation to begin with, I am pleased that the issue is finally resolved. After three years of litigation, the technology industry is definitely worse off, not to mention the taxpayer! It is time for the government to put the issue at bay and focus on rebuilding the economy.

Microsoft competitors have received much under this settlement. There should be no room for complaints on their part. It is time to focus on the needs of our American economy.

Sincerely,
Gerard Terpening
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00010511

From: Tori Heath
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:05pm
Subject: my opinion

I have been using computer (s) since 1980. I need them because I am a CPA, but also wish I had more time to "play, explore." Bill Gates has done incredibly wonderful things

for computer technology. HOWEVER, I think his success has gone to his head, and somehow he thinks he ought to control the market.

Just one example...I have always liked WordPerfect because of it's "reveal codes" feature. But, every version through #8 has caused me nothing but problems. I finally reached the point where I was simply wasting my time with it. If you can't beat them join them. So, I went with MS Word and its accompanying Excel. Neither of these programs measure up to what Corel (or whoever owns them now.) Furthermore, I have to have the entire "Office" package which I have absolutely no need for. I spent over \$200 over a year ago to buy "Word" and "Excel." Then I learn that there are no bug fixes, updates, etc for these programs alone. I had to have the entire "Office" package itself. I resent Microsoft's power and control over such situations.

It's not that my computer system is inadequate (far from it). I do not like being forced to have programs which I neither need, nor want. They muddy up the registry, mess with my "start" menu . . . in general take up space, including memory, which I want to use the way I want to use it. I believe that is my right. It's one thing to have "Windows," but that's as far as it should go as far as I am concerned.

I have recently upgraded my 2 computer systems. One has "XP" on it (which I love)....but I have downloaded Sun Microsystems spreadsheet and wordprocessor which is getting glowing reviews. On my other system I have "Windows 98 SE," and use Lotus "SmartSuite." I like it, far and above "Office."

I don't know how to curtail Mr. Gates. To give him license to donate computers to as many schools as he wants to is a tax gimmick designed to make you and everyone else happy. I raised 5 children, none of whom had computers in school. They learned just fine. At the Jr. High level I can see where they can be of great use, and provide more learning opportunities. But nothing beats a good teacher who is well versed in his/her subject.

I firmly believe that Mr. Gates should be FORCED (under knowledgeable government supervision) to provide his source codes for all his operating systems. How else can other companies write competitive programs which can run under these operating systems. Microsoft is not the only company which has excellent programmers, and other companies can offer different products.

Don't let this guy get away with what he has done, and probably still doing, because he can afford such a team of lawyers. You need good advice from people who know computers and programming. Please listen to him. Gates has no right to "buy" his way out of his monopolies, etc.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Very sincerely,
Victoria Heath
theath@triad.rr.com
336-454-3121

MTC-00010512

From: John Lancaster

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:13pm
Subject: opinion

I think Bill Gates and Microsoft are arrogant, interested only in themselves and to hell with the public. I hope you do what is proper in this case—Break up the monopoly.

MTC-00010513

From: John Yunker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I must protest the terms of the Microsoft Settlement. The current wording of the settlement codifies the right of Microsoft to control access to information by private individuals. The settlement must be changed to specifically grant the right to interface with the microsoft platform to authorize, get, and put information. Certain specifications, such as the root file system, cannot be subject to license because this would restrict access to a basic public infrastructure. The information infrastructure is just as important to society as the energy, water, and communications infrastructure.

The standards for hooking together basic public infrastructure MUST be available to society at large for the effective evolution of our society. No one can dispute that access to information is a basic part of modern public infrastructure. The ability to build an interface to my information store is a basic public right.

As long as they have an effective monopoly on private information platform (non-commercial) they cannot use that position to exclude any class of society from being able to build components of the information infrastructure, e.g. they must make key interface specifications public and not subject to license. They can make specific technology used in providing a service subject to license, but not the service itself, nor the specification of interfaces to those services.

Thank you,
John Yunker
1901 45th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98116
(206) 935-6251
john.yunker@bleuciel.org

MTC-00010514

From: John Luongo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern,

The Court has established that Microsoft has a monopoly position. As such, its conduct is to be scrutinized to protect consumers. In the light of Microsoft's past behavior, we can expect minimal cooperation from Microsoft at best, and more likely, continued abuse. Microsoft's lack of candor at the trial was offensive, and I believe that it bodes poorly for their future conduct. As consumers, we need a remedy that is much stronger than that which was reached in the recent settlement. One needs to look no further than Intel and AMD to see the effects of competition in the personal computer marketplace. The battle for consumers between these two competitors has two

obvious benefits. First, lower prices. And second, more innovation.

Business and personal consumers need the same type of competition in software. I would like to choose to purchase my operating system from another vendor without having to switch to Linux or Apple. And I would like to have a greater choice of office productivity software as well. Microsoft can market software that is bloated with features that I don't want or need, and it can force me to upgrade my licenses for Windows or Office when they decide it is no longer profitable for them to support. For example, if I decide to keep upgrading my computer indefinitely, at some point they can refuse to "activate" my software licenses. In effect, this forces me into a subscription mode. If I choose to use Office XP Professional ten years from now, I should not need Microsoft's "permission."

Microsoft's tactics bully both consumers, and other entrants to the marketplace. I wish market forces could remedy this imbalance. Because this is unlikely, we need a settlement or judgment that will protect end users from Microsoft's greed. We need your help.

While it may seem extreme, I believe that Microsoft should be forced to license the code for Windows and for office productivity software to competitors who are willing to pay an equitable fee. This will compensate Microsoft for their intellectual property, while allowing competitors to market products that appeal to segmented markets. One size does not fit all in the computer software marketplace.

There is a great irony in all this. Microsoft is an enormously talented competitor who, in the long term, would benefit more from healthy competition than from its present dominance.

MTC-00010516

From: J Oyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:33pm
Subject: the case

Since when does the government have any right to say what the value of a product is. Overcharge the public? The public has gotten a good deal. maybe we forget where we were just a few short years ago. Computers were a mess to operate. They could not even talk to another computer, until Microsoft came along. GOVERNMENT: leave us alone.

MTC-00010517

From: Art Mayer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:31pm
Subject: Power

Microsoft has used its financial, legal and monopoly power for too long, and in too many ways, to allow it to continue to destroy competition and stifle better products.

Anyone with more than a rudimentary knowledge of computers, and who has been involved with computers for a long period of time, knows the following: Microsoft's total addiction to "the bottom line" has turned them into a company that determines a time when it wants to release a new product, with unlimited advertising and promotion, and then releases the product at that time

without regard to the product's readiness or quality. The term, "sloppy programming" is used by the Microsoft programmers themselves to identify this problem.

And, secondly, the fact that Microsoft tries to undermine, purchase and destroy, or simply destroy, companies producing better product has led to the sad situation of today, in which other, and (real or potentially) better operating systems and applications are held back and eliminated. This country, or the world, would not let one pharmaceutical, medical, oil or energy entity control the sales, supply and use to the world, of necessary products or knowledge. Today, information and the internet is becoming as important as medicine and energy. It needs to be controlled for the good of the world, not one, selfish organization.

Art Mayer,
Bellevue, WA

MTC-00010518

From: Robert Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation

By way of introduction, I'm a retired engineer and, although I have owned numerous personal computers over the last twenty years, I still consider myself just an average computer user. I hope you'll forgive my fervor in the matter of litigation against Microsoft, but like the VAST MAJORITY of computer owners, I (as well as the stock market) was appalled at the Department of Justice attack on Microsoft. Actually, the innovation and COMPATIBILITY of Microsoft's products have greatly improved life for the average computer owner. In addition, Microsoft is a most respected company, who has played a MAJOR roll in making the United States the world's undisputed technology leader (so seldom has it been that our US companies have not played second fiddle to the Japanese).

Under the guise of somehow protecting computer users, the DOJ forged ahead with this legal action as though they somehow knew more about what we wanted than we did ourselves (which, I feel, smacks a bit of "Big Brother-ism"). In part, I feel that the DOJ was overly swayed by the rantings of Microsoft's competitors (like Sun Microsystems) who had a vested interest in crippling the company. If one really wanted to do what is right for the computer market, they would get off Microsoft's back and let them continue giving us more innovative and reasonably priced products. Judge Penfield Jackson has, of course, been revealed for what he actually was and the Department of Justice concluded the case with logical remedial actions. However, some nine states seem to have rationalized that the DOJ, along with the other 40 states (and most assuredly, we consumers) are all wrong and that they have a sacred obligation to set it all straight. Anytime something is held up to the scrutiny of a blood letting such as this has been, there are always some who will never let go (not unlike vultures who have been waiting in the wings to glean whatever benefits that might be realized from a lynching). Pardon the comparison, but we consumers view their action as classic ambulance chasing.

And, just when is enough, enough. Has anyone ever stopped to consider what this three year long ordeal, against one of the countries most admired companies, has already cost our country? I realize that this action by the dissenting states isn't costing them anything (I believe that Microsoft has to pick up their legal bills). It makes me wonder if they would be as compelled to carry on their "crusade" if it were on their nickel. I really hope that I'm wrong, but I get the strange feeling that somewhere in this pursuit, these nine states will actually be seeking a monetary settlements for their state's coffers.

Please don't take offence at these concerns. They are truly meant as constructive suggestions.

Bob Williams
rtwill33@earthlink.net
828-926-9593

MTC-00010519

From: John L. Varner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

John Varner
7503 E County Road 625 N
Grandview, IN 47615-9558
Ph. (812) 362-8045
January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

At age 73, and a long-time admirer of Microsoft, I write you with concern over the recent settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. Not only was this negotiation process rational and fair, but also it was well monitored and in the interest of all parties involved. This is why it is ridiculous for it to go under any further scrutiny. After three frustrating years of court battles, it is time to move forward.

The greed of professional lawyers and the states objecting to this settlement has become ludicrous.

My experience is limited but I have owned 3 computers and taken about 6 computer courses from Ivy Tech. Microsoft is certainly the leader in development and innovation of records for business.

WHERE would industry and our economy be today with the without the technology that for the most part has been pioneered and developed by Microsoft?

The terms that Microsoft and the D.O.J. have agreed upon are productive, detailed and in the interest of the entire IT sector. Microsoft has agreed to design versions of Windows that will allow easier installation of non-Microsoft software. Along with this, they are willing to be monitored by a committee that will make sure that they follow procedure. The IT sector is ready to move forward and get back to business. Can't we help support our technology industry, and stop any further litigation against this settlement?

Let us allow our software companies to work together in order to maintain our place in the global market.

Please help to support the agreement as it is, and let the terms speak for themselves.

Please don't shackle and penalize Microsoft further because of its initiative and hard work to become the leader. The world desperately needs Microsoft's expertise.

Sincerely,
John Varner

MTC-00010521

From: Charles Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
12112 Olive Trail
Plymouth, IN 46563-9385
January 11, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my opinion that litigation against Microsoft should have never occurred in the first place. Our government has dragged this thing out long enough while it should be focusing on far more important issues.

One of the first items of the settlement I would like to address has to do with contractual restrictions. Under terms of the settlement, Microsoft has agreed to not enter into any third party agreements, which require distributors to exclusively deliver their items, or at a fixed percentage. This is how most companies maintain market share such as Pepsi and Coca-Cola. I believe this concession is detrimental to Microsoft and inhibits their ability to compete in a free market.

Secondly, in regards to the disclosure of interfaces that Microsoft is being forced to do, I think that it is ludicrous. Microsoft has been the leading innovator of technology and services over the last decade. They should be rewarded for their innovation and be allowed to keep their technological secrets that have propelled them to where they are today.

The best interests of the American public will be served when the nine states drop their lawsuits. The government must stop interfering with private enterprise.

Sincerely,
Charles E. Jones

MTC-00010522

From: Alex Amies
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wish to comment on the proposed United States v. Microsoft Settlement.

I do not believe that the settlement is strong enough to create a level playing field between Microsoft and its competitors. In particular, it will have the following impact on me as a computer programmer: (1) Force me to invest my time learning proprietary Microsoft technologies rather than industry standards.

Microsoft in many cases stubbornly refuses to follow open industry standards and since they create the most commonly used platforms everybody else has to learn to use Microsoft's own versions of API's, protocols, and formats. Therefore, I get to spend less time learning technologies that can be applied to other operating systems. A

monopoly company should be required to follow open industry standards.

(2) Force me to use Windows as my desktop operating system when I would prefer to use something else. I would prefer to use Linux and that would be an option for me at work if the Netscape mail client on Linux (which follows the IMAP and POP3 standards) is not compatible with the Microsoft Exchange Mail server that my company operates for its staff. I am very dependent on email communication and, in fact, cannot work without it. A monopoly company should be required to produce network software that is compatible with products from other vendors.

Alex Amies (US Citizen)
192 Woodbury
Irvine, CA 92620
949/255 3302

MTC-00010523

From: tom@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 9:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As an independent software engineer, I hope you reign in Microsoft and curtail its evil practices. Any company who has a monopoly on the OS should not be able to sell applications for that OS. Any programmer just knows this is right.

Thanks,
Tom Gordon
Stratosoft Inc.

MTC-00010524

From: Daniel A. Myerson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:11pm
Subject: Settlement

The attack by the justice department was unjust. How could any settlement be called unjust in those circumstances?

Dan Myerson

MTC-00010525

From: Tee Freddy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
P.O. Box 503

Clinton, Louisiana 70722
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I support the settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. Although I believe that antitrust litigation in this case was unwarranted, Microsoft should be able to move on with its business under the terms stipulated in the settlement. Microsoft has made concessions like increased information sharing and non-retaliation clauses in the settlement.

Microsoft has done worlds of good for the technology industry. In the past decade, Microsoft has provided consumers with high-quality, user-friendly software. Their products are the frameworks for the technology industry. As such, this antitrust dispute has served only to curb the productivity previously seen in the IT

industry. Hence, this settlement is in the best interests of the state and the economy.

At this time of recession, it is critical that Microsoft be allowed to concentrate on business now.

Sincerely,
Fred Alsup
CC:fin@mobilizationoffice.com@inetgw

MTC-00010526

From: John Edge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:16pm
Subject: microsoft

I am an Australian and it worried me that Microsoft seem to be dictating the law rather than being judged.

It really does give the impression that big money is exempt from penalties.

John Edge
Australia

MTC-00010527

From: Karen Mazza
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern at the Justice Department:

Enough already with trying to punish Microsoft. As a consumer, I am happy with their products, and think they do a better job than anyone else. All this trial did was waste taxpayer money, and punish investors. It is time for the government to get out of trying to regulate industries, and let the market do its own work. The market is far better at regulating competition than lawyers and bureaucrats!!! Let the market and consumers decide which products are the best!! Untie corporations' hands and let them do their work of producing superior products WITHOUT government interference! In this economy, we need to let our companies produce new and innovative products and technologies to help create new jobs. It is time to end Clinton's era of anti-trust law abuse. The settlement is enough. Stop now.

Sincerely,
Karen Mazza

MTC-00010528

From: Robert Dollins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 10:47pm
Subject: Microsoft deserves harsh judgement

Having been an often unwilling customer of Microsoft's since it's early days of being only a computer languages supplier, I can attest to negative effects of their predatory and unfair practices toward both customers and competitors. Many new startups and innovative companies now lie in the dustbin of computing history because of Microsoft's practices, very often to the detriment of the consumer.

In my opinion, there is no judgement too harsh to place and enforce against Microsoft to minimize the practices in which they have habitually engaged. The arrogance of Bill Gates and the entire corporate structure of Microsoft deserves the most rigid of punishment and restriction from competing unfairly. The consumer and innovative new products and capabilities will benefit.

Robert Dollins

MTC-00010529

From: Agliodoro, John
 To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/11/02 10:51pm
 Subject: The U.S. Government and Microsoft Corporation

The stunning achievement of Microsoft as a noble enterprise is its great gift to the general public.....the access to useful and inexpensive information. This voluntary transaction by a willing consumer exchanging a pittance of cost for the value received should result in a chorus of support by U. S. officials. The high profits EARNED by Microsoft which produce huge government income and high employment that creates more productivity and further government tax income by those gainfully employed should guarantee unwavering support for the existence, growth, and continuance of Microsoft as a standard of awe and respect.

And yet, unconscionably, competitors of less sterner stuff in alliance with pale political will and bureaucratic force, characterize an angel of deliverance as its opposite.....FOR SHAME !! There must be agents of reason within the corridors of government who could reverse the nonsense and give due reverence to the man and his company and therefore give reverence to the sacred philosophy our blessed nation was founded upon.

John Agliodoro, CEO
 Cybex International
 john—agliodoro@umholdings.com

MTC-00010530

From: David A. Cobb
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Gentlefolk:

I am a professional software developer of over thirty years experience. Thus I have watched, and been affected by, many of the changes in the business of information technology during a period when it has changed dramatically. The desktop platform has not, until recently, been a major focus of my work; however, I have been a user of desktop systems for about twelve years and have used a considerable variety of both Microsoft and competing products.

Microsoft is certainly capable of producing good software. So are many others. However, Microsoft does not consistently do so, because, in my opinion, they don't need to be good to win. This is a most deplorable situation for both business users and developers. So long as one company remains "the only game in town," American software products will be somewhat less than they could become.

I have watched from the sidelines as one competitor after another has been crushed. Sometimes, to be sure, it was because they could not produce a product as good as or better than a Microsoft product. But often it was for other reasons having little to do with the technical merits of the products.

Microsoft can easily afford to give away software, as they have done with their Internet Explorer. Likewise, their "deals" with OEM system builders lets them put their products in the hands of users at a perceived

price no competitor can match. Even without the economic muscle provided by Microsoft's wealth and monopoly power, the production of software invites this sort of marketing—however high the cost of initially developing a product, the cost of reproducing it is practically nothing.

I have read the Proposed Final Judgement with bemused dismay. I am no lawyer and don't pretend to understand all of it. But it seems clear that this is barely a "slap on the wrist." Microsoft is hardly constrained from continuing its version of "business as usual." This seems extraordinary in the face of a strong judgement that they have indeed routinely engaged in unlawful business practices.

My memory reaches back over many years of this business to a time when IBM was the "2000 pound gorilla," and was constrained in several ways by one or another consent decree. A part of the means used then seems very appropriate now: *I recommend that the PFJ be amended to require the complete unbundling of operating system software from (hardware) systems.*

Specifically, let the OEM builders construct their systems and then offer the consumer a choice of software *at retail prices* to be installed. This will immediately eliminate the consumer's illusion that the pre-installed Windows software, with all its newly bundled add ons, is free. Let the consumer see that, for example, the hardware costs \$700, the Windows OS costs \$200 or a Linux OS costs \$50; the Internet Explorer browser is included in the OS, Netscape for Linux costs \$25, etc. I realize that the OEM's are not a party to the judgement; the terms would need to be something like: "Microsoft shall cause all software to be marked with the price at which it is to be sold, whether at retail or pre-installed, and shall not contract with any OEM or system integrator to imply that the pre-installed software is being provided free or at negligible cost." Further, Microsoft should be constrained to offer its software to any OEM or system integrator at a cost determined only by the volume of sales—with no covenants concerning what software packages the OEM may elect to market with his systems.

This is the best opportunity the US will have for many years to come, to restore a measure of competitiveness in an industry that is becoming rapidly less competitive by the month. Please do not throw it away.

Sincerely yours,
 David A. Cobb, Software Engineer
 7 Lenox Ave
 West Warwick, RI 02893-3918

MTC-00010531

From: Andrew Clerkin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 10:54pm
 Subject: Time to end anti-trust case

I believe that it is time to end the anti-trust case against Microsoft. The government has wasted way too much time and money on this case. I'm a consumer and I don't think Microsoft has hurt me. If people don't want their products they don't have to buy them. There are alternatives available. This case was pushed down our throats by competitors who want a short cut to the top. Rather than

compete with Microsoft they figured it would be easier to get the DOJ to go after them. Even the experts in the field have no idea how computer technology will evolve. I think it is absolutely ludicrous to think that government bureaucrats would be able to figure out how technology will evolve and how the government should control it. Let the free market run it's course. The DOJ totally screwed up the telephone system in this country. Prior to the break up of AT&T we had a regulated monopoly that worked great. Now we have an unregulated monopoly and the whole system is screwed up thanks to the DOJ. The point is that "it ain't broke, so don't try to fix it".

Sincerely,
 Andrew Clerkin

MTC-00010532

From: Mehelis@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:00pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 1430 Aerial Way SE
 Salem, OR 97302-1606
 January 11, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 United States Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
 After three years of unnecessary legal battles, I was pleased to hear that a settlement between the federal government and Microsoft has been reached. Considering the terms of the agreement, Microsoft did not get off easily. In fact, Microsoft has to make several significant changes to the way that they handle their business. For example, Microsoft has agreed to make available to its competitors, any protocols implemented in Windows' operating system products that are used to interoperate natively with any Microsoft server operating system.

With the many terms of the agreement, I see no reason to pursue further litigation on any level.

Sincerely,
 Anna McNeil

MTC-00010533

From: Schulman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/11/02 11:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After the United States Government pursued breaking up the phone company at great cost to the taxpayer, the ultimate result was higher costs for service, poorer quality service, nuisance competitive advertising and illegal switching of services, and the little Bells are starting to merge together to improve service, reduce cost and get a better handle on management.

Regarding the Microsoft Settlement, all I see is that the United States Government is demonstrating again that it did not learn from historical reference. Ultimately, the consumer will not benefit, the taxpayer will have footed an enormous cost, and Microsoft will end up the winner anyhow. It's a lose/lose game and the Government is making the rules to make sure that the real loser is still the consumer.

I think the United States Government cannot run private business as well as private

business can. As it is, there are too many incompetent administrators with guaranteed job security and high salaries in the government that would have been fired in the private sector for excessive waste of profits and poor business handling.

I would grade the Government's efforts in this matter a C minus—and that is being generous.

After all, the private sector cannot provide a military with such waste and lost records as has been shown time and time again and still manage to protect our country with other people's money as our Government can.

DENNIS SCHULMAN
9591 128TH TERRACE N
LARGO FL 33773

MTC-00010534

From: Ishmel Taylor
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/11/02 10:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ishmel Taylor
11059 Continental
Warren, MI 48089-1734
January 11, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ishmel Taylor

MTC-00010535

From: Edna Earle Crews
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 11:04pm
Subject: End The Clinton-era Anti-trust law abuse

Dear Sirs:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this

trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Take action soon.

Sincerely,
Edna Earle and Raiford Crews
2087 Crews Lane
Crystal Springs, MS 39059

MTC-00010536

From: ACalapai@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 11:05pm
Subject: (no subject)

GENTLEMEN:

BASED ON WHAT NEWS WE HAVE , I FEEL THAT THE JUDGE IN THIS CASE IS BIASED AGAINST MICROSOFT AND SYMPATHETIC TO APPLE CO AND OTHER COMPETITORS OF MICROSOFT.

I DO NOT SEE APPLE COMPUTER DONATING ANY EQUIPMENT TO ANY SCHOOLS OF NEEDY CHILDREN, BUT YET THEY CRITICIZE MICROSOFT AS BEING UNFAIR OR WANTING AN ADVANTAGE TO PENETRATE THE SCHOOL SYSTEM WITH THEIR WARES. BECAUSE THE COMPETITORS ARE UNABLE TO COMPETE WITH MICROSOFT THEY TURN TO ENLIST THE COURTS FOR THEIR BENEFIT ON THE BASIS THAT THEY HURT THE THE PUBLIC.

I AM GRATEFUL THAT WE HAVE THE BENEFIT OF THEIR PRODUCTS AND WHAT MICROSOFT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO OUR ECONOMY IF THEIR DONATION WAS INSUFFICIENT WHY DID NOT THE COURT JUST ASK FOR ADDITIONAL BENEFITS.

THE COURTS SHOULD WAKE UP AND NOT BE SO DUPED BY THE STATES ATTORNEY GENERALS WHO ARE STILL NOT SATISFIED AND THE COMPANIES WHO COULD NOT DEFEAT THE ASTUTE MANAGEMENT.

THINK ABOUT ALL THE INVESTORS IRA'S AND PENSION PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN DEVASTED THE COURT'S EVEN SAW FIT TO REFUSE MICROSOFT ADDITIONAL TIME TO PREPARE FOR THE CONTINUED CHARGES .

IT SEEMS THAT THIS LETS KEEP GANGLING UP ON MICROSOFT BY THE ENEMIES OF MICROSOFT IS GETTING TO BE STANDARD PROCEDURE BY THE COURTS AND SOME BIASED STATES.

THE FINAL OUTCOME THEREFOR IS THAT THESE NEEDY CHILDREN WILL BE DEPRIVED OF THIS BENEFICIAL EQUIPMENT. I HAVE NOOT SEEN ANY CONTRIBUTION FROM APPLE AND

OTHER COMPETITORS JUDGE YOU HAVE HURT THESE CHILDREN ACALAPAI

MTC-00010539

From: Joan B. DeMarcus
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 11:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I will be brief. The U.S. should adopt laissez-faire capitalism. Let Microsoft go.

Microsoft dominated the market because it was the most productive and efficient company in its marketing field. Productivity

and efficiency are virtues. No person or company should be punished for their virtues.

As for the U.S. antitrust laws, they are fraudulent and should be repealed.

Joan B. DeMarcus

MTC-00010540

From: Anita
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 11:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with this action and think the government would be better served if they would quit undermining the businesses that keep this country running head and shoulders above all the others.

Thank you,
A.L. Farina

MTC-00010541

From: Chris Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/11/02 11:40pm

Subject: Make an informed decision

I just spent 9 days trying to make a Microsoft Windows 2000 server work with a Unix SAMBA server. (SAMBA is an NT4 compatible open source protocol so that windows users can access unix file systems as if they were windows file systems.) If you research the history of Samba and the nightmares they have had trying to figure out how Microsoft uses the SMB protocol, you will quickly see the efforts Microsoft goes through to break the Samba compatibility. Each time a new version of windows comes out, it is just different enough to cause problems for Samba/Unix administrators. As an administrator, once you spend 9 days trying to find a problem (and the problem is directly related to microsoft keeping the protocols secret and changing the protocols) you curse Microsoft.

After cursing them, you realize why some companies only use Microsoft —because MS has made it near impossible to use anything else but them. The second thing to consider is the same tactics related to MS Office. Each version uses a new format (which again is secret). Not only does this make it near impossible to use Corel Office, et al, it also forces customers to upgrade MS Office when a new version comes out because the old version is not compatible with the new version. Our company has to share files with other companies and if we can't open their files, then we can't do business with them. If they use MS Office, then we have to be able to support that too. We have been trying to use Corel Office which is a fraction of the cost, but the inability to keep up with Microsoft's file format changes might force us to drop \$50,000 into getting 200 users onto MS Office.

Now, not only does MS force you to upgrade... most companies prefer to upgrade their office applications every 4 years, but Microsoft's new licensing policies will require companies to upgrade every 2 years. Where are the choices for the users? Sure, you can choose other options but you may not remain in business if you do because of the external forces of MS as I listed above. Beware .Net, the new Comcast/ATT cable deal, Xbox, ERP things they are planning, etc,

and you have an ever more dangerous MS. Don't just think of punishing their past, but controlling their current actions and future actions. They are more of a threat right now than they ever have been. The current DOJ proposal's are the equivalent of dropping the case. A \$1 billion dollar cash penalty plus restrictions still may not stop them (do you realize how much cash they have in the bank?) and the current proposal doesn't even get near this.

Chris

MTC-00010542

From: mitchen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 12:02am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530-0001
 email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
 Fax 1-202-307-1454 or 1-202-616-9937
 Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am a software developer and IT professional. I've been following the Microsoft Antitrust case and recent developments with the DOJ settlement. As a professional, I can testify that Microsoft is a monopoly and its dominance affects average consumer who have to pay a high price for a not so good product. To give you an example of a monopoly, let me ask you if you have a TV set at home? When you purchased your TV, did you go to a big store where a sales person helped you to choose among dozens, if not hundreds, of different models, didn't her/she? Even if you went to a small shop on the corner, you probably looked at a few models anyway. When you brought your TV home and hooked it up to your antenna or satellite dish, how many channels can you watch? Probably more than one, at least. You get your network channels, your cable channels, your public television, and of course all these home shopping channels on all kinds of airwaves spectrum. Now, please let me know what would it be called, if you go to a store to buy a TV and all the brands and models belong to the same manufacturer.

Well, you want to watch TV, so even if all the sets are made in one place, based on one technology, rely on the same set of commands and have the same menu for operations, you still would buy it, because again, you really want to watch TV and you don't care about the brand that much. Ok, you brought your TV home, you hooked it up to whatever you have: antenna on the roof, your satellite dish, you cable or all of the above. You are done working, it's time to have fun. You grab you coke and pop-corn, get in your favorite chair, grab the remote and push the Power button. Ta-da! You are watching it and everything is great but suddenly you are starting to notice that you can watch only certain channels. And the stingiest thing is that you are watching only channels which are owned by the same company which manufactured your TV. Even though there are a lot of channels to choose from and they offer a seemingly great number of topics and programming, they still all

originated in the same place where your TV set was made. Your friend tells you about some other channels which you can't get on your TV.

You have to go through enormous pain to get those "other" channels on your TV: you have to call that nerdy guy from work and have him do some magic work on your TV, downloading and installing different special systems to allow compatibility of your TV with "other" channels. Ok, you spent enough time and effort to get your TV fully compatible with all channels and programs. Few months (weeks, days, minutes) later, you get news from the company which manufactured your TV that your set is very insecure, full of hidden problems, dangerous to operate if you don't know what you are doing and all your neighbors can see what's going on in your living room through your new TV set's screen. You are panicking, you are calling tech support, the nerdy guy from work and other experts in TV so that they protect your privacy and your living room. Again, almost all the problems seem to be solved, but you are a little bit jumpy and you don't look at your new TV the same way as only a short time ago. There are still some problems with your TV. Did I mention that you can't buy VCR, DVD player, stereo or any other system to connect to your TV, unless it's also manufactured by the same company that made your TV set? And of course, VCR tapes and DVD discs that you rent at your favorite rental store must only be made by... guess who? You got it, your TV set manufacturer! But even this is not the worst part. Soon you hear again from the manufacturer that all remaining problems with your TV will be fixed in the new model which you must buy to ensure that your viewing pleasure continues since the company is changing format of all its TV, radio, video, etc. programming and only the new model TV set will be able to receive it. Devastated, you through away your "old" but still perfectly good TV set (except that it's kind of useless now) and get in line at your favorite big (or small) TV store to buy the new latest and greatest TV set. And the story continues again and again in the same manner.

So, do you think that this is a monopoly? I hope you do, and I hope that you will pass this message around to other people in DOJ. Please let me know if you have any question or if I can be of any help to you and your colleagues in this matter.

Sincerely,
 Alexander Mitchen
 IT developer

MTC-00010543

From: Cristea, Eugen
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/12/02 12:19am
 Subject: monopol == no good

Dear Judge,

I believe there are thousands of e-mails regarding this case. I will try all my best to be short and sharp. In 1999 i have to buy a new computer because my old one was very slow. Usual, computer prices are dropping every few months. At that time the situation was different and special the cost for the memory was up. Why? There was a big

earthquake in Taiwan and Taiwan is a main memory producer. In a few months everything was back to normal but i believe you understand my point. In this case it was a natural disaster, but it could be anything. Your car has two separate brake circuits in case one of them fails. What if Microsoft will get bought by a sick mind like those responsible for the 11-th september. There are many ways things could go wrong in this situation. It's risky to put your money in just one place.

Anyway, life will go on with or without Microsoft. Roman Empire was powerfull and invincible for a long time but it disappear in the final.

just a small dot in this world,
 eugen

MTC-00010544

From: Ishtiyag Bhatti
 To: Microsoft
 ATR.gws@clickaction.com@inetgw
 Date: 1/12/02 12:24am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I am an educated housewife and mother, having a master's degree in education. I've opted to stay at home since I have a 22 month old baby.

I came to know through a friend some of the aspects of the Proposed Settlement made by the Justice Department with Microsoft, and I am displeased by them. Firstly, how could the Justice Department grant Microsoft a government-mandated monopoly of the software industry and even worse— other technology markets? Definitely such decision would seriously jeopardize all serious competitors - both now and in the future. We're living in a free and capitalistic society, and one of the advantages of it is that people have the right to choose from among several brands of one single item, and in this case, software. I would want to see a healthy competition of several software companies, in order to make prices competitive as well. Secondly, how could the Justice Department condone Microsoft for violating the antitrust law and even for its illegal conduct e.g. bribing other competitors in order to stop their operation. What is the Justice Department's motive behind this action?

Your Honor, I would want Microsoft be brought to justice for the good of this present as well as the future generation.

Respectfully,
 Meldy Bhatti
 P.O. Box 184
 Rantoul, IL 61866

MTC-00010545

From: Lucio DiGiovanni
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 12:30am

Microsoft has Not been dealt a fair deal
 A fair deal would have been to be split Microsoft up so that Apple could have had a chance to sell a more consumer friendly product for the past 5 years instead of being squashed to 5% market share.

MTC-00010546

From: Kay Schenk
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 12:31am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Kay Schenk, MizK

"The probability that we may fail in the struggle ought not to deter us from the support of a cause we believe to be just." — Abraham Lincoln

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the judges and counsel involved in the Microsoft antitrust case, #98-1232, for allowing public comment on your final decision. I'm sure by now you have received many responses from interested citizens like myself.

I hold a master's degree in Computer Science which I obtained in 1976. I've worked continually with computers since that time. My occupational setting has been primarily with academic institutions where I have been involved in many different roles since 1976: as computing support personnel, as a programmer, and in my current title as Web Master for the two main web sites at California State University, Chico. Needless to say, I have lived through more changes in the computer industry than I can even remember at this point.

I have attempted to follow this particular antitrust against Microsoft for several reasons not the least is my current involvement in Web development, where the "browser" software of course is an integral component. However, what I find really interesting is that it was this particular piece of software apparently caused this complaint to be filed. (I don't really define this as "middleware" since that term carries a very different connotation to me.)

In my mind, many of Microsoft's business practices, this being just one of many, have certainly been worthy of this type of complaint. But I digress. I read with interest the "Competitive Impact Statement" that was posted to the DOJ Web site around mid November, 2001. What I found particularly interesting was this statement: Appropriate injunctive relief in an antitrust case should: (1) end the unlawful conduct; (2) "avoid a recurrence of the violation"; and, (3) undo its anti-competitive consequences. Additionally, you state that:

Restoring competition is the "key to the whole question of antitrust remedy". You then go on in this same paragraph (section IV.B. of the "Competitive Impact Statement") to describe how Microsoft's illegal conduct maintained the application barrier to entry in the personal computer operating systems market by its practice with the particular middleware product, its Internet Explorer browser.

Unfortunately, in my mind anyway, this is only one very small instance of the type of practices carried out by Microsoft for to thwart any and all development not only in the PC operating systems market but the PC applications market as well. And, I don't feel your proposed Final Judgment will fulfill the any of the goals of "injunctive relief" at all in the long run. Much more has gone on in the computer industry since this complaint was filed in 1998, and I can tell you with absolutely certainty, that many more anticompetitive moves and harmful monopolistic practices have been carried out by Microsoft in these last five years. Some, even, have severely compromised the entire Internet. The initial complaint contains 129

paragraphs of description. They seem to provide a good overview of Microsoft's former practices with OEMs with respect to the installation of the Windows operating system and severe restrictions placed on these OEMs concerning the installation of other, many better, non-Microsoft products. Frankly, I don't see the current case so much as directly realting to the browser product, as the incredible amount of market share Microsoft amassed from say 1990-1998 because of these practices and others.

Because Microsoft controls the PC operating systems market, it found a way to convince your office for one, that certain features it "incorporated" into more recent versions of its operating system, Windows 95, for example, were really part and parcel of the OS, and not just unnecessary elements it decided to include to increase its share in other markets. Incorporating Internet Explorer directly into Windows 95, and not easily removed, was just one such tactic. At about the same time, Microsoft made significant strides, fully aware of the Internet's expansion about that time, to include "monitoring" pieces, if you will, into the Windows 95 operating system to basically track users without their knowledge. Many of these "features" were well publicized on the Internet when discovered and ways were found to disable them much to Microsoft's chagrin, I dare say. I'm sure you must be aware of a letter to President Clinton by Ralph Nader on July 26, 1995 concerning some of this.

In reality, something like browser "middleware" is not even remotely required by an operating system, whose only function really is to provide a means to address the memory available and devices attached to your machine, and load some modicum of software processing power into memory to enable you to program your computer. Anything else on top of this primary function, I classify as "utilities" or "user interfaces" or "software applications". Browsers, as an entity, do not really pose any threats from a competitive standpoint to operating systems in my mind. If this is Microsoft's excuse for their conduct, I stand dumbfounded.

The Final Judgment certainly is a step forward in curtailing Microsoft's current unethical practices, but it certainly does not mitigate, in any way, prior grievances not does it prevent the kind of development practices that have basically enabled Microsoft to totally dominate the PC OS market to begin with.

The biggest positive of this Judgment in my opinion is the requirement that Microsoft provide its Apis and Communications Protocol specifications to developers and OEMS (sections III.D. and III.E.) Although this requirement does not "open up" what Microsoft considers its operating system, it will at least hopefully provide the development community at large much needed information on how others can provide comparable "middleware" products.

However, even this requirement comes with a loophole that the Justice department will no doubt find difficult to challenge if one were to believe Microsoft. Section III.J.1. states that Microsoft is not obligated to

provide APIA information which it feels "would compromise the security of a particular installation or group of installations of anti-piracy, anti-virus, software licensing" "I would guess given our current Internet computing environment, that Microsoft might claim that major portions of its Windows OS might fall into this umbrella definition. The upshot of such a loophole will be that Microsoft will continue to capitalize on its monopoly power and reveal very little that will directly benefit additional developers. Microsoft has attained much of its OS monopoly power by developing its own applications, which just coincidentally work best with its own OS. This is no accident. It is absolutely because Microsoft has refused to disclose certain details of the Windows internals to the development community at large.

The appointment of a Technical Committee (detailed in Section IV. Compliance and Enforcement Procedures) seems to be a great requirement at first look. However, I question the politeness of allowing Microsoft to be involved at all in choosing these individuals. This is nonsense.

I also highly object to the restrictions placed on the TC members in terms of public access and accountability to the public. This antitrust suit presumably serves the public interest! And only that. The only communication from the public at large that I can decipher from the Judgment is item IV.B.8.d.:

"The ETC shall complaints from the Compliance Officer, third parties, or the Plaintiffs and handle them in the manner specified in section IV.D. below". I guess I would have to ask: what third parties? Who do I complain to as a private citizen? My state attorney general? Additionally, nowhere in this Judgment is there a mechanism for even informing the public who these TC members are. This is the Internet age. Given th enormous public exposure of this case with nearly all pertaining information posted to the DOJ Web site that this rather critical follow-up is completely shrouded in privacy.

In this regard, I find items IV.B.9 and IV.B.10 especially of concern. I don't think Microsoft should have the opportunity to govern how the implementation of this part of the Judgment is implemented. And this is what seems to be taking place in the description of these two points. Additionally, I find the payment of the TC by Microsoft troublesome without further details. Why wouldn't an escrow account to which Microsoft contributes a fixed annual amount simply be established based on cost estimates? It seems incredibly unwise for Microsoft to be directly in charge of paying the TC. Again, it is difficult to determine actual implementation details based on what you've published.

These are specific issues I have with the Final Judgment as it is currently written. However, like many, I feel this Judgment is woefully inadequate in addressing the "larger" issues of Microsoft's business practices, which are integrally tied to its monopolistic position. Microsoft's unethical business practices are a direct result of its monopoly power and the desire to ensure that the proprietary APIs on which much of

the Windows environment has been built would be used as definitive "standards" in nearly every aspect of computing—from the desktop to the Internet. To this end, Microsoft has attempted to thwart nearly every aspect of "open standards" that have existed for years. As early as 1995, Microsoft seemed to head a coalition of other vendors in opposing the "interoperability" specifications of HR 1555, the communications bill which provided, in part, the V-chip mechanism.

More recently, in its OS distributions, Microsoft has badly implemented the core protocol used by the Internet, *tcp/ip*, thereby setting up a scenario leading to denial of service attacks on Windows/NT systems, one of which belonged to the U.S. Navy. While this might be attributed to innocent error, many of the Internet community believe such lack of quality testing is solely attributed to Microsoft's monopoly power and a basic "we don't have to care" attitude. Microsoft's security problems are so well-known they are documented in literally thousands of sites on the Internet. This scenario wouldn't be quite so fearsome if Microsoft only sold products to businesses who, hopefully, would have the technical expertise to deal with them. But this is not the case in our current society where, according to a U.S. Census report in August, 2000, 42% of households had Internet access. Many of these consumers have very little awareness, much less actual knowledge, of computer security problems and what they could ultimately mean. More sophisticated hacking techniques like distributed denial of service attacks, coupled with total lack of prevention or precaution by household computer users, spells enormous problems! Microsoft is not only a key player in this problem, but, according to nearly every reliable source dealing with computer security issues, THE key player. The reason why is simple—they're a monopoly, they don't have to care.

Microsoft itself is now so concerned about its reputation in this area that it has publicized that "white hat" hackers who expose these problems only add to the problem. This is ludicrous! Is it not the vendor's responsibility to fully test such products under many adverse conditions to determine worthiness. Apparently not for Microsoft, who, in its zeal to rush products to market, has not taken the time, or can't be concerned enough to take the time! More recently, according to a post to a well-known British web site on 12/13/2001, Microsoft continues its highly debatable business practices by essentially "bribing" security by offering them upwards of approximately \$30,000 worth of software for \$1,450:

"All you have to do is keep silent about any Microsoft security bugs you might discover, until Redmond authorizes you to speak.

Oh, and you have to employ at least two exclusive Microsoft Certified Professionals, such as MCSEs."

The story gets better but I'll spare you the details.

My point in all this is simple. Microsoft has employed unethical business practices from its inception. It continues these practices even I write this. This Final

Judgment will not stop those practices. There are too many loopholes and the implementation, however well-intentioned, is fraught with problems. Microsoft is a monopoly and as such operates the way most monopolies do with little concern for quality, customer satisfaction, or long-term innovation.

They exist to conquer competition in any way possible including but not limited to marketing products of exceptionally poor quality with the expectation that the consumer will just buy into it because it's the only game in town.

The main function of any antitrust remedy in my mind is to protect the consumer. Your other goals are worthwhile but not really the main point. Your Final Judgment does little really to protect the consumer and in fact, denies the consumer access to intricacies of the Judgment itself. The best outcome of this case would be to divide Microsoft up into individual entities presumably an operating systems division, an applications division, and a networking division, so at least, the hope anyway, the new divisions would at least be on equal footing with competitors and Microsoft might be prevented from deceiving consumers into believing all that is not really an operating system, is.

Thank you for your consideration of this response.

MTC-00010547

From: Andrew Harrod
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:03am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Andrew Harrod, M.A.L.D.
1512 Bremerton Lane
Keswick, VA 22947-9148
(434) 295-8328

To whom it may concern:

I wish to write in support of the proposed Microsoft anti-trust settlement. I feel that the American taxpayers have supported this law suit long enough and that it is time to move on.

Andrew E. Harrod

MTC-00010548

From: DHscoggin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:04am
Subject: Microsoft Overcharging

I think the charge that Microsoft has used its monopoly power to overcharge the consumer is ludicrous. Don't understand how they can be coincidentally charged with overcharging the consumer and also bundling additional capability into their products at no / low cost to drive their competitors out of business. Also, it is clear that Microsoft has been a catalyst for innovation in the computer technology field rather than an inhibitor. Let's move on to something more important like the pillage of Enron.

MTC-00010549

From: Bill Adams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,

Microsoft also known herein as MS has intentionally restricted use of the java programming language as an included feature

in their new browsers, siting various and conflicting criteria for doing so. This prevents millions of websites with such existing technology from having it used, prohibits good and fair trade and stifles innovation. This feature can be worked around by the many of millions of developers who created the content at a tremendous expense in time and energy. A free web site that I developed (<http://www.SeeMyDesign.com>) and continue provide for the good of society, employs such technology and has been running successfully since 1997 but key features will become defunct because MS chooses to hurt the end user.

This removal of industry standard functionality (has been free and available for 5!! years in all browsers) is in light of MS bundling many other features in the operating system which have the effect of promoting and locking the users into the MS operating environment and in effect, becoming free to those that purchase a computer.

An example is the .mov movie MIME type that Apple computer utilizes to display their interactive content on the windows platforms. This change prevents Apple quicktime from properly displaying and playing in to name an example: Windows2000. No message or information is provided. This specific example can be seen when viewing Quicktime VR content. Not only does a message not pop-up in the browser indicating the content cannot be displayed, but nothing happens at all—which for the average user, won't know what action to take.

This small example is MS mode of operation and has been since the beginning. I urge, beg and employ you to make mandatory, an invitation from MS to 3rd party vendors to include their windows-certified softwares with the MS operating system install media (CD's, etc.). I also strongly feel that MS should be penalized for their past actions of which penalty should be of monetary nature and provide good to the whole of humanity such as providing learning material to schools, but NOT providing software and computer which exacerbate the problem. Thank you for your consideration of these issues and for providing a conscious for those that do not know technology well enough to make informed decisions and those that do know it well enough but don't use alternative tools because comparable ones are bundled with the operating system. PLEASE contact me if you have any questions, need a voice or would like additional opinions.

Sincerely,
Bill Adams—Founder,
www.SeeMyDesign.com
801-484-3319
promote@seemydesign.com

MTC-00010550

From: Jsam42@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:26am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Sir,

Please stop harrassing Microsoft for being so successful. Bill Gates is one of the true heroes of this country. Please settle this case.

Sincerely,
John S. Samolitis
1545 W. Chase #203
Chicago, IL 60626
773-764-5336

MTC-00010551

From: dusty holman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:47am
Subject: Microsoft

I am retired from Texaco after 39 years as an electrical engineer.

I think you will find that if it was not for Bill Gates that the computer industry would be in shambles.

Microsoft standardized computers and their operating system. If it were not for Microsoft there would be chaos in operating systems and no one would be able to walk up to a computer anywhere and operate it.

How does Bill Gates overcharge for his products? I was under the impression that in the USA you could charge anything you want to for your own products.....if folks don't want to buy it they don't have to.

You can always go out and build your own operating system. Like Apple; like IBM. It is very simple as they found out.

For some reason I think the Justice Department is trying to destroy Microsoft so the Chinese can take over computers.....wonder why I think that?

Dusty Holman

MTC-00010552

From: Ruth Harris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:15am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am disappointed that the DOJ seems to have caved in to Microsoft. This is a company that engages in clearly unethical behavior. I can give you an example. A friend who is a consultant works closely with a business organization and had his email account through them and the ISP they used which also hosted their website. The organization decided to make online ordering of their products available to their customers.

In order to do this they needed "shopping cart" software and decided to purchase that offered by Microsoft. They went to the appropriate website to download it and went through all the steps to do so. At the end when they clicked the button to complete the process, the Microsoft website hijacked their website off their ISP's server. They were unable to get the process undone. Phone calls to Microsoft were futile. They all lost their email access as a result

I don't care how much money Bill Gates donated to politicians. This sort of behavior should be stopped.

Ruth Harris
Santa Rosa, CA

MTC-00010553

From: tom@nzymes.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:16am
Subject: Enough Already!

This country became the Great Country it is because of the free marketplace. Why does the government feel it has the right to control any part or faction of that marketplace. It has to stop before you destroy the initiative of

every small business in America. Whenever the opportunity arises for Attorneys of any ilk to practice their trade of twisted truths and distortions especially against the free will of businessmen in America we, as a country take another step towards their great socialist dream.

Thomas Stansbury,
Westminster, CA

MTC-00010554

From: madhavan.s. madhavan.s.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Sir,

I strongly in line with Sun's view of the issue as i am a Java Developer and i am expecting the Java to play a leading and key role in developing portable,cross-platform applications . So please keep Microsoft out of this Monopolistic behaviour .

Regards,
S.Madhavan.
MADHAVAN.S

MTC-00010555

From: T-Bird Tom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:42am
Subject: microsoft settlement
7288 Graydon Drive
North Tonawanda, NY 14120-1453
(716) 695-6104
January 11, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you today to voice my opinion in regards to the Microsoft anti- trust dispute. I support Microsoft and am eager to see this dispute come to a timely end. This agreement is thorough and was reached after extensive negotiations and three years of anti-trust dispute. Microsoft has agreed to carry out all provisions outlined in this agreement, such as: disclosing more information about certain internal interfaces in Windows and granting computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs. A technical oversight committee has been created to monitor Microsoft compliance, and companies can sue Microsoft if they feel the company is not complying.

We are facing very difficult economic times. We must do all we can to focus on our lagging economy. It is time to let Microsoft move on and forward. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
Thomas Miller

MTC-00010556

From: Dean Stephens
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 2:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dean Stephens
6310 Green Valley Circle #305
Culver City, CA 90230
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial was always just one more of the ongoing trial lawyer witch hunts. It is high time for this trial to be over. In a hundred years, the people involved in witch hunts such as the tobacco trials, and the Microsoft trial, will be reviled and despised with the same feelings we have today for the bogts who burned witches at the stake. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief, even as the innocent victims of the previous witch hunts finally found peace.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of serving consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views on the disgusting behavior of America's courts and its slimey lawyers.

Regards,
Dean Stephens

MTC-00010557

From: Chris Stackhouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Keep the settlement as is. It has been agreed to by most of the parties, the lawsuit and penalty has clearly made its point, the donations will obviously improve access to computer technology for the poorest schools and kids. Only Microsoft competitors are complaining (or their state's attorneys general).

It's time to move on.

MTC-00010558

From: Bmnov20@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:06am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Clinton spent 40 million going after Bill Gates rather than capture bin Laden when he had the chance. Now look where we're at and where are the priorities. Bill Gates is what America is about, the chance to make a difference in the lives of a lot of people and contribute to the economy and provide a lot of jobs. He used his brains to make a buck and many bucks for a lot of people. Because of the DOJ and some crybaby companies everyone in America has lost something. Leave it alone and go after something worthwhile. We in this family are angry.

Mary Linker

MTC-00010559

From: Bebu Corp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Party,

I think that the Microsoft Settlement is not enough. I work in a non-profit organisation providing refurbished old computers to the poor and disabled. Microsoft has prohibited us from refurbishing old computers with Windows 95 on them. While this operating system is old and unsupported by Microsoft anymore, they still require us to obtain a

license to "give away" these donated computers.

I wish that the settlement will consider organisations like ours because we are not breaking hurting anyone but Microsoft is still screwing us up. Those computers were donated to us for free and we simply format the computers, install the old Windows 95 or Windows 3.1 with slower computers, and donate them to new immigrants, poor families, disabled people and orphan homes. We make no money and all of our helpers are doing voluntary work.

Yours Faithfully,
Daniel

MTC-00010560

From: Thamaraiselvan P
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi there,
i am strongly opposing Micorosoft Monopoly. This will slowdown/reduce the innovative software development/products. They should provide API/Specification for their products like WORD/EXCEL etc. thanx.. ThamaraiSelvan.P
Member Technical Staff—ADG
E-mail : thamaraiselvanp@planetasia.com
Phone : 5522252/7 ext :511
www.Planetasia.com
"You don't know what you can get away with until you try."

MTC-00010561

From: rumpwrr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:33am
Subject: Setteltment

For God sake settle this thing now. Microsoft is only guilty of creating a standard operating system that allows all computers to easily communicate. Designing a useful standard is why "Windows" is popular not because Microsoft has some sort of manopoly. If the competition in the nine states can't compete let them go out of business.bill Rumpza

MTC-00010562

From: James Wine
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 3:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

James Wine
5817-20th Ave
Sacramento, CA 95820-3107
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James M. Wine

MTC-00010563

From: jean martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 5:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is high time, and long past, to get the Microsoft antitrust case settled and done with. I am almost sure that the very beginning of the economic downturn we are currently trying to climb out of, was first initiated due to the anti-business, anti-capitalist attitude of the previous Administration. I am in full support of the current Administration in its desire to get this case settled without further action. Enough is enough. Please "call off the dogs".

Jean L. Martin, M.A., M.S.S.W. (retired)
Richardson, Texas

MTC-00010564

From: Evans Hollandsworth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 6:19am
Subject: get over it

Microsoft is definitely guilty!!!!!!—of using the "free enterprise" system which i think has made this country great. Why do we//You want to punish someone for being very successful???

The folks that are pushing these suits are mad cause they didn't have the foresight, intelligence, determination that Bill Gates had.

Gates has given the whole world a usable product.

Let him alone!!!!
Evans Hollandsworth

MTC-00010565

From: Philipp Resl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 6:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am part of the worldwide network that is working to get BeOS back into the market place, but there is no hope to succes if the following issues aren't addressed:

At first I think it is important to make dual-boot options mandatory, moreover open Office file formats would be a great thing.

I hope this letter helps, and I wish you all the best for your Settlement!

with regards,
Philipp Resl

MTC-00010566

From: sangchul shin

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am very much concerned about the possibility that Microsoft continue its monopoly on the desktop operating system. It has been proven several times that Microsoft in fact have used its monopoly position to crush the competition. And that is precisely what the court has found: Microsoft broke the law. Now I am amazed U.S. government's leniency toward Microsoft. I want to make sure that you know I am utterly opposed to the US government position on this matter and call for more severe punishment against Microsoft.

MTC-00010567

From: dick@softplc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Your proposed settlement with Microsoft is unbelievably lenient. It is as if you were not in the courtroom when the evidence was presented. The best observer of this case was Judge Jackson. What the appeals court had to say about his opinions missed the fact that he observed the evidence being presented.

I have been in the software business for 20 years. It is my opinion that your settlement does not go far enough.

Don't cash your checks from Microsoft. Somebody might find out that you have been bought.

I am a Texan, a republican, and a Bush supporter, but if I find out that Bush had anything to do with this settlement, he will not get my vote next election.

Go back to what Judge Jackson thought was appropriate. His supposed BIAS could not have been pre-existing. His opinions were formulated based on the evidence presented by David Boies.

You have made a mistake, fix it.

Dick Hollenbeck
President, SoftPLC Corporation
SoftPLC, Open Architecture Control
Software

dick@softplc.com
Ph: 512/264-8390
Fx: 512/264-8399
http://www.softplc.com

I want to be what I was, when I wanted to be what I am now.

MTC-00010568

From: Brent L. Roulier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:50am
Subject: DOL Settlement with Microsoft.

The time has come to bring this case to a close. The proposed settlement needs to be implemented. We need to get the economy moving forward, Every minute of delay further hurts America.

Brent & Diane Roulier

MTC-00010569

From: Mike Strong
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 9:11 am
Subject: CC scolding sent to Microsoft

You will never be able to volunteer a resolution to your infractions because you are incapable of recognizing any culpability for

inappropriate, anti-competitive practices on your part. In your minds, if there is ANY competition remaining in the universe, on any level, on any product, you are totally justified (in your minds) to pursue the most aggressive, monopolistic behaviors that you can you squelch that nook of remaining resistance.

The inanity of your settlement proposal of dumping a billion dollars or so of your own products onto the public sector as a token apology for crimes and indiscretions you obviously do not believe that you've even committed is more than ludicrous. It's insulting. You are flooding the educational sector with your own products, fostering a future dependency on your products., which computer companies have done as an explicit marketing strategy for decades (DEC was the best at this during the seventies with Universities, and Apple in elementary schools). In addition to taking all the benefits of that, business-wise, you try to spin it as some sort of spectacularly sacrificial consolation for your detractors. While you are patting yourselves on your backs, I should think that you are probably writing it all off your corporate taxes at the same time. While I don't know that you've had the audacity to pull that third maneuver, I would expect it. I do not fault the tactic as a business tactic. Rather, I am incensed that you would try to blatantly spin it as penance.

As a computer professional who has developed on your platforms for 15 years, and who has developed products targeted for Microsoft platforms all during that time, I have had enough. You have virtually never cooperated with good, industry standards. Everyone else involved always mistrusts your participation on various standards committees. You only feign to go along for a short time to get your bearings until you can finalize plans for your own, proprietary, parallel standard. You want the world to only have you or the rest of the world to choose from standards wise, and you work feverishly to make use what they are already dependent upon you for to coerce them into accepting your proprietary alternatives to emerging standards.

Microsoft should have embraced J2EE..NET is a total offense to me professionally. Your subscription-licensing model, while suitable in a few contexts, where clear, on-going service and value are being provided, is otherwise a subtle trap that you are laying down. Because some people have become content with earlier versions of certain MS products that have been perfectly adequate for them, you cannot bear having them not make their annual sacrifice at your alter. You feel compelled to ensnare everyone into putting out their financial arm for an unending IV transfusion into your wallet. You want to be the all-encompassing public utility for all activities, all commerce, all enterprise functionality and endeavors.

The fact that you have done many good things, and made many wonderful products that all of us want to support you in, such as Microsoft Word, et al, makes your excesses, indiscretions, and greed all the more egregious and scandalous.

You must be resisted by the most aggressive means. I will boycott your

products and services every chance I can in every context that I can, and I will actively encourage others to do so, until and unless you demonstrate some willingness to behave well. While aggressive competitiveness is the "American way", it comes with rules of engagement and fair play. If you've won 90% of the monopoly board, you must be reconciled to the fact that you have to begin to play the game differently. What was OK 15 to 20 years ago, can no longer be the mind set by which you operate today.

Either accept the separation of the OS business from the applications business, or accept public-utility style regulation. You have to accept one or the other at this point, or you will be taking a position of overt evil. No amount of rationalization or word-smithing will be able to assuage the wrath you will deserve.

Mike Strong HM: 512-259-0723
321 Mesa Oaks MBL: 512-970-0637
Leander, TX 78641-8937 FAX: 413-581-3847

MTC-00010570

From: John Bintz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 9:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the two most important parts of this settlement are the IE bundling with Windows to kill Netscape and the inability for OEMs to allow dual-booting PCs. For the longest time, Netscape had the much superior product to Microsoft, but once IE became bundled with Windows, and the only way to get an alternative browser was to download a several megabyte file over a phone line connection, most average users say, "What's the point? I've got the 'e' here. I'll just use that." The average user balks at both file downloading and program installation. It's no wonder Netscape holds so little market share right now, and what is left is slowly eroding away (my work's Web traffic logs indicate that 80% of external traffic right now is IE, 15% is Netscape).

The dual boot restriction on OEM PCs also killed the Be software company and their competing operating system BeOS. BeOS was a very powerful, Unix/Amiga-like platform built from the ground up to be the ultimate media processing foundation. Hitachi wanted to make a dual boot Windows/BeOS machine, but because of OEM restrictions, users of the Hitachi FLORA had to go through numerous steps to enable the BeOS part of the hard drive. No normal user could be expected to follow all these steps just to enable an alternative operating system. Their response? "But it goes to Windows just fine! Why do I need this Bee-thingy, anyway?"

Microsoft's inability to give the users control is what makes them dangerous. If I want, I should be able to uninstall IE and put a competing browser in there to replace it. Had Microsoft opened up all of the programming interfaces to the operating system, a competing browser (such as Netscape or its offshoot Mozilla, which is what I'm using right now) could seamlessly replace Internet Explorer and everyone would be happy. Had Microsoft allowed OEMs to give visible dual-booting options, companies like Dell wouldn't have to

produce two different lines of computers, one with Linux preinstalled and one with Windows installed (and Be might still be around). You could get a quad-booting Windows/Linux/FreeBSD/BeOS machine if you wished, and consumers would be happy.

However, Microsoft is really taking advantage of the beginning and non-power computer users with their very sneaky tactics. Try explaining to a beginner that the 'e' and the 'n' do the same thing, but that the 'n' is better. "Why is it better? The 'e' came with the computer!" Or try explaining that there's different OSes out there than Windows and you can use two different ones on your computer. "What, like those eyeMac thingies? My friend has one, and her Word is all different. I told her to get a Gateway, and now her Word looks right." It's the non-power users who are hurt most by this, because Microsoft's practices limit their exposure to anything non-Microsoft in any way they can.

Thank you.

MTC-00010571

From: Maria Hans
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 9:36am
Subject: antitrust case.
Blank213 Blazer Court
Melbourne Beach, Florida 32951
January 8, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The reason I am writing to you is to express my support for the settlement that has been reached in the Microsoft antitrust case. After three years and millions of dollars spent, both parties in this case have agreed to bring it to an end. I plead with you to avoid those special interests that are trying to have this case resumed.

This settlement, despite the objections of opponents, is equitable. With this settlement Microsoft has agreed to disclose its internal interfaces and other previously secret code to competitors. In fact Microsoft is sharing more secret information with competitors in this settlement than any computer company has ever in history shared. However for the opponents of the settlement this is not enough, some of them won't be happy until Microsoft is destroyed.

As Microsoft is one the most important American companies, and a very large employer, I think it is wise to end the case against them and let them focus on business. With this settlement, that will be possible.

Sincerely,
Richard Hans/Maria Hans

MTC-00010573

From: Edward Hine
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 9:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please keep the spirit of freedom which I feel Microsoft Corporation represents. It seems that competitors are trying to destroy this freedom with their own selfish goals.

Next time on line,
Andrea

MTC-00010574

From: curtis kreutzberg
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/12/02 9:09am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 curtis kreutzberg
 13623 south 300 east
 draper, ut 84020
 January 12, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 curtis kreutzberg

MTC-00010575

From: Mark Martin
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 10:07am
 Subject: Judgments

Regards:

1) I am a software professional that programs in a variety of areas.

2) The fluid nature of our environment, particularly in the last few years (the internet in particular) is a diverse area to maintain, and requires knowledge of many areas.

3) There needs to be some sort of standards so this medium can be of benefit to all, so for most needs, I use the non-profit/impartial settings for this such as World Wide Web Consortium (www.w3.org) for compliance purposes.

4) At some level in order to satisfy our clients, the ability to be portable and satisfy our clients becomes, more specific regarding the operating environment they use vs. what we use to serve them.

Case in point (as a developer, I consider this a perfect example of predatory practices):

1) Internet Explorer 6.0, Microsoft dropped/ restricted it's use of software plugins, this changed a big area of the internet programming arena.

How does this impact, what is predatory about it?

Well there are several areas to consider.

1) The User base, from a development standpoint most software professionals have accepted the fact that the user prefers Windows as the desktop, Mr. Gates has undoubtedly driven this, however many competitors, particularly in the free software arena have come about, it is up to us to educate the general public as we can about the alternatives.

But by and large, the public is driving that end of the market.

2) Since the public drives the market, what happens when Microsoft changes the game from a development standpoint? From a business perspective, it forces Microsoft's lack of support onto the support desks the of companies such as ourselves to resolve issues that were a direct result of Microsoft's broad power to totally change the market place. From an economics standpoint it can be argued that this creates jobs and generates spending, however, for the smaller businesses, this may not be an option.

3) This move along with the 'NET' initiative in the current release of Windows XP, further proves this predatory initiative further, from a programming perspective it (Microsoft) is again trying to garner market share through their vast influence by further negating those initiatives that are currently in place to try and establish a neutral ground for programming and delivery. How so? Well, any previously neutral options become, again driven by the public and the desktop, further forcing the programming community into a position of

a) designing new methods to neutralize the change or...

b) submitting for financial reasons to Microsoft's drive over the market.

I can name numerous other instances of this practice through the last 15 years, I am sure you are aware of many of them, so I will not bother enlightening you as to these areas, unless, you inquire of me further.

In general, the public (in our affluent society) is duped by the the 'Wolf in Sheep's Clothing'; the only way to change this is to educate them. But I am increasingly concerned, that this amount of technology garnered in one area, is risky to the general nature of our world (not just the U.S.). It seems strange that in some arenas, there are virtually little or no virus attacks, but in Microsoft, it is daily news, not to mention our own military utilizes this technology (at least to some degree). I am not particularly a negative person, but the long term implications of this practice to continually drive market share and proliferate the use of a medium that is not only bug prone but has a high propensity to propagate rogue computer programs (as in viruses), is a scary thought indeed, since a lot of our government is driven by this very software.

What would I do?

Well, I do think Microsoft has a lot to be credited for, no I do not think they should be put out of business. They are doing what our capitalist society is supposed to do, go after the dollar. But there are ethical considerations that need to be addressed with the amount of power this company

possesses, and no amount of publicists can address them through recommending humanitarian donations, and foundations for Microsoft to make them look better in the public's eyes. The fact of the matter is, is most of the public is oblivious to long term implications, nor do they care, until it effects them. Having said that, I will proceed...

1) This power needs to be dispersed, i.e. it is so powerful, that if allowed to persist, at the very least, it needs a body to govern it, not unlike our government does, we know this as the 'checks and balances' (the Judiciary Branch, The House and Senate, and the President).

This method is the one that governs our capitalistic society, so it should work and be fair for Microsoft.

2) If you are not going to divide it up, so all this technology does not reside in one faceless giant's realm, at least develop a governing body consisting of consumer/technical expertise that has an unbiased and educated hand in this direction our society and technology has taken us. These people have to be unencumbered by lobbyists. There are many such organizations trying to do this now (though all may not be in our country). This is a basis for argument, but is a compromise between break up or allowing these sensitive areas to be continually changed with the main consideration being market share.

3) The alternative, if the above is not acceptable is to continue on with the original remedies proposed by breaking up Microsoft, as originally proposed. If the Department of Justice fails to provide a remedy to this, the potential to subvert our society exists and will only get easier if the power of this entity is not dispersed.

It is my hope that this will be read with an open mind and with consideration, not just another faceless citizen. Until the last DOJ remedy, I have given much faith to my government to provide the correct course of action, however, I have become increasingly concerned with the methods of arriving at these judgements. I understand that some remedies will not meet with my own personal approval, and can live with that, but I feel a compelling need to appeal to the good of all, not just a base of satisfied internet users.

There is more to this than meets the eye, it is not meant to be 'evil' as some refer to it, but there does not appear to be a checks and balances system for this technology and I do not believe that it is a purely monopolistic approach. I equate the proliferation of this broad range of technology with the invention of the atomic bomb.

With great freedom, comes great responsibility, and that responsibility also compels us to look further than our pocketbooks or predatory marketing practices. We have a responsibility make our country aware of the power of this, and first we need to become responsible enough as a society to be able to use this technology both morally and safely.

It has already showed it's (the technology) ability to be a very positive thing for humanity, but the negative uses are just as numerous.

In summation, I do think something more appropriate than the current remedies is in order.

I feel that too much power (not just market power) resides in this company's (Microsoft) ability to drive the market. This power needs to be dispersed.

MTC-00010576

From: Stephen T. Spray

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:22am

Subject: Congratulations to Judge Motz

Any knowledgeable user of Microsoft products is fully aware of the bundling and the games they have played for years to frustrate competition from competitors.

Congratulations to Judge Motz for taking a stand for open competition in the real spirit of what has made America great. A deal in which the guilty party is the architect of the punishment is the worst sort of abuse imaginable, but it is typical of Microsoft's arrogance that they would think they could get by with it. I am so glad they have not—so far.

Stephen T. Spray
Huntsville, Alabama

MTC-00010577

From: Michael Carter

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:23am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft has cost my father a couple of jobs, I have lost opportunities because of them. If I am going to say anything that sticks with you it is hack them up like at&t/ma-bell, if anyone is going to believe in the justice system it is on your heads. some of the things microsoft has done, and continues to do, I think could land someone like me in prison for life. but since they have so much money and influence they are getting a slap on the wrist. do you think people will believe in the justice system if the wealthy and powerful can walk all over it, but joe blow you or I die by it.

Where is our david.....? We have a rampaging Goliath!

MTC-00010578

From: Charles Crawford

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:24am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has a superior product that has world wide distribution because it is the best. Let them continue to expand their technology for the benefit of all of us.

Thank you.
Charles P. Crawford

MTC-00010579

From: Paquette, Robert

To: MS ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:28am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

13 Osprey Drive

Berkley, MA 02779-2337

January 12, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I support the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Justice

Department. This agreement will be good for the public by allowing Microsoft to focus on more innovation and new software development.

Although I did not agree with the commencement of this suit in the first place, I agree with Microsoft that it is time to move forward. One is that Microsoft has agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs that compete with programs included within Windows. This will allow computer makers to replace access to various features of Windows with access to non-Microsoft software such as programs from AOL Time Warner or RealNetworks.

As the Director of Technology for a small business in Massachusetts, I understand the importance of Microsoft's products for our economy. The company has done much to standardize development in this country and improve worker productivity. I trust your strong leadership for this settlement will continue.

With highest regards,
Robert Paquette
cc: Representative Barney Frank

MTC-00010580

From: prockett

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:31am

Please support the original court's decision on microsoft. Bill Gates is way ahead of the crowd in ideas and they are jealous.

Pat Rockett

MTC-00010581

From: Jerry (038) Phyllis Price

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:34am

Subject: Microsoft Trial Comments

Dear Sir:

I am writing to ask the Justice Department to settle the Microsoft trial. I believe this trial has squandered taxpayers' dollars, and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. I have lost money on my Microsoft stock, as many others have. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. I believe a settlement of this case will be in the public interest. And I can think of better things to spend our taxpayer's money on than targeting another corporation.

Sincerely,
Phyllis Price
P O Box 6307
Maryville TN 37802.

MTC-00010582

From: Randall Weytens

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 10:41am

Subject: Microsoft Case

To the United States Department of Justice,

I am sending this letter in response to the U.S. Department of Justice's acceptance of public comments on the Microsoft Case.

I do not think that Microsoft has violated any laws. This is why I think so: Microsoft is not a monopoly. A monopoly is only possible when other companies are not allowed to enter the marketplace by law, and Microsoft does not create or enforce the law.

Microsoft has never used force in the marketplace. Microsoft has never told businesses to do something at the point of a gun. They trade only when the transaction will benefit them. To survive in the free marketplace, a business cannot sacrifice itself to others and be successful. Microsoft has not violated any businesses or individual rights. The only possible way to violate another's rights is to steal, damage or destroy private property (from the first form of property, a person's body, on up to material and intellectual property).

I think the attack on Microsoft is illegal because:

To tell Microsoft to give away their source code is a violation of property rights. They have purchased or developed their code legally, by themselves. It is intellectual property, and it is theirs.

To break up the company is to violate their property rights. The company has a right to their property (everything from buildings to software source code), and therefore the right to bundle, integrate, or offer separately their software in any manner they choose. If someone does not like Microsoft software, buy something else. (There is Apple and Linux, to name a few, amongst others). Microsoft has brought value to the marketplace by offering affordable, well designed solutions that individuals all over the world use and enjoy. They have brought immeasurable profits and benefits to the businesses and individuals that use their software, enhancing their productivity by leaps and bounds. If Microsoft was no good at what they do, they would not be successful. People would not buy their products. The only legal and moral way to end Microsoft's grip on the marketplace is to produce something better than Microsoft has.

In order for humans to survive, they must think. Reason is not automatic. Those who choose to think have the chance of survival. Survival is not guaranteed, because some will be better at thinking than others. The Constitution of the United States, which is based on this idea, does not guarantee a business survival in the marketplace. They are not entitled to x number of customers, or x percent market share. They are not guaranteed subsidies from the American people or a share of another's ideas.

Business is based on the law of survival. If you can produce something that is good, that people are willing to buy, then you will survive. Do not, and you will not. Microsoft embodies this principle. They have succeeded. People like, use and want their software.

I think that America is the best place on earth, because it is the only one based on true, moral principles.

The ideas, that one is entitled to something just because it exists, that have motivated the attacks on Microsoft is what will send us all

to hell in a hand basket. These ideas are based on Altruism, the foundation of everything that is anti-American. America became great because it enforced the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, not the guarantee of happiness. I hope that these rights will still be defended, and that Microsoft will be left to do business as usual, their way.

Thank you for your consideration,
Randall J. Weytens
CC: Jessica Wanless, Paul Millard, Randall Weytens

MTC-00010583

From: MPerryCole@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 10:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ

I believe the settlement in m/soft is fair and reasonable. In view of the serious issues involved and the time taken to come to resolution and because of the lower court judge's impertinent and unjudicial remarks which could provoke a new trial and prolong this matter even further, this matter is ripe for settlement, and the parties should be allowed to settle this long and hard fought dispute.

Please cast my vote to put this matter behind us and move forward. We need to conquer a recession-not keep rehashing this old news.

Michael Cole
Attorney at Law
Calif Bar #37417

MTC-00010584

From: George McClure
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 10:45am
Subject: attorney general letter sent

MTC-00010586

From: Bill Wagner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi Mr. Ashcroft,
Enclosed is an attachment in defense of Microsoft Corporation.

Thanks,
William M. Wagner Jr. 13 Osprey Drive
Berkley, MA 02779-2337 January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft US
Department of Justice Washington, DC
20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
I support the settlement that was reached between Microsoft and the Justice Department. This agreement will be good for the public by allowing Microsoft to focus on more innovation and new software development.

Although I did not agree with the commencement of this suit in the first place, I agree with Microsoft that it is time to move forward. One is that Microsoft has agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights' to configure Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs that compete with programs included within Windows. This will allow computer makers to replace access to various features of Windows with access to non-Microsoft software such as

programs from AOL Time Warner or RealNetworks.

As the Director of Technolo9Y for a small business in Massachusetts, I understand the importance of Microsoft's products for our economy. The company has done much to standardize development in this country and improve worker productivity. I trust your strong leadership for this settlement will continue. With highest regards,
Robert Paquette
cc: Representative Barney Frank
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00010587

From: Bob Harler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:08am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT 6959
South Highway 76 Russell Springs, KY
42642 January 11, 2002 Attorney General
John Ashcroft U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
I am writing to you in support of Microsoft regarding the antitrust settlement. Microsoft did not deserve to be the target of antitrust litigation. They reached their point of market dominance solely due to the superiority of their product. Other vendors of software could not adequately compete with a product line that had been so overwhelmingly welcomed by the world's computer users. Superior product development is what placed Microsoft at the pinnacle of market dominance, not illegal marketing.

That being said, I do agree with steps being taken to ensure illegal marketing does not take place. But punishing Microsoft for producing a superior product smacks of allowing their whiny competitors to use the U.S. legal system to enhance their own market position. That practice should be considered as unfair and illegal as the alleged Microsoft practices.

I appreciate your time in this matter.
Sincerely, Robert M. Harler

MTC-00010588

From: charles messler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

This protracted litigation is akin to trying to milk a dead cow. Clearly, it smacks of an abuse of the legal system by attorneys interested more in fees than a just settlement.

I can see nothing wrong with Microsoft's efforts to integrate functions in any of their current Operating System platforms. To say that it disadvantages Apple (MAC) is ingenuous. There are MAC people and there are PC people. PC people are less likely to be graphics oriented, and prefer the control that Windows gives them. The integration is a plus. What is to stop MAC from innovating rather than cry help? Information Technology has a life cycle measured in months. Any settlement will be partly out of date before it can be approved.

It still galls me to recall Mr. Klein, Janet Reno and group cavorting like children when the now chastised judge made his findings of law.

Thought should be given to the millions of Microsoft shareholders that will be affected by the actions of the DOJ. Consider retirement assets that have already been decimated, albeit not to the extent of Enron.

Let the individual States fight in the Supreme Court if they are not satisfied with an omnibus settlement.

Thank you,
Charles L. Messler

MTC-00010589

From: Jared Davis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:33am
Subject: My Opinion

To whom it may concern,
I have followed the microsoft antitrust case with interest. I believe that the Departmane of Justice should not settle the case, and that the original findings of the case should be adhered to. These are, in my opinion, the actions that should be taken:

Microsoft should be split, all application software should be produced and sold by one portion that is split off, all operating system software and support should belong to another portion.

All java language development should be halted by Microsoft. This is not to say that they cannot use it, but that they must make their browsers and operating systems 100% compliant with the Sun Microsystems release. A monetary damages fee should be paid to the holders of the Netscape Software company.

Internet Explorer must be spun off to its own company, completely separate from the applications and the operating systems producers.

It is not fair, cor correct, for Microsoft to lose a judgement that it is a monopoly, then use the money it has illegally earned from that monopoly to buy off the Department of Justice.

Thank you,
Jared Davis

MTC-00010590

From: dblubbers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that this settlement should be accepted and done quickly. This court case is one the the things that started the downslide of our economy. I have been familiar with the computer business since 1981 and am fully aware that certain companies are using the government to overcome Microsoft as a competitor.

Sincerely, Beverly Lubbers

MTC-00010591

From: dblubbers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case immediately. It is a fair settlement. Having been in the computer business since 1981, I am aware that Microsoft's competitors are using the government to attempt to control Microsoft as a competitor. The states do not wish to settle because they see dollars to use for their budgets. We have used Microsoft products since they started. We are thankful

that they have helped establish a standard software that we could all safely build our businesses on. Thank you, Microsoft.

Dick Lubbers

MTC-00010592

From: Karen Hunt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:55am
Subject: Settle the Suit, ASAP, Please
Attorney General John Ashcroft January 12, 2002 Department of Justice RE: Microsoft Suit Pending
Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
Please let the Court know that you support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. Please use all of the power of your office to make the settlement of the aforementioned case come to an end by letting the Federal Judge know that we, Americans want it to end and stop putting Microsoft through all of this scrutiny. Please let the Federal Judge handling this case hear from you, representing us, the consumers. Take action today, and in support of this proposed settlement.

Thank you for your speedy work in this matter. Thank you for your continued integrity that you have displayed in the past and I know, will in the future.

Sincerely yours,
Karen W. Hunt
8931 Gaylord # 166
Houston, Texas 77024-2910
(713) 464-8153

MTC-00010593

From: Alan Vier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:57am
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

My view on the Microsoft anti-trust is that they should be free to innovate. I also feel that they are not using their "nopoly" in terms of pricing. The os is very complex and to get an upgrade for under \$100.00 is a bargain! It would be nice if everybody could use their time and profits to better use than to spend it in court!

I do feel that Microsoft should not leverage their "monopoly" in terms of dealer preferences or limiting other companies to innovate.

Let us remember that it is Microsoft that tries to allow others to write applications for the PC vs Apple and others that limit hardware and make it more difficult to write software. It was Microsoft that allowed others to innovate other hardware and software applications that made to PC so popular.

Sun and the like should fight their battles in the marketplace and not in court. Linux is putting pressure on Microsoft to keep prices down and innovate, which is the way it should be.

In summary,
Let the bright create and not fight!

MTC-00010594

From: Charles B. Stinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 11:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Charles B. Stinson Lighthouse Road P.O.Box 62 Prospect Harbor, Maine 04669-0062 Tel 207/963-2677 Email ckelp@acadia.net January 14, 2002 Attorney General John

Ashcroft US Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am in support of the current settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice at the federal level. Microsoft has produced some of the best products for the computer, which accounts for their vast success and status as an industry leader. There have been some instances in the past where making a choice in peripheral Windows components was overly difficult, which is one of the reasons I am in favor of the current settlement. I understand that from this time forward Microsoft products will be much more accommodating to the use and integration of competitors software peripherals. This is definitely a step forward, because I believe above all else the consumer should have the right to choose, to mix and match software as they see fit.

Another important reason for ending the antitrust proceedings swiftly is the strain, which our economy is currently under. The information technology industry is one of the biggest in the United States, and the antitrust suit has hurt this industry. Not only Microsoft has felt the burden of these proceedings, commercial retailers who sell MS products, employees of said retailers, Microsoft affiliated companies, stock holders, and the American tax payers have all been impacted by the antitrust suit. Given the current down turn in our nations economy, now is not the time to be wasting our resources in the court room when they could be better utilized elsewhere. Therefore I support the antitrust settlement, and urge you to do the same.

Sincerely,
Charles Stinson

MTC-00010595

From: Ludwik Kozlowski SR., M.D.
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 11:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Ludwik Kozlowski SR., M.D. 7608 Geronimo Circle N. Little Rock, AR 72116 January 12, 2002 Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than

bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ludwik J. Kozlowski SR., M.D.

MTC-00010596

From: Harold Berenson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 11:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Harold Berenson 20110 218th Ave NE Woodinville, WA 98072-7145 January 12, 2002 Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Harold R. Berenson

MTC-00010597

From: Charnan31@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft
ATR,BUBDAVI@aol.com@inetgw
Date: 1/12/02 12:10pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

My opinion and comments: Microsoft should get off the hook??\four years is enough??\ If another company has a better operating system??\they should show it and the world will buy it instead of XP. My County and my City has computers and training in every Library Thanx to Bill Gates. Their Software is reasonably priced??\litigation is never reasonable in cost.??\Let????s settle it now??\

Charles Murrell,
Redding California.
CC:gmburl@attbi.com@inetgw,SLATER455@aol.com@inetgw,Ce...

MTC-00010598

From: bs—crotteau

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 12:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get on with it. Make the settlement and let Microsoft get back to being a major contributor in the high-tech world. One of the few places where the USA still holds competitive advantage.

Thanks,
BC

MTC-00010599

From: Alan Hansen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 12:35pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

Dear Sir or Madam

The time has come for the scumbags in the Justice Department to stop the suit against Microsoft, get off the dole and go to work.

Alan Hansen
124 North 155st
Shoreline Wa.98133
Have a nice day,
Al

MTC-00010602

From: Juanema Hinesley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 12:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Juanema Hinesley 5733 Hwy 9 E Shirley , AR 72153-6033 January 12, 2002 Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Juanema Hinesley

MTC-00010604

From: Samuel Golf
To: Microsoft ATR,MicrosoftComments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw,...
Date: 1/12/02 1:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Case

[Text body exceeds maximum size of message body (8192 bytes). It has been converted to attachment.]

To the minds of many Americans, the results of the Microsoft Antitrust case have called into question the integrity of our legal system as well as our political process. And to those which have not yet noticed, I think historians will take note on behalf of future generations.

In the past few years, Americans have been outraged at revelations of Chinese attempts to influence our political process through campaign contributions. It is well established in fact that Microsoft did give massive campaign contributions to members of congress and one erstwhile presidential candidate, namely George W. Bush. Additionally, lobbying efforts—either directly or indirectly—were made to others in congress as well as the Justice Department.

In light of these facts, it was with horror and dismay that I watched the direction and aspiration of the Justice Department's antitrust efforts change nearly 180 degrees following the presidential election (in stark contrast to previous tradition). The dangerous message which is being broadcast here is manifold:

First, it is possible to commit a serious crime in this country, be found guilty of committing that crime, and by manipulating the length of the trial beyond the term of a presidential administration it is possible to escape the original intentions of your prosecutors, effectively nullifying the most detrimental outcomes.

Second, the concept of "one man, one vote" is a joke in this country. Here we vote with dollars, and the more dollars you have, the more votes you get to make.

Third, and most disturbing, there is no longer separation of powers between the executive and judicial branches of government, as the framers of our constitution wisely intended. At other times in our history, foreigners committing similar acts have been imprisoned for treason. At other times in our history, Americans committing similar acts have been tried—and committed—for racketeering.

Additionally, when people have knowingly submitted false evidence in a trial, they have been tried and committed for perjury—again, leading to imprisonment. Microsoft was actually caught in the act of falsifying videotapes entered into evidence not once, not twice, but three times in the course of its antitrust trial.

I cannot recall when such egregious acts have ever been treated so lightly in America. Please keep in mind that we are not talking about abstract concepts of "harm to consumers" or "diminished competition in the computer market". We are talking about the very palpable pain and suffering of literally tens of thousands of hard-working people losing their jobs, businesses, and fortunes when Microsoft's illegal acts bankrupted thousands of businesses. Most of these businesses did not fail because they were making inferior products, nor because they were poorly managed, but because of the unlawful acts of an unfair competitor.

Meanwhile the founders, employees, and investors in Microsoft have made literally

billions of dollars as a result of these illegal actions -which apparently everyone who benefited gets to keep. Where is the deterrent to committing the same illegal acts in the future?

Microsoft has already been found guilty of violating antitrust laws. The entire reason the antitrust trial occurred is due to Microsoft's violations of a previous consent decree. Now the Justice Department proposes to remedy Microsoft's behavior with yet another, impotent consent decree. This solution defies logic: When someone is found guilty of breaking laws, the punishment amounts to making them say "I'm sorry" and then promise not to do it again. Of course when the same perpetrator commits the exact same crime again (except worse) the new, improved punishment amounts to making them saying "I'm really, REALLY sorry this time" and promise not to do it again. Ever.

Except with Microsoft, they haven't even acknowledged that they are guilty. Publicly they maintain that they are the ones being injured by the "overzealous" efforts of the Justice Department (which at this point is anything but "zealous"). Microsoft is nowhere near saying "I'm sorry." So with Microsoft's established pattern of breaking consent decrees, what assurance do the American people have that they will actually adhere to this new one?

Other arguments diminishing the need for drastic remedies similarly defy logic: Some would have us believe that with AOL purchasing Netscape, the competitive landscape has changed faster than the trial could proceed, so there is no longer any need for anything to be done. Perhaps we should apply the same logic in a murder trial: once a murderer has completed killing their victim, there is no longer any need for punishment, because there is no way that the victim could possibly be harmed again. Microsoft effectively put Netscape out of business (it would never have been possible for AOL to purchase them without a tremendous devaluation of their stock); their products are no longer used widely, and they have lost all power to compete in the market with Microsoft—not because they produced an inferior product, but as a direct result of Microsoft's illegal and anticompetitive acts.

An effective remedy should be one which does not cost the American taxpayer the burden of a Saddam Hussein-style inspections of Microsoft's internal workings. As with nuclear inspections of Iraq, Microsoft has demonstrated its willingness to play a shell game with incriminating evidence. No, clearly Microsoft's past behavior demands that an intelligent person require permanent structural change to the company to pave the way for real competition in the computing market, and will furthermore show that in America, nobody is above the law—no matter how much money or political influence they wield.

The nature of Microsoft's unfair advantage which they have abused in the past comes from the collusion of several essentially separate business units, which must be cleaved in the remedy stage of this trial in order to have lasting beneficial impact: 1) operating system (OS) software

- 2) software development tools
- 3) productivity applications software
- 4) Internet client & server software
- 5) media software (Windows media, et al)
- 6) hardware
- 7) thousands of substantial holdings in other companies in disparate markets

Due to the massive size of Microsoft and its demonstrated ability to abuse this clout, simply dividing the company into two would still produce two rabid 800-pound gorillas, rather than two well-behaved chimps willing to play nicely in their respective markets. Three or four separate entities—with mechanisms in place to prevent continued collusion—are required to restore healthy competition to all these markets. Furthermore, Microsoft should be required to divest itself of holdings in other companies, which it also uses to maintain and extend its monopolies. Additionally, restitution should be required, considering the billions of dollars in gains that Microsoft and its investors have accrued as a result of these illegal practices. There simply must be a deterrence to breaking the law, and keeping the profit of billions is not a deterrence. Since our entire society has been damaged by Microsoft's actions, our entire society should receive restitution—to the tune of tens (if not hundreds) of billions of dollars—in the form of infusions to our nation's education system. Contrary to the previous proposals in civil suits, Microsoft should have no control—directly or indirectly—over the ways in which this money is spent. It could be used to offer equal technological access to all in our society, as well as explore implementing exciting new possibilities for integrated accelerative learning approaches that have been proven around the world to work eminently better than our own current system.

I also feel that officials at Microsoft should be prosecuted for racketeering and perjury efforts which occurred both during and after the antitrust trial. Again, people in our society should be treated equally in the eyes of the law, no matter how deep their pocket books happen to be. Also, the suggestion of making Microsoft's OS source code "public source" would simply benefit Microsoft, by encouraging wider adoption of the OS, because it would essentially be FREE. This would mimic the cycle of damage done to Netscape when Microsoft chose to give away Internet Explorer. In the "public source" scenario, Microsoft would also benefit from the combined efforts of thousands of programmers attempting to fix the many thousands of bugs that are known to exist within its operating systems. Microsoft has the particularly slimy business model of knowingly releasing software which is profoundly flawed, then charging its customers for a re-labeled product which partially fixes the bugs found in the previous generation, along with some additional new features and new bugs. This has been the business model of "upgradeware" that Microsoft has employed when convincing people to upgrade from Windows 95, to Windows 98, to Windows ME, and now Windows XP.

Recall that separation of powers and the public's faith in the integrity of the American

political and judicial processes are literally what is at stake as the remedies are applied in this trial. Please show Microsoft that they are not above the law.

I offer my sincere appreciation for your time and consideration.

Samuel Goff

MTC-00010605

From: Mathieu Frenette

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 1:03pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm a Java Software Architect who really cares about the outcomes of the settlement—especially long term results—for they may bring down my entire open-source-multiple-platform-technological-freedom-world forever. No matter the usefulness of Microsoft's products, I just can't imagine a world with *only* that. Unfortunately, it seems to be the direction things are going.

I'm afraid this settlement has a much greater impact than what most people are aware of, for it will communicate to Microsoft whether or not (and at what degree) the entire world is willing to accept a "technological despotism".

Technological lock-in, altogether with their new operating systems (ie. WindowsXP) which slowly puts them in the middle of literally everything—including worldwide E-commerce—will bring them even closer to this "technological despotism".

In this respect, I sincerely believe the settlement should serve as a warning to Microsoft, clearly stating that the world is not letting go of its technological freedom.

Thank you profoundly for taking the time to review people's comments...

Best regards,

Mathieu Frenette

Java Software Architect

Freeborders Canada

mathieu.frenette@freeborders.com

MTC-00010606

From: Richard Becker

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 1:04pm

Subject: Amazing indeed...

Dear Sirs:

As a software engineer, and president of a technology company, I am astounded that the government cannot clearly see what Microsoft has done over the past several years. They have leveraged their monopoly to further strengthen their position, and effectively freeze out new, and for the most part better technologies. The most amazing part of this whole situation, is that they continue with business as usual, and for the most part nothing happens. They manage to tie things up in the courts for years, while technology keeps moving forward, and their position continues to strengthen. Nothing short of a breakup will stop this monopoly, and allow technology in this country to move forward. When one looks to Europe and Asia, where Microsoft is not so entrenched, that is where technology is thriving. Competition spurs innovation, but monopoly's stifle it.

With the recent introduction of the X-Box, Windows Multimedia format in DVD's, and in refusing to support competing, yet superior technologies (ie. Java) their

monopolistic position only strengthens. As a person that is directly involved in the industry, it is so obvious as to the general strategy of Microsoft, it is a shame that our learned justices can't see it also.

Regards,

Richard J. Becker

President

MATRIX Information Systems Inc.

MTC-00010607

From: DWyatt4@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 1:12pm

Subject: Comment from consumer

It is obvious to many that the consumer is not the issue. We know that to buy a car piece by piece is outrageously more expensive and would put most car owners out of the market.

Yet you want Microsoft put in a position where they cannot add value to their product to the benefit of the consumer.

The amount of money Microsoft has had to spend in courts and to attorneys could have gone a long way in stopping world hunger and health issues. The consumer would also be way ahead without this costly litigation.

That will benefit only a few competitors of Microsoft.

The justice dept. as usual will end up screwing the consumer.

Dick Wyatt

MTC-00010608

From: Derek Mason

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 1:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is a very sad day in American history to see the DOJ abandoning its role of protecting the American public. It's issues such as the gov't's unwillingness to truly do what is right w/ MS that leads the public to see the U.S. gov't as corrupt, ineffective and protecting corporate interests over the needs of the general public.

The real issue in the MS case is stopping its monopolizing practices, which leads to further abuses and encroachments on constitutional protections. Corporate monopolies develop and function in a fashion not unlike authoritarian regimes, such as fascism.

The proposed settlement really doesn't do anything to accomplish this. The proof of this should be readily apparent to well-trained attorneys and constitutional experts. One needs only to look at MS's most recent behavior to grasp how ineffectual the DOJ has been.

Windows XP requires the purchaser to acquire an activation code from MS upon installation. This code is really an inventory of one's computers hardware. MS says it does not gather individually identifying information from the computer, but my computer hardware is my property, and I have a right to privacy regarding its content and use.

The claim that activation is separate from registration, which is essential for access to a variety of necessary services, such as the support system. Registration does require submission of identifying information, but MS claims it keeps this separate from activation.

What guarantee do I have that MS will do this? Given their behavior in the past, only a naive idiot would accept this. It is unimaginable that the DOJ allows this. The founders of our nation would be aghast at allowing a government agency to do this, let alone a private company.

Yet, MS is undaunted in its practice because I believe they know they can do what they want without any real action from the DOJ, or other regulatory body. It bespeaks the kind of arrogance of the early monopolists like JP Morgan, Rockefeller and the other early 20th century industrial tycoons.

I do not believe that MS paranoia about loosing profits from software privacy entitles them to infringe on the civil liberties of Americans. Apparently, the DOJ believes this as well because it has failed to stop the MS monopoly.

As if this activation isn't enough, MS is even more intrusive. If you change some of the hardware in your computer, such as cpu, ram chips, harddrive, firewire cards, Windows XP de-activates itself. You are then required to call MS and tell them what you have done to your computer!. I added a firewire card to my pc, and had to call them. It took two days to get a live person, but we've lived with that for many years. When I reached their agent, she said, "So, what are we doing today?" The implication being that they were entitled to know what I was doing with my pc. Incredible!

MS doesn't have a right to know this. They have sold me a copy of XP, and it does not include my giving up my rights to privacy.

The point is that we are forced to put up with this because: We have no other viable options when it comes to an OS. They have a monopoly. Why doesn't the DOJ grasp this? Does the settlement get at this?

Obviously not because MS continues to do these kinds of things.

One can also see very clearly where they're heading next. It does not take a genius to see that they are going to incorporate MSN into the OS, just as they did with Explorer. Then signs are already there. To get access to certain services, such as support, you have to have MS Passport, which is part of MSN.

Further you have to take their instant messaging, and you cannot even delete it from your system. They have recently bought QWest's internet system, which is now MSN. So they now have their own internet. The next step is to claim MSN is part of the os, and force people to pay for it in order to access the internet. They will do this by changing Internet explorer to MSN. The DOJ's settlement with MS is an abandonment of the US constitution, and the ideals that it embodies.

The real solution is to take the API and make it public domain, or force them out of every other business avenue they have been pursuing, MSN, internet service provision, non-os applications, and to stop them from abridging privacy.

It is hard to understand why DOJ cannot find the courage to what is so obviously right for the American people, and in their best interest, not a corporation's. Big Brother is here alright, but Orwell was wrong in thinking it was the federal gov't, it's Microsoft.

Derek Mason
Smithfield, UT

MTC-00010609

From: ME Conces
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:38pm
Subject: I am opposed to the government curtailing Microsoft's innovation in the business world.

Objections

I am opposed to the government curtailing Microsoft's innovation in the business world. Objectonists regret they can't keep up, so they spend our money going to court to prove that in essence

Microsoft is better qualified than the opponents in moving forward with innovation in the computer world. I feel Microsoft should be able to place computers in the schools if they can do it. Other companies are only objecting because they didn't think of it first.

Mary Eileen Conces
meconces@NWLlink.com

MTC-00010610

From: W. Roger Gehman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Warren Gehman
126 Park Avenue
Mount Joy, PA 17552-1524
January 10, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

Microsoft has gotten a raw deal as a result of a vendetta against it by politicians and lawmakers. Microsoft in no way should be broken up and should not be subject to many of the concessions it is being forced to make.

For over a decade now, Microsoft has led the tech world in innovation delivering the highest quality and most reliable products and services to the market. At times their market dominance precluded others from gaining an edge, but that forced competitors to raise their performance levels, weeding out companies who were not strong.

Microsoft cannot be punished for exhibiting vision and grit. Bill Gates accomplished the American dream and should be able to bask in his success, not wallow in political agendas. I urge your office to support the settlement for the sake of American public.

Sincerely,
Warren Gehman
cc: Senator Rick Santorum
Representative George W. Gekas

MTC-00010611

From: miriamlarson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:45pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs, Lets resolve the Microsoft problem and get on to bigger and better projects! I'm sure that you and your cronies have spent enough time and money on this subject . . .

Sincerely,
Miriam Larson

Bremerton, Wash. 98311

MTC-00010612

From: taliesin@speakeasy.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I submit that both the Courts and the Department of Justice have a fundamental conflict of interest with respect to the antitrust case against Microsoft. How can one possibly judge a company and mete out fair justice when one depends upon that same company to do one's daily work? I further submit that in the interests of justice, Her Honor, her staff, and the DOJ team—at the very least—should immediately henceforth and until the conclusion of the case, cease and desist from using any Microsoft products for any reason in any way related to the case. This includes operating systems, applications, servers, even mice and keyboards. This includes all aspects of the lives of those involved. Home computers, games and game consoles, et cetera, et cetera, ad infinitum nauseumque. This will do two things. It will not only remove the specter of "what will I do if all this disappears" doubt from the minds of those involved, but prove to them personally just how pervasive the Microsoft monopoly is... and just how possible it is to break it, if only we have the will.

The proposed settlement, so far as I can tell, has no punishment for Microsoft, only prevention of further wrongdoing. I propose the following very simple step: A complete, total, ten-year ban on using Federal monies for the purchase of any Microsoft products, directly or indirectly. Current software would be allowed to remain, but as licenses expire or computers need upgrading, they would have to be replaced with non-Microsoft products. You cannot both break Microsoft's monopoly and pay them to maintain it. This would not only remove any Federal conflict of interest completely, but have the effect of forcing Microsoft to play fair with non-Microsoft systems or be forced from the industry as people make the changes necessary to make their own systems talk to non-Microsoft Federal systems.

There are many flaws with the proposed settlement, but I believe the addition of this one proviso, removing the conflict of interest from the case, will effectively cure all its remaining ills, and forever break the monopoly that today is Microsoft.

Glenn R. Stone
Linux Systems Engineer
working in Redmond, WA

MTC-00010613

From: Tanner lewis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 1:55pm
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing you today expressing my sincere belief that that no further action on behalf of the federal government needs to be

taken against Microsoft. This issue has held the leading innovator, as well as the entire IT industry, in a state of stagnancy for three years now. It is time that the government let them get back to work. For this reason, the settlement reached in November should be implemented without further delay. It is quite clear that this settlement is thorough and reasonable. The government wanted to inhibit anti-competitive behavior and that is exactly what this agreement does. Microsoft has agreed to allow its competitors access in code and interfaces that internal are internal to Window operating system products.

Additionally, Microsoft has conceded broad new rights to computers makers to ship non-Microsoft operating systems, as well as the rights allowing them to configure Windows so as to promote software applications that compete with Microsoft products. There are many other provisions of this settlement, all of which will be verified by a Technical Committee for compliance. Under these conditions, it is fair to say that Microsoft's competitors have a significant advantage, and more importantly, this settlement satisfies the original goal of the government's lawsuit.

This settlement should be implemented immediately so as to allow Microsoft to get back to producing innovative products and services. This issue has been drawn on far too long, to the detriment of the IT industry and the economy. It demands a resolution. Please continue your hard work in this direction.

Sincerely,
Tanner Lewis

MTC-00010614

From: rosing@peakfive.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

This is in response to the Microsoft Settlement. I'm disappointed because the settlement will not lead to a competitive business environment. It's clear that Microsoft has a monopoly. I can't run my business without paying Microsoft. The problem with the settlement is that it doesn't address the fact that Microsoft already has a monopoly. To rectify this the settlement should encourage more competition. The settlement makes a reasonable attempt at fixing some obvious problems in how Microsoft interacts with other companies and how they can modify or use Microsoft's operating system, but there is a lot more to using an operating system or writing applications for an operating system then setting icons. Microsoft should have to make any changes to the operating system available to the entire public long enough ahead of time of implementing them that other companies can use the changes in a competitive manner with Microsoft's other software products.

Another approach to ensuring competition would be to encourage a competitive operating system for PCs. My biggest complaint with Microsoft is that it has little to no competition. The consumer is stuck with whatever Microsoft comes up with no matter how many errors or worthless features

are in it. If the Mac OS ran on PCs then Microsoft would be pressured to fix some obvious problems. If there were a company with enough capitol to build a simple interface for Linux then Microsoft would have real competition. I would like to see the settlement structured to have Microsoft pay for the development of a competitive product, either Mac OS on a PC or a simple Linux interface, then have Microsoft's operating system made public.

Thank you,
Matthew Rosing

MTC-00010615

From: Frank Koch
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Frank Koch
158 Terning Drive West Eureka, MT 59917
January 12, 2002 Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530 Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Frank Koch

MTC-00010616

From: Denise Rounds
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 1:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Denise Rounds
PO Box 480097
Charlotte, NC 28269
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the

wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be

encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Denise Rounds

MTC-00010617

From: James E. Osteen, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:29pm
Subject: Put an end to the Antitrust Case

Can you please save me and my fellow taxpayers a little money? The last thing that we need now is for the DOJ to keep harassing Microsoft. In my eyes, Microsoft's competitors are whinning, because they cannot build a better product.

James Osteen

MTC-00010619

From: marina slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:48pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Judge KK;

As a long-time (and very discontented) Microsoft user, I find it almost unbearable to think that I will be forced to continue to use the MS operating systems— and (gasp) MS applications— indefinitely into the future if the PFJ is approved as it now stands. Please help bring at least a modicum of real competition to our country's PC software industry. For all of us millions that use the PC everyday to do a variety of tasks, how much nicer it would be to have truly free choice in applications—and an Operating System that actually worked without crashing. Clearly you can't do a lot about the latter. But please do something about the former. Please don't allow the 'bolting' provision of the PFJ to stand.

Sincerely yours,
Marina Slayton
Palo Alto, CA

MTC-00010620

From: marina slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

THANK you Judge—for taking this case seriously. Please do not let Microsoft have its way.

We need a competitive software industry in our country-not a MS monopoly.

THanks,

MTC-00010621

From: G S
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:02pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
GREETINGS JUDGE;

THANK YOU FOR YOUR WORK IN REVIEWING THE PFJ. AS A 10 YEAR VETERAN OF THE SOFTWARE INDUSTRY, MY READING OF THE PFJ TELLS ME THAT IT IS DEFINITELY NOT IN THE PUBLIC'S BEST INTEREST.

I HOPE YOU WILL SEND THE PFJ BACK TO JUSTICE AND ASK THEM TO CORRECT AT LEAST THE MOST EGREGIOUS SECTIONS, IF NOT (PERHAPS BEST) START AGAIN.

AFTER ALL, THREE COURTS HAVE ALL FOUND THAT MICROSOFT DIRECTLY AND REPEATEDLY ABUSED ITS MONOPOLY POSITION (95% OF THE EFFECTIVE MARKET FOR PC OPERATING SYSTEMS IN THE USA??). WHY SHOULD WE TRUST THEM GOING FORWARD???

THANK YOU.
GWS

MTC-00010622

From: Barbara Bryant
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 2:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barbara Bryant
PO Box 1344
Levelland, TX 79336
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

WHY DON'T YOU GO AFTER THE "UTILITY/TELEPHONE MONOPOLIES IN SMALL TOWNS?"

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bryant

MTC-00010623

From: Anders Persson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hej

Microsoft position on the software market make them a monopoly company. They thoroughly use it by adding not large differences to standards but small ones. Many companies in Sweden have abandoned other products like Netscape since they do not handle everything correctly if a site has been developed by any MS product. Since a lot of people use MS Word, MS Front Page in large companies they of course produce their sites with those tools. Netscape handles them almost correctly but since Microsoft has added some slight differences only known internally of Microsoft it is only MS Internet Explorer that has the possibility to handle the pages correctly.

They have tried the same with Java and their product Visual J++ that in some cases produced not standard Java code. So, Microsoft is defacto, by its large market share, setting the standard but not telling anyone. A similar case is the openoffice.org tool that tries to read MS Word format documents. I recently filed an issue about a bug to openoffice.org. They did not handle some tables correctly that was produced with a MS Word tool that a friend of mine used. They looked at the binary format of the document and the reason was that MS Word ignored in this specific case the carriage return that was included in the table? Why did they ignore it? How should anyone else than the developers at Microsoft be able to write products that use information produced by other tools either by direct communication or via files produced by Microsoft tools.

If a small company do like Microsoft none will bother since it often does not affect anybody. But since Microsoft totally dominate the market everyone must follow what they do. If Microsoft decide that they need a new product in a certain area they just take it since they can easily create a new product that is better integrated with all other Microsoft tools than any other vendor can do.

The only possible solution is to divide MS into a lot of smaller companies.

Regards
Anders Persson

MTC-00010624

From: Don Running
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

MTC-00010624-0001

805 Harrison Street
Wakefield, MI 49968-1043
January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530-000

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

We are huge supporters of Microsoft. We have long been impressed by the company's ability to produce user-friendly products. Microsoft has their hand on the pulse of the

consumer's needs. This is the secret behind Microsoft's ability to innovate. We want to voice our support for the settlement. This settlement is fair. It is reasonable. It contains many terms that will ensure anti-competitive behavior in the future. The largest of these terms is the disclosure of the internal interface. Competitors will now be able to access the design of the Windows system. This will put competitors at an increased advantage.

Microsoft is a great company. It has helped the technology industry immensely. The settlement will allow them to get back to what they do best. Enact the settlement.

Thank you.

Sincere regards,
Donald R. and Margaret A. Running

MTC-00010624-0002

MTC-00010625

From: Gayle Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
4119 North Simpson Road
Otis Orchards, WA 99027-8721
January 12, 2001
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I support the settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust Case. I am outraged about the amount of money and time that has been devoted to it. This case should not have been brought in the first place. I am even more outraged by the handling of the case by the judiciary. I believe firmly that the government should simply drop the case against Microsoft, however, as the likelihood of this happening is slim, I support Microsoft's agreement to comply with the terms of the settlement agreement in the interest of ending this costly, wasteful, unwarranted, and needless litigation.

The terms of the settlement are more, considerably more, than fair, just, and reasonable. Microsoft has gone far above and well beyond what should be expected of it. Microsoft has agreed to disclose to its very competitors the interfaces that are internal to its proprietary Windows Operating System. Similarly, Microsoft agreed to not enter into contracts with third parties that would require that third party to exclusively promote or distribute Microsoft products. There should be no hesitation in accepting these terms; no hesitation on the part of the Department of Justice; and, no hesitation on the part of the Court. A nation that hesitates in times of crisis is lost. And our nation is facing a crisis.

I believe firmly that this case was brought as a result of the government's ongoing pattern of interfering with successful American businesses. Innovative companies, like Microsoft, should be free to further their businesses. When innovative American companies are allowed to freely innovate, American businesses, American consumers, and the American economy in general, will benefit.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter and, please, let our nation move forward.

Sincerely yours,
Gayle E. Green

We do not lose heart. Though outwardly we are wasting away, yet inwardly we are being renewed day by day. For our light and momentary troubles are achieving for us an eternal glory that far outweighs them all. So we fix our eyes not on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal.

II Cor. 4:16-18

MTC-00010626

From: Mike Duetting
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
5756 Spruce Knoll Court
Indianapolis, IN 46220
(317) 255-4806
January 12, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my full support of the recent antitrust settlement between Microsoft and the US Department of Justice. The case has dragged on long enough and I believe the settlement is fair and in the best interests of the America public. There are two things I completely agree with in the terms of settlement and think will be good for the IT Industry. First, the increased relations between Microsoft and computer makers and software developers will allow knowledge sharing, which is unprecedented in this industry and should promote higher growth rates. Second, designing future Windows versions so that computer makers, software developers, and consumers can more easily promote non-Microsoft products is a welcome adjustment to the current format.

But, for the IT Industry and economy to rebound this matter has to be settled as soon as possible and that will only happen when the nine states in opposition drop their lawsuits. I believe they should be scolded for their actions and I disagree fully with their intents.

Sincerely,
Michael S. Duetting

MTC-00010627

From: m C
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:11pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
DEAR JUDGE; WHEN REVIEWING THE PFJ, PLEASE THINK OF WHERE OUR NATION WOULD BE WITH ONLY ONE OIL COMPANY (STANDARD OIL) OR WITH ONLY ONE RAILROAD CORPORATION... MONOPOLIES ARE INHERENTLY BAD FOR OUR INDUSTRY, OUR ECONOMY AND OUR NATION. AND I DON'T THINK THAT ANYONE LOOKING SERIOUSLY AT THE NUMBERS WOULD ARGUE THAT MS DOESN'T AT LEAST HAVE A DEFACTO MONOPOLY IN OUR INDUSTRY.

AGAIN AND AGAIN AND AGAIN MS HAS ABUSED ITS MONOPOLY POSITION TO PUT ITS COMPETITORS OUT OF BUSINESS. AND NOW THE GOV'T WANTS TO TRUST MS NOT TO DO IT AGAIN (WHICH IS HOW I READ THE PFJ).

THAT IS RIDICULOUS...AND IT WILL BE A SERIOUS BLOW TO THE AMERICAN SOFTWARE INDUSTRY.

PLEASE TAKE A COURAGEOUS STAND FOR FREE MARKETS. PLEASE STAND AGAINST THE MICROSOFT MONOPOLY.

THANK YOU.
MARIAN CHILDS
TOLEDO, OHIO

MTC-00010628

From: Stephane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The american DOJ is the only authority that can do anything against the unfair market strategy of Microsoft corporation. And it may do so because, for its own interests, breaking such a monopoly would benefit the USA's state.

1-Microsoft's monopoly keeps the new economy fragile and weak. What would happen in case of Ms' crash ? The main industrial network in IT would be thrown to ground. Do you think people would like not to upgrade windows computers during 10 years because MS is dead ? Do you remember that anti trust laws were established after 1929 and why ?

2-This monopoly costs to the us society. The illegal and nonsense raises in software (that became necessary for most users and enterprises) involves a real robbery of the american society. The states are stolen, as their people are, when they spend million dollars just because the have to buy an up-to-date system (even if up-to-date just means more beautiful and newly marketed).

3-From a computer security point of vue, having only one large scaled operating system (that can't be customized or modified in any way) is the MAIN factor that explains why viruses and security holes spread so quickly in the net. More diversity would carry more immune to the net and the american economy as well.

4-No more innovation, what a pity for such a new field : creating Operating Systems for people.... Microsoft is simply leveling down the computer science as many will tell you. Even their "innovations" are not innovations because they are not shared and this just becomes a market advantage to strengthen Ms and weaken the technology ability to change and evolve. American founder thought it would not become another oligarchy ...

What an amazing idea to see that justice is feared to break someone who concentrates so much power in a democracy...

MTC-00010629

From: ELHoffmann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Since technology changes and evolves so quickly these days, it is impossible that a monopoly can exist.

Every company has an equal opportunity to achieve success and Microsoft should not

be punished for accomplishing the highest level of success. Over the past ten years, growth of Microsoft has fueled the

US economy. As a result of litigating Microsoft, this source of "fuel" has been cut short. Thus it is important to end litigation as soon as possible.

The settlement offers the best solutions to the problem and serves the best interest of the people. We should not continue to weaken our US companies and while risking the chance of another foreign entity take advantage of the software market. There are already several non US companies developing products that will provide very strong competition for Microsoft. Microsoft should be left alone so that they can continue to develop new cost effective products and stay ahead of these foreign competitors. I am very concerned about the large legal bills being forced on Microsoft to defend themselves against this unwarranted litigation. In past years many other US companies had an equal opportunity to develop competitive software but have not been successful simply because what Microsoft has provided has been better and cheaper. I know because I have used much of that software and am very familiar with the cost and functionality.

After more than three years of litigation, it is about time that a settlement was reached. The current agreement ensures that other US competitors have an opportunity to be promoted the same amount as Microsoft. Provided in future Windows programs will be a mechanism that enables all users to easily reconfigure Windows to endorse software programs that are competitive with Microsoft products. In doing this, Microsoft consented to document and disclose necessary interfaces to the competition in order to advocate software compatibility. In addition, Microsoft has agreed to the establishment of a Technical committee. These software engineer experts will monitor Microsoft's business practices and will report any violations of the settlement.

Due to the excessive length of this case, it is necessary to end litigation immediately as it is not beneficial to the parties involved or to the US citizens. I believe the justice department has many more important items on its agenda. This country can not afford additional terrorism so that is where the justice department should be putting these resources (to better use in protect the people of the United States).

Thank you considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Leon Hoffmann

MTC-00010630

From: DrShelleyG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 3:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DOJ should allow Microsoft to press on in competitive ways and to innovate. Surely some compromise can be reached. If not computers and software for schools, how about software for government entities?

Shelley S. Gordon, Ph.D.
2444 West Oak St. #228
Denton TX 76201
DrShelleyG@aol.com

MTC-00010631

From: tjsimon124
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 3:28pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Department of Justice:
 It is high time that this case be closed and allow Microsoft to continue their innovative process's in developing new, improved, and affordable software programs that benefits individual consumers, the software industry, and the American Economy. Please stop spending taxpayers dollars on this case and devote your efforts to other more important matters that affect all Americans.

If the few special interests individuals would spend the resources in improving their software products instead of litigation, maybe they too could improve the efficiency of their products.

THOMAS J. SIMON
 Concerned consumer

MTC-00010632

From: CANTDANCELK@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 3:29pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

It is just unbelievable that a company such as Microsoft is penalized for being successful. Enough already! I have yet to find ANYONE who has been "hurt" by what ever Microsoft has been accused of. The real villain in this circus are the competitors of Microsoft who just cannot compete or will not compete without government intervention. If you cannot compete in a certain market, then you probably are IN the wrong market. This is what a true "open market" is. Microsoft is being penalized for following the American Way. A successful company that has indeed improved my way of life and millions of others. Let's face it. The states that are involved are only looking for another "cash cow" to fill their coffers. To drain Microsoft of legally earned revenue, an amount that Microsoft will have to pay, but like any other prudent company, would pass the cost back to the consumer by raising the price of its product, thus basically becoming a "hidden tax" upon the American people.

The Department of Justice must end this trampling on the spirit of what is America, an open market, the freedom of commerce, the right to be successful without penalty.

Lou G. Kush
 27810 49th Ave S
 Auburn WA 98001-1913
 United States of America
 (253) 859-3004
 e:mail: CantdanceLK@aol.com

MTC-00010633

From: WWilli2182@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 3:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
 I should like to record my view that the Microsoft settlement recently agreed upon is fair and reasonable, and in the public interest, and it would be very much against the public interest to reopen the case at this time, after already protracted litigation.

Very truly yours,

William J. Williams

MTC-00010634

From: Richard Iverson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 3:37pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 8468 W McRae Way
 Peoria, Arizona 85382
 January 12, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The federal government has no place telling people how to run their business or punishing them for being successful when they do it right. Microsoft is being punished for simply being too successful. I hope that this settlement means that both Microsoft and the government can move onto more important issues.

This settlement will make it easier for companies to design their products for use in Windows by requiring Microsoft to give them information about how Windows operates internally. If they don't feel that Microsoft is complying, they are allowed to take them back to court. I feel that this is more than enough to handle all of the original complaints that were brought against Microsoft in the first place.

Please let this settlement stand and let this whole mess finally be over and done with. Thank you for hearing me out in this matter and I look forward to hearing the result of this case after the comment period has ended.

Sincerely,
 Richard Iverson

MTC-00010635

From: Patraykirby@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 3:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 January 8, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

This letter is intended to express my concern regarding the continued delay in the settlement of the Microsoft case. This matter has been the object of years of litigation, constant controversy and continuous delay. All the while, one of the nation's most dynamic corporations has been hamstrung in a manner detrimental to the whole IT industry and our national economy. It's time to end this controversy and get Microsoft back to work.

The proposed settlement will satisfy the concerns of the government and remedy the grievances of Microsoft's competitors. The company will be constrained to open up its Windows systems to non-Microsoft software and computer manufacturers. There will be a Washington appointed oversight committee to monitor the company's compliance. In short the fears of Microsoft's competitors are no longer justified.

This case is now no more than a political football, and treating it as such is detrimental

to this country and our economy. Please finalize this settlement.

Sincerely,
 Raymond C. Kirby
 9411 Brookview Drive
 Brentwood, TN 37027

MTC-00010636

From: Julia Stemper
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/12/02 3:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Julia Stemper
 1830 E. Parks Hwy. #639
 Wasilla, AK 99654
 January 12, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
 The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Julia Stemper

MTC-00010637

1437 Darthmouth Street
 Scranton, PA 18504-2122
 (570)342-0590
 January 8,2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice,
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001
 Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am happy to see that a settlement has occurred between Microsoft and the US Department of Justice in the antitrust case, but extremely upset with the nine states continuing their lawsuits. Microsoft should not be broken up and most of the concessions they are being forced to make are ridiculous. I am currently studying for a degree in Business Information and have worked in numerous internships in the IT sector. As a student, and constituent of IT businesses, I think Microsoft is being wrongly forced to disclose their technology that they have

worked long and hard to develop. I will say that Microsoft has done wonders for our technology educational systems and should be applauded for how they have helped our economy.

The terms of the settlement have some just points such as forming three-person team to monitor compliance with settlement and increasing relations with competitors to share technological codes and interfaces.

I hope that the Department of Justice helps to suppress state opposition and works to free up Microsoft so that they can focus on regaining the growth they had over 3 years ago.

cc: Senator Rick Santorum
Senator Arlen Specter

Sincerely,
Mark Gowarty
From: Mark Gowarty
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 4:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached are my feelings on the Microsoft Settlement. Please see that they are read and reflected upon.

Thank You
Mark Gowarty
CC:Microsoft Freedom to Innovate

MTC-00010638

From: Don (038) Susie Meador
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
MabelDonald A. Meador
20482 Townline Rd.
Lanark, Illinois 61046
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
I want to take a moment to comment on the settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice that was reached late last year. The settlement is definitely in the public's interest and is a fair deal for both sides of the dispute. From every indication I have seen, the agreement is strong and requires many changes to be implemented by Microsoft.

As an example, Microsoft has agreed to design future versions of Windows to provide a mechanism to make it easy for computer makers, consumers and software developers to promote non-Microsoft software within Windows. This will in turn give consumers the freedom to choose to change their computer's configuration at any time. Also, Microsoft will be monitored under the agreement by a Technical Committee to ensure they are meeting their obligations.

I believe Microsoft has done a world of good for this country. Their products are extremely important to this country, whether small businesses or individuals in their home use them. I hope you continue to support the settlement and take no further action.

Sincerely,
Donald Meador

MTC-00010639

From: fstapel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:20pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs;
You may add my name to the list of people who are dissatisfied with the proposed settlement suggested by the Microsoft Corporation. I believe that giving poor school districts refurbished PCs and software, will only end up adding to the monopoly that they now enjoy. It will also impoverish the already under funded schools, in maintenance of these reworked machines plus the continual cost of updating them, and upgrading the software. It seems a very clever ploy to get more schools locked in to the "Microsoft Way", which has already proven to be expensive to businesses and the private sector alike. I believe Microsoft needs to forfeit a stiff fine, and have this granted to these schools, with the choice of Operating Systems, Windows, Macintosh, Linux or whatever.

Thank you for taking time to read this. sincerely.

Frank Stapel
106 Develin Drive,
Phoenixville, PA 19460
fstapel@erols.com

MTC-00010640

From: Otto Ammer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:28pm
Subject: antitrust

bravo microsoft!!!!!!!!!!!!!!Why doesn't the gov. keep its nose where it belongs.

Not in pvt industry.
O.J. AMMER
300s. stonebase rd.
New Wilmmington Pa. 16142

MTC-00010641

From: Steve Skipper
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:30pm
Subject: Settlement agreement

To whom it may concern:
As a resident of Washington I am amused at the different states' AG's as they attack Microsoft. Even though our AG was a lead litigator in the tobacco suit (we grow no tobacco in WA), I notice our AG is not part of this action, but many of the other AG's have competitors to Microsoft headquartered in their states. This appears to be a legal shakedown, because many of them were happy if Microsoft dumped money into their state in exchange for settling. (If it were truly an anti-trust case, none of these pursuers would let Microsoft buy them off.) Is this the American way? I hope not.

I would like to mention just one little piece of testimony in the government's case against Microsoft. Ralph Nader in his testimony mentioned that they were so upset with Microsoft's business tactics that they did not use any Microsoft products in their office. I think that says it all. Microsoft is not the only game in town.

I would also like to refer back to another case not so long ago, very similar to this one. Remember when the government claimed that no one would ever be able to compete against IBM, because they controlled so much of the market. A suit that lasted some 13 years was for naught. IBM is even throwing in the towel on trying to compete

in the desktop business and it had nothing to do with the government making a level playing field. What was the purpose of the suit? Are we going to make the same mistakes with Microsoft?

The free enterprise system is not perfect, but I think if we look at history, it turns out to be the most efficient and gives competitors the best opportunity to become the new industry giant.

If Microsoft is willing to settle under the terms now proposed, let's do it.

Steve Skipper,
Not affiliated with, own no interest in, not an advocate for or not paid by Microsoft

MTC-00010642

From: Tammy Stambaugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Attorney General Ascroft,
I'm writing to ask you to accept the proposed settlement by the Department of Justice, Microsoft and nine of eighteen states which will stop wasting taxpayer's money on the decade-long competitor-driven persecution of Microsoft.

I ask that the Federal District Court determine that the proposed settlement is in the public's interest and end the waste of our money on this case. Please settle it, and be done with it.

Thank you,
Tammy Stambaugh

MTC-00010643

From: PTLJanell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it May Concern:
As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of

1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janell Hope
11805 Meridian Pl. NE
Lake Stevens, Wa. 98258
ptljanell@aol.com

MTC-00010644

From: Pete Carapetyan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 4:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Your honor:

Please do not allow our country to be bushwacked by Microsoft, who uses not one but every available tactic to maintain their control over the marketplace.

By making technology appear much more complex than it really is, and then using that as a shell game to outwit the court system,

Microsoft makes a sham out of our laws, and a mockery of what has allowed technology to move forward.

Please do not allow the court to be duped by this very clever group. You do not have to be a technical genius to see when you are being snookered.

Pete Carapetyan
http://datafundamentals.com

Java Development Services

Open standards technology for commercial profitability

MTC-00010645

From: steve@stevemarse1studio.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 4:40pm

Subject: Attached word file
Steve Marsel Studio, Inc.

215 First Street
Cambridge, MA.

02142

steve@stevemarselstudio.com

January 11, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania
Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-
0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

After three long years of litigation between Microsoft and the Justice Department, I was excited to hear that a settlement had been reached.

The agreement reached required extensive negotiations and is extremely comprehensive. The agreement requires many concessions from Microsoft that show the government got strong deal in this matter. For example, Microsoft has agreed not to enter into any agreement obligating any third party to distribute or promote any Windows technology exclusively or in a fixed percentage, subject to certain narrow exceptions where no competitive concern is present. Also, any violations of the settlement could bring a contempt of court charge against Microsoft. The settlement is also a good development for consumers. Besides benefiting the economy, Microsoft will now be able to focus their resources on developing the next generation of products consumers have come to expect. Therefore, I hope your support of the settlement remains strong and this entire affair can be put behind everyone.

Sincerely,
Steve Marsel

MTC-00010646

From: Charlene Higgins
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 4:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charlene Higgins
504 N. Cottage
Miles City, MT 59301
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charlene Higgins

MTC-00010647

From: alvin j pohl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 5:07pm
Subject: MICROSOFT LAWSUIT
12380 Drayton Drive
Spring Hill, FL 34609-4034
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
January 10, 2002

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

It has come to my attention that there has been a settlement reached in the Justice Department's case against Microsoft. I would you like to know that I support the settlement, which has been reached by the parties involved.

However, I believe that the case was a waste of the court's time to begin with. There was no need to bring legal action against Microsoft, because they did not commit any crime. They are just a successful company who develop excellent products. I think the terms of the settlement are more than fair and reasonable for the government to accept. For instance, Microsoft has agreed to license its Windows operating system products to the 20 largest computer makers on identical terms and conditions, including price.

Also, I would like to remind you that there will be a three person technical committee established to make sure Microsoft is complying with the settlement, and to aid in the dispute resolution process. Furthermore, the continued pursuit of legal action against them would just be a waste of time and money. I ask that the Justice Department terminate its efforts to prosecute Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Alvin Pohl

MTC-00010648

From: Gerald Thomas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 5:13pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sir,

I believe that a favorable Microsoft settlement is in the interest of consumers and the public in general. Microsoft products have continually improved and have provided inexpensive software to the average family at a reasonable cost. I would have bought from their competitors if their product was as good.

Gerald G. Thomas

MTC-00010649

From: Don Kovacs

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 5:18pm

Subject: Fw: Microsoft settlement

ATTN: Renata B.Hesse

BOGUS

The DOJ, Microsoft and nine (9) attorneys-general have reached a satisfactory conclusion in this case against Microsoft. This case should be concluded as over and those states that do not wish to partake in the settlement should get NOTHING, including Connecticut, which I am a resident of (my attorney-general Blumenthal has a tendency to grandstand). Enough already. Microsoft makes a product and generates jobs, pays taxes and provides social responsibility to schools, etc. Government, takes from citizens and is supported by my taxes. End this case NOW!!!

Respectfully

Don Kovacs

16 Elaine St.

Norwalk, CT 06850

(203) 866-9671

MTC-00010650

From: Muneer Qaid

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 5:24pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

First let me start with this funny thing...i'm writing to you this email using Microsoft technology(Hotmail) itself but opposing Microsoft' way in business.

Yes, i think Microsoft should give some space for other companies to work and make money. Apparently that was not the goal of Microsoft in the past years. I do encourage Microsoft innovation and hard work but it SHOULD NOT target its work at harming/destorying or taking ideas of others and plug them into MS Operating Systems.

I think Bill Gates had made enough money to keep him and all his grandsons extremely rich for sooooo long. Give it a break Bill Gates.

Regards,

Muneer

MTC-00010651

From: Kay Lidington

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 5:43pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I live in the UK. Many people are concerned over abuse of a dominant position by Microsoft. The media is full of stories of abuse of a dominant market position by the firm. It probably needs to be reined in, but break-up of the entereprise is in the interests of no-one. Whether or not you like the firm, they have single-handedly advanced

information technology to levels that even a couple of years ago were beyond the wildest dreams of most people across the world.

If you wish to rein them in, many people will consider this appropriate. If you wish to break them up, you will do more damage to the civilised world than Osama bin Laden could even imagine.

As a patriotic UK national, I wish a UK firm had the expertise that Microsoft consistently show. As a member of the civilised 'Western' community, I expect you to consider where we would be without this firm.

For the record, I use an outdated version of "Windows" (Windows '95)because newer versions would leave smaller business like mine, that rely on older Windows-dependent programs, unable to run these 'old' programs without spending money we do not have.

I have no love for Microsoft, but be realistic—it is the only firm able to advance computer applications at a pace required by businesses worldwide.

K Lidington,

MILT, MInstTA (UK)

MTC-00010652

From: George Salisbury

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 5:49pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

I find the persecution of Microsoft an abomination of free enterprise. Microsofts bundling of their products is a procedure that has been followed by many manufacturers since day one. But the idea that a man like Bill Gates can utilize the system and become the richest man in the world causes our current socialist government fits. This is totally un-American. You are supposed to be free to be all you can be in this country. Apparently, not!

Totally disgusted,

George Salisbury

6018 E. Gillette Rd.

Cicero, NY 13039

MTC-00010653

From: Stella Canfield

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/12/02 5:48pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stella Canfield

111 E.Evans Rd.

Wapato, Wa 98951

January 12, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry.

It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Stella Canfield

MTC-00010654

From: Glenda R. Snodgrass

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/12/02 6:06pm

Subject: Proposed settlement of Microsoft anti-trust case should be REJECTED

With regard to the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case, may I respectfully state that I believe the proposed settlement should not be approved. Primary faults with this proposed settlement include:

1—No punishment. In spite of the fact that Microsoft has been judged to be a monopoly, which is a violation of U.S. anti-trust law, the proposed settlement does not punish Microsoft in any meaningful way, nor does it grant any meaningful relief either to consumers or to companies such as Apple, Sun and Netscape which were found to have suffered due to Microsoft's monopolistic practices. Microsoft will continue to enjoy the many fruits of its prior illegal activities.

2—No relief. The proposed settlement will not require Microsoft to change its normal way of doing business in any meaningful way. Consumers will still be forced to buy Microsoft software, at least the operating system, with every new PC purchase. (If you don't believe this is true, pick up the telephone right now and call Compaq or IBM and try to order a new PC with no operating system installed. They will not sell you one.)

3—No disclosure. A fair settlement must require Microsoft to reveal the secrets of its file formats to the extent that third-party software companies may create competitive products able to read documents created by Microsoft software and which will interact with Microsoft operating systems as well as Microsoft's own products do. The existence of the Microsoft monopoly over recent years has resulted in the creation of millions of documents in Microsoft-specific file formats; until these documents can be properly used by other software products, the monopoly will not be broken. The current proposed settlement does not provide for such necessary disclosure.

4—No protection. Likewise, the proposed settlement does not provide for adequate disclosure of network protocols like .NET, which Microsoft plans to use to completely dominate the Internet. Until and unless these protocols are regulated by an independent third party and fully disclosed, only software developers using Microsoft development

tools on Microsoft platforms will be able to fully implement the technology.

5—No security. It is crucial for national security interests that the Microsoft monopoly be halted, firmly, in its tracks. Just as a gene pool must be diverse to survive, the communication infrastructure of this country must have a diverse base to withstand attacks. It is a well-known fact in technical circles that the Microsoft operating systems have myriad serious security holes, making its ubiquity an even greater liability. More secure systems cannot penetrate the market, to diversify the national infrastructure and provide security through complexity, until the Microsoft monopoly has been broken.

The proposed settlement will not break the stranglehold of the Microsoft monopoly, and thus should be rejected.

Glenda R. Snodgrass
Post Office Box 885
Mobile, Alabama 36601

MTC-00010655

From: Philip Haddad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 6:11pm
Subject: Microsoft

As a taxpaying citizen I'm demanding that the crusade against Microsoft stop. Trial lawyers make loads of money in these cases. However, it sets a bad legal precedent and is paid with by taxes.

Sincerely,
Philip Haddad

MTC-00010656

From: Peter Menchini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consultant who works in the technology field, I am strongly opposed to the way the government has been handling this case of late. Microsoft, as a matter of course, uses it's monopoly position to carry out the most outrageous anticompetitive practices.

Indeed, they are the very picture of arrogance. They stifle innovation at every turn, even as they take credit for other peoples' initiatives. Their complete lack of concern for software security for instance, has cost companies thousands of dollars in lost revenue.

I urge the Department of Justice to stop helping Microsoft achieve dominance in school systems, and instead deliver the most severe punishments allowed by law.

While I prefer a break up of Microsoft, I understand this may not now be possible. In any case, I would think the government would look at how much money Microsoft really has, and ask for both compensatory and punitive damages based on the billions they've cost not only consumers, but State, Federal and local governments as well. This should be calculated to include the loss of jobs at other, competing firms as Microsoft's threats have forced corporations to dump other viable technologies or suffer the wrath of Redmond.

These things are all well documented, and Microsoft has made it clear that they are both unrepentant and unbowed. Even today, they continue their efforts to dominate at all costs,

even if it means that America falls behind in cutting edge technology.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Peter Menchini
Citizen of the United States of America

MTC-00010657

From: Millie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 6:43pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

My opinion and comments: Microsoft should get off the hook? four years is enough? If another company has a better operating system? they should show it and the world will buy it instead of XP. My County and my City has computers and training in every Library Thanx to Bill Gates. Their Software is reasonably priced? litigation is never reasonable in cost. Let's settle it now?

Charles Murrell,
Redding California.

My brother, Charles Murrell, wrote the above; we are in agreement with his opinion and want you to know.

George A. & Millie L. Berlemeier
14 Bruno Ct.
El Sobrante, CA 94803-3238
(510) 223-3694

MTC-00010658

From: leotakorns@frontier.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 7:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to have the Microsoft case settled. I do not think we are gaining anything by prolonging and dragging it out.

MTC-00010659

From: west goewey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 7:23pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

get it over with . . . tired of my tax dollars being wasted on this law suit. lets get the economy rolling . . . the only ones that win in a law suit are the lawyers!! let the buyer worry about what operating system to buy!! the settlement looks good to this consumer.

west goewey

MTC-00010660

From: Pat and Bob Goodpaster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 7:39pm
Subject: Fw: Microsoft settlement

From: Pat and Bob Goodpaster
To: mailto:Renata B. Hesse
@microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Sent: Saturday, January 12, 2002 7:11 PM
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft's generous offer should be accepted. Enough is enough. Let's get this closed and let this progressive organization help move our great country forward.

Sincerely,
Robert L. Goodpaster
1648 Elliott Ave.
Ashland, Kentucky

MTC-00010661

From: RickWRoberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft continues to develop business strategies which have a direct effect on the consumer and developer communities. One of the objectives of these strategies is always to impede other companies from developing technologies which might interfere with Microsoft's goals. Examples: Netscape Navigator and Java Technology. Even after the Antitrust suit was filed, Microsoft continues to try make it harder for other companies to develop their technologies. Example: Microsoft .Net strategy. And Microsoft says look at all the great things we have accomplished. But, much more could have been accomplished if Microsoft wasn't always trying to inhibit other companies abilities to compete in a fair market. I will only support a settlement which does not allow Microsoft to continue to bend the laws to suit there strategies.

Rick W. Roberts
Independent Software Developer

MTC-00010662

From: Kevin Poulsen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

It has come to my attention, through BeOS channels, that you are accepting proposed remedies to Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior as a monopoly.

To the point:

1. Microsoft should be limited from placing ANY restrictions on resellers. This includes, but is not limited to resellers selling individual copies of software, major/minor computer manufacturers who bundle MS software with their systems, VARs who may give discounts for bulk orders on MS products, etc.

2. Microsoft should be required to publish a price list with all available discounts. Anyone who meets requirements for fair discounts (based on volume, etc.) can get the discounts without any strings attached. Also, end-users should be allowed to upgrade whenever they see fit, instead of being forced into "subscription services".

3. Microsoft NEEDS to be broken into at least 3, preferably 4, independant companies (Mini Micros) using the AT&T breakup as a model. I strongly think we need 2 operating system companies and 2 application companies. Tied to this, COMPLETE OS APIs need to be published to any application/OS manufacturer that requests them.

4. Monetary damages at a staggeringly high number—sufficient to be considered by Microsoft as incentive for avoiding anti-competitive practice in the future. These monies could be placed in a trust fund for a number of years. Anyone who can prove damages, can be paid from this trust fund.

Now, my thoughts on each item:

1. There have been numerous operating systems that could have fared well if it wasn't for Microsoft's heavy hand behind the scenes of computer manufacturers. Examples include OS/2, Dr DOS, many DOS variants, Linux, Unix, and, most recently, the BeOS. I remember when OS/2 came out. I was a student at the time and I saw the two OSs side-by-side in the University computer

store. OS/2 looked impressive, but it faded away quickly. I wonder why? I have had a strong interest in the BeOS for about 5 years. I heard that the BeOS was shipping as a dual-boot on some HP computers. I later found out that the computers did ship with the BeOS installed, but that Microsoft prevented HP from adding the BeOS to their boot manager and would not let them use a third-party boot manager. This severely effected the commercial viability of the BeOS. Computer manufacturers and software distributors should be able to compete on a level playing ground. Microsoft has no place dictating unfair distributor restrictions.

2. Microsoft has frequently played favorites and punished distributors who don't agree to Microsoft's whims (selling OS/2, selling linux, etc). Microsoft should not be allowed to "punish" ANY software distributors. There are valid reasons for giving discounts.. specifically volume. Changing the wholesale price on Microsoft products for "preferred" or "black-listed" vendors is unfair practice. In addition, Microsoft recently initiated a "subscription" policy. Instead of allowing end-users to upgrade when they feel it is appropriate (e.g., when Microsoft provides a decent upgrade product), Microsoft now requires that companies use a "subscription service" for upgrades. This is a clear coercion that would be unnecessary if Microsoft provided a product that was worth the upgrade. End users should be able to indicate approval by upgrading whenever they want.

3. BeWINE is an effort to allow Windows applications to run on the BeOS. WINE also allows Windows applications to run on Linux and X. ([http:// bewine.loungenet.org/](http://bewine.loungenet.org/) and <http://www.winehq.com/>) I would like to see this project succeed, as well as others like it. But, they need ALL of the OS APIs. Breaking Microsoft into 2 companies, one with the OS and the other with applications, simply will NOT provide the open information that is needed. I think it is more important to break Microsoft into 2 OS companies. This is the ONLY way that all the OS APIs will be made public.

4. Microsoft has inflicted amazing monetary damage on competitors as well as on it's customers. If a company (Microsoft) produces a quality product at a fair price, then I don't mind if they make a healthy profit. Microsoft not only has NOT provided a quality product, they know that they can charge outrageous prices as long as they have control. Microsoft's value will undoubtedly increase if it is broken up (just look at AT&T and the baby bells). Microsoft's effort to avoid a breakup is clearly so that they can maintain control. Microsoft has to be fined punitive damages relative to it's size. This is the only way to give them a sufficient incentive to compete fairly.

Some additional commentary:

First, my background. I was a network administrator for 5 years working primarily with Windows NT 4.0. Mind you, I wouldn't mind working with Microsoft products if they actually worked the way they should and were priced according to what they are worth.

Windows has traditionally been a very unstable and low performance OS. Microsoft puts effort into "features" that will get

customers. But they routinely include "bugs" that are "fixed" in the next version to entice upgrades. Once blatant example is USB support for Windows NT 4.0. This is not difficult to provide. In fact, I've heard of 3 third-party programmers who had plans to offer it, since Microsoft hasn't included it in any of their 7 service packs. Coincidentally, none of those companies have brought it to market. I know (but can't prove) that Microsoft killed any efforts to offer USB support for Windows NT 4.0 so that users would have to upgrade to Windows 2000.

I've seen many confusing pricing schemes that are designed specifically to drain money from customers. Sometimes, these schemes include charges for no product. In particular, they charge a fee for every computer that accesses a server. They have started a "subscription service" that is effectively the only way to get product upgrades without spending a fortune on "new product" prices for upgrades. We also know that Microsoft charged twice the profitable price for Windows 95.

I became aware of the BeOS about 5 years ago. I watched in anticipation as newer versions came out and as it got great reviews. Finally, with version 4, I thought it was good enough to give it a try. It worked great (and still works great) on my P200. I've since upgraded to 5.0 and I am writing this e-mail using Mail-It on the BeOS. I still use Mail-It for my everyday personal e-mail. There are several sample programs that ship with the BeOS. I eagerly opened 11 of them, including a flight simulator, a Mandelbrot set generator, a spinning Open-GL teapot, a couple of videos, games and a starfield simulation. With all eleven of these applications open and running, some of them slowed slightly, but the equivalent of the Windows Start menu didn't even hesitate when I clicked on it. I bought stock in Be Inc. about the time that it was fluctuating wildly. This was poised to be a great OS. It was almost purchased by Apple. Then, as I later learned, HP (I think) delivered several computers with the BeOS installed. They were supposed to be dual-boot, but Microsoft nixed the dual boot, essentially making the BeOS inaccessible. That, among other things, killed the BeOS. The BeOS was then sold to Palm for 11 million—a mere fraction of it's asking price for Apple. I am hoping that Palm will license to Be United so that we can revive this great OS.

(Please note that my e-mail address will be changing from kwpoelsen@home.com to kwpoelsen@cox.net in the near future, in case you want to contact me.)

MTC-00010663

From: Dean Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 7:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dean Johnson
2411 Skyline Way #106
Anacortes, wa 98221
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dean Johnson

MTC-00010664

From: Joyce A. Reynolds
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
12332 Ridge Cove Circle
Charlotte, North Carolina 28273
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I have become increasingly concerned by the outcome of the antitrust suit brought against Microsoft by the U.S. Department of Justice. Even though I feel that Microsoft should never have been brought to trial, I am satisfied with the terms agreed to in the settlement that was reached. I support the terms of the agreement, which include increased information sharing and non-retaliation clauses.

Unfortunately, nine other states, along with Microsoft's competitors are seeking to overthrow the decision before it becomes permanent and to impose even further regulations of the company than it has already submitted to. This is ridiculous. The Department of Justice has better things to do with its time and money than to haggle endlessly over already resolved issues. It is in the best interests of the Justice Department, and indeed the American people, to let the lawsuit stand as it has been resolved.

I support the terms of settlement as they are. There is no need for further debate. I hope this letter will help persuade you that the settlement needs no further amendment. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Joyce Reynolds

MTC-00010665

From: millers
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:19pm

Please we have had enough. Most people are sick of the government waste in pursuing Microsoft. Let it go more harm than good is being done. We need less government intervention not more or as in this case prolonged waste of court time and money.

Thank you
David G Miller
millers@presys.com

MTC-00010666

From: Fred Grott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse

The proposed settlement does not settle any specific points within the anti-trust judgment.

Question: How much of embarrassment for the US DOJ would it be if the settlement in Europe under their laws succeeds to redress Microsoft's Monopolistic practices where the US DOJ fails in obligation to the US Public's trust?

No matter what settlement is implemented, remember this . . . Worldwide computer users, software developers, hardware vendors, software vendors, and etc will remember where you failed and some of us happen to vote upon those lines in the next round of up coming elections in the US.

Fred Grott
badapple@netnitco.net

MTC-00010667

From: Professor Time
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have written on this antitrust case many times over the past few months. Now that the government seems to be doing what is in the best interest of the consumers, I feel that any attempt to "derail" this settlement is just another example of bureaucratic overspending.

Let us put an end to this nonsense and go back to being truly competitive. Agressiveness is not always a dirty word. Sometimes it is just another way of saying "Yankee Trading".

Thank you.
W. Craig Westlake.

MTC-00010668

From: Alfred E Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:
The Microsoft settlement is fair. Please stand by it!
Thank you.
Al Johnson

MTC-00010669

From: Bill Loytty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:47pm
Subject: One vote for accepting the proposed

settlement.
Dear staffer who tallies these things:
Please add one vote to the "accept the settlement and get on with it" pile.

MTC-00010670

From: Aroughthopher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir or Madam,

I am a developer and user of the BeOS operating system, produced by Be, Incorporated. BeOS is a product that is used world wide. Recently Be, Inc. was forced to sell its intellectual properties to Palm, Inc., due to problems getting themselves situated in the market place. One of the main reasons for this can be summed up in one word, Microsoft. I am part of a group of people trying to get BeOS back into the marketplace, but in order for us to this, Microsoft cannot be allowed to get away with what the actions they have taken in the past, and continue to take. The proposed settlement is a start, but some work is needed. The following is a list of items that I feel would help in our cause, and they the US DOJ, could help us accomplish.

1. Microsoft Office needs to use open file formats, so that alternate operating systems can interact with it properly. We don't need the source code, just the file format. The format chosen should be standardized by a recognized standards body, and maintained by them. This way, future compatibility can be maintained.

2. The Win32 API needs to be made publicly available and fully documented. This is needed so that products, like BeWine or WinBe can be used to run MS Windows applications under the BeOS.

3. The file systems used by Windows, needs to be opened, so that operating systems that exist on the same machine as MS Windows, will be able to access the files that exist under the Windows directories. Microsoft should also be forced to interoperate with foreign file systems as well.

4. The ruling must include a "must-carry" rule, so that any OEM Microsoft is supplying Windows with, must have a alternate operating system installed, if Windows is installed on that system. This is the only way alternate operating systems will ever be given a chance by average users.

The last point I made is the most important. This is the only way the Microsoft can truly undo the damage they have done to the BeOS. Because Microsoft had made exclusive contracts with almost all of the major OEMs in the industry, not many people ever even heard of BeOS. Be, Inc. is/was a small company, and did not have the marketing budget the Microsoft has. And since they were unable to make deals with the OEMs, they could not get their product to market, except on the shelves of retail stores, over the internet, and by word of mouth.

The current proposed settlement is too weak, for the damage that Microsoft has done to the industry. I don't think Microsoft should be put out of business, but they should be punished. I currently use some Microsoft products, and therefore do not

consider myself anti-Microsoft. I do, however, believe in capitalism, and what Microsoft did was inexcusable.

Thank you for your time,
Paul Ashford

MTC-00010671

From: Richard Paul
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/12/02 8:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Richard Paul
1134 2nd Street North
Fargo, ND 58102
January 12, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Richard A. Paul

MTC-00010672

From: Spencer Grey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/12/02 9:26pm
Subject: Opinion of MS Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
I would like to add my voice to those who are against the current proposed settlement in the antitrust case against Microsoft.

I feel the proposal does little to either redress past transgressions that Microsoft has made or to meaningfully prohibit monopolistic behavior from Microsoft in the future. The measures outlined in the settlement are not realistically enforceable and subject to manipulation and interpretation.

Consumers and developers alike will ultimately benefit from more stringent action being taken against Microsoft. Please take this into account when you make your final decision.

Thank you for your patience and understanding.

Respectfully,
 —Spencer Grey, President
 ** Electric Funstuff
 ** <http://www.electricfunstuff.com>

MTC-00010673

From: Mary Henry
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 9:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

MTC-00010673 0001

142 LOWELL ST. APT 3
 1ST FLOOR REAR
 MANCHESTER, NH 03104
 MARY A. HENRY
 Telephone (603) 666-0574
 email: mhenry2@worldnet.att.net
 January 10, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 U.S. Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I enthusiastically support the Microsoft settlement and hope to see it enacted in the immediate future. The sooner the settlement is enacted, the sooner Microsoft will be able to return to the business of making quality software.

The settlement includes many concessions on the part of Microsoft. Microsoft has agreed to licensing restrictions. These licensing restrictions will allow the twenty largest computer makers to license the Windows' operating system at the same price. This allows computer makers more freedom to select the software that they want to ship to their customers.

Microsoft has come to this settlement with interest in resolving this issue. We should resolve it as soon as the public comment ends.

Sincerely,
 Mary Henry

MTC-00010673-0002**MTC-00010674**

From: Kat31286@netscape.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 9:42pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel strongly that Microsoft should be punished for it's transgressions.

There is a horrible misunderstanding of the point of the suit in the first place. Microsoft is a monopoly and has used that monopoly position to force others out of business or to bend to fit their desires.

Microsoft has done tremendous injury to the Java community, Netscape, Apple and countless others with it's anti-competitive practices. It affects people's freedom to choose among alternatives. It affects the price people must pay, directly or indirectly. It also has longer-term implications for people's privacy and security. It means less innovation and lower quality software. Please consider this when making your decision. Thank you very much.

Kate Ruter

MTC-00010675

From: Dr. L. E. F. Page
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 10:00pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen:
 While the Tunney Act requires a public comment period, please be aware that lobbying groups can flood the system with "public comment." Haven't we spent enough time trying to limit Microsoft Corp.'s ability to remain an innovative industry leader? The settlement seems just as proposed, without further breaking up or restrictions, and I feel you should affirm it as soon as legally possible.

Sincerely,
 Leslie Page (concerned private citizen and internet user)

MTC-00010676

From: Adi Ben Yahya
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 10:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft—a bully

It is clear that Microsoft is the biggest bully in the school yard. Worse still, it's now grown so big that it jeers at the teacher's warnings. For the sake of the others, and ultimately the bully, it's time to discipline mischievous behaviour.

AB
 CCadi_ben3@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00010678

From: RBeck89373@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 10:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement Ashcroft letter sent this date via US mail.

MTC-00010679

From: mary-johne hickman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 11:02pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: PLEASE LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. OUR ECONOMY IS JUST ABOUT SHOT!! YOU'RE NOT HELPING IT ONE BIT. PLEASE LEAVE MR GATES AND HIS COMPANY ALONE. AMERICA DOESN'T NEED ANYMORE INSULTS. PLEASE END THIS NIGHTMARE AND LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE.

THANK YOU,
 MARY-JOHNE HICKMAN

MTC-00010680

From: Jim Hall
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 11:13pm
 Subject: public comment: Microsoft antitrust litigation

I am writing this email to send a short statement on what I believe would be a suitable remedy to the Microsoft antitrust litigation. This is in response to the public comment that was invited for 60 days.

After reviewing the findings of fact in this trial, and based on my position and experience in the Information Technology industry, I cannot see how the settlement that is proposed even pretends to remedy the antitrust violations for which Microsoft has been found culpable. A suitable penalty, in my opinion, would be to split the Microsoft company into two halves: one that provides operating systems, and one that provides application software (including the web browser.) The two halves must be prohibited

from bundling the other's products for a period of no less than seven (7) years. Further, only one of the split companies should be allowed to carry the "Microsoft" name, to prevent confusion in the marketplace that the two halves still operate as one. I believe that such a remedy would require the new companies to fairly compete with other software companies in the marketplace. Microsoft would not be able to leverage a monopoly on the operating system at the desktop level to push application software. Other vendors would be put on a more level playing field with the two Microsoft companies. Thank you for your consideration of my comment.

James Hall
 1254 Lafond Ave
 St Paul, MN 55104

MTC-00010681

From: rlwills@scottsbuff.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/12/02 11:43pm
 Subject: Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
 1102 Lincoln Street Potter, NE 69156-0068
 January 12, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 United States Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am a long-time Microsoft supporter. As such, I am pleased with the settlement reached last November with the department of Justice. The settlement is a vital end to the litigation process that has crippled the IT industry in recent years.

The details of the settlement are complex. Microsoft has agreed to many terms that will increase competitor's ability to access the Windows' operating system. First, Microsoft has agreed to disclose the internal interfaces of its software design. This allows developers to substitute their software in place of the Microsoft network. The terms of the settlement will allow users to erase separate aspects from the operating system, such as Explorer or Media Player.

This settlement is in the public interest. It provides an opportunity for the IT industry to rebuild itself. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
 Richard L. Wills

MTC-00010683

From: melinda stortenbecker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 12:06am
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Get it over with. Competition and free enterprise are what made this nation a hope for everyone, not just a few wealthy. When Gates started, he was just a nobody with drive and determination. Leave it be.
 Melinda Stortenbecker

MTC-00010684

From: Eugene Vilensky
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 12:48am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,
 As a college student and a computer enthusiast and future programmer, it is my strong belief that Microsoft has done irreparable harm to the computer industry.

They have done wrong and deserve to be punished not because they are a successful company, but because they have violated anticompetitive law, and have done it with an air of arrogance and political clout and disrespect for the wishes of consumers.

It is understood that Microsoft is the U.S.' single most successful company, but they have not done it by pushing out a quality product that has fought for its own Darwinian place in the marketplace. They did it by choking off competition—in the case of preventing computers from shipping with BeOS installed alongside Windows (or any dual-boot configuration). I was and still am a big fan of the Be Operating System, it was a powerful tool that would in a free market have won marketshare on its own merit, but it suffered because people could not find computers with BeOS installed, hence the main tenet of competition—consumer choice—was choked off by Microsoft. Even now I cannot go to BestBuy or circuit city or Dell.com and easily order a preconfigured Linux machine. Even now Microsoft is plotting the destruction of consumer choice.

And if we don't punish Microsoft for breaking the law, why can they not be brought to justice for delivering inferior products? If GM didn't have Ford to contend with, would you, the "Department of Justice" allow such a GM to ship cars with faulty clutches and breaks, that would harm people's livelihoods as much as Microsoft bugs have stolen money from my employer and my fathers employer and the company that my uncle owns? The damage is in the thousands of dollars, because Microsoft can defecate in a box, brand it as 'Windows', and the market is forced to accept it. We demand some semblance of quality from our auto manufacturers, so why not from our software suppliers? I hope that the DoJ really lives up to its name, promotes competition and products that succeed on their merits and creates an economy in which two or even three or four 'Microsofts' can coexist, improving each generation of software upon that which came before, learning that customers are important when there is an alternative, and each employing thousands of people and strengthening the economy.

Best regards,
Eugene
mailto:e.vilensky@home.com

MTC-00010685

From: Mike Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My impression is that the government has spent so much time listening to disgruntled competitors of Microsoft that it has missed the end user exposure.

The end user problem with Microsoft is not that it makes software that competes with other companies. The problem is not that sometimes MS integrates software into its operating system. From the end user perspective, the software on a PC should be vertically integrated. And it should be done by a single manufacturer.

From an end user standpoint, just try to identify the responsible software maker when

something doesn't work and more than one software maker potentially is responsible. The difficulty to the end user goes up exponentially with the number of different software makers involved. E.g Microsoft Windows with Netscape Navigator and something doesn't work. Neither Microsoft or Netscape will take responsibility. They just point fingers (if they talk to you at all) to each other.

The problem is that MS dominates the Operating System market and therefore can dictate terms to the end user. What the end user needs is a viable number of choices for an Operating System. More Linux operating systems on new PCs; more OS2 operating systems on new PCs; more Apple systems out there.

As an end user, I'd much prefer having a viable choice of what operating system I would be using on my intel based (there's another problem) PC. The DOJ has focused on fixing things for malcontents such as Netscape (whose browsers are clearly inferior to Explorer and whose own ethics are somewhat suspect). That may be a problem for companies like Netscape but it is certainly not as significant a problem for the end user as the total dominance of MS in the operating system world.

The end user is going to be up a creek without a paddle in the future because of the near universal usage of Windows. The DOJ focus should be on making the playing field more level for alternative Operating systems.

MTC-00010686

From: Jim Herrmann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
First some of my background. I have been a computer professional for 15 years, specializing in data base administration. My professional career has been mostly with mainframe data bases, but I have done extensive work from my home with personal computers. I maintain several web sites for various volunteer organizations to which I belong.

I believe the Microsoft Settlement has been a capitulation by the current administration and the Department of Justice to the big money donations of the Microsoft lobbying and campaign contributions. The US won this case! Why has the justice department settled for this woefully inadequate solution to Microsoft's conviction as a monopolist? This is the penalty phase of this case, and yet there appears to be no penalty for Microsoft, and in fact if implemented as written, could actually increase Microsoft's Monopoly. For true justice to be served, the courts must decide the punishment and not the politically (and monitarily) motivated DOJ. For this reason, the settlement as currently written must be REJECTED!

I would like to point out several flaws in the settlement and recommend some alternatives that would seem to make more sense. I refer to the settlement found at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm>

III.A Microsoft shall not retaliate against an OEM...

Not only should Microsoft not be able to punish the OEM, but OEM pricing should be

disallowed for Microsoft. The OEM vendors should be required to pay full retail price for the operating system and office products, and pass this on to the consumer. In other words, strike paragraphs III.B.2 and III.B.3 from the settlement. Furthermore, the OEM should be required to list this cost as part of total cost of the machine, and offer all machines they sell with either alternative operating systems, or no operating system at all installed. This would provide clear disclosure to consumers of the "Microsoft tax" they are paying with each new computer system. Allowing users to remove items from a purchased machine is inadequate, as they have already payed the "tax" and Microsoft goes unpunished.

III.D ...Microsoft shall disclose to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs, ...the APIs and related Documentation... While this is a step in the right direction, Microsoft should be compelled to make public, not simply to certain companies but to the public, all operating system APIs, all communication APIs, and every single file format, current and future, created or used by any of their products. The interfaces and file formats should not be allowed to be considered "intellectual property" that would allow Microsoft to restrict access by imposing "royalties or other payment of monetary consideration" simply to interface with their products. This will promote true competition by allowing other companies and the open source community to write programs that can be fully compatible with, and have equivalent functionality to the Microsoft monopoly products.

II.J—No provision of this Final Judgment shall:

1. Require Microsoft to document, disclose or license to third parties...
2. Prevent Microsoft from conditioning any license...

This paragraph reads like a major legal loophole for Microsoft that will allow them to get away with keeping large parts of the interface to their systems a secret by saying that the disclosure would "compromise the security" of that system. The APIs and file formats I mentioned above should be excluded from this paragraph.

Section V. Termination

B. In any enforcement proceeding in which the Court has found that Microsoft has engaged in a pattern of willful and systematic violations, the Plaintiffs may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of this Final Judgment of up to two years, together with such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

So if I have interpreted this paragraph correctly, if Microsoft fails to comply with this settlement in the first five years, their punishment is to spend two more years not complying!?! How is this an incentive for Microsoft to comply with the settlement? This section completely removes what few teeth this settlement ever had. This section should be completely rewritten such that if Microsoft fails to comply with the settlement, any and all intellectual property not in compliance will be forfeited to the public domain. That would be an incentive for compliance!

In summary, the Microsoft punishment for being a convicted monopolist should include

the opening and documenting of all Application Programming Interfaces for their products, the documented specification of all file formats for documents created by their products should be public domain, and the complete prohibition of the discounts and "bundling" Microsoft currently engages in with hardware vendors. Additionally, the legal loopholes should be removed, and the penalty for non-compliance should be severe.

A settlement that truly encourages competition is very much in the national interest and national security. A study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk. We can not allow any one company to maintain a strangle hold on something as important to this nation as the information technology infrastructure of this country. It is very important for the future of this nation that a careful and deliberate penalty that restores true competition to the software marketplace be implemented.

Thanks you for your time,
Jim Herrmann
Kansas City, Kansas

MTC-00010687

From: Steven
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 2:58am
Subject: Microsoft Case

To Whom it may concern;

Please consider the settlement offered by Microsoft. Learning tools and teaching has never been but should be the number 1 concern. Any thing that bolsters the teaching environment instead of the N.F.L. will benefit the future of this nation.

Give our children computers.
Concerned;
Steven R. Evers

MTC-00010688

From: Gradyg123@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

My comments about the proposed final settlement are simple:

1. The settlement ruling must be properly enforced otherwise it is a complete waste of time.

2. Microsoft Corp. has shown and *continues* to show no reasonable regard for any person, company, product or authority that presents an obstacle to the continued growth of Microsoft. They are the new Mafia.

I offer the following news articles to illustrate my point. Note that eliminating Linux software is ranked second on Microsoft's agenda for 2002, despite the fact that Microsoft has 96.28% of the OS market compared to 2.32% for Apple and .24% for Linux. But Linux has had success with server software and Microsoft also wants to control the internet, so "the spread of Linux" must be prevented.

Ximian Gives Linux a Friendly Face

New software package features a graphical interface, but is the company's first product that won't be free.

Matt Berger, IDG News Service

Tuesday, August 28, 2001
Ximian Desktop, the first packaged software product from the Boston-based company, includes a suite of desktop applications and a graphical user interface for Linux PCs,

"We see the biggest opportunity of open source on the desktop in the corporation," says Nat Friedman...

[continues]
<http://www.pcworld.com/news/article/0,aid,59743,tk,dn082801X,00.asp>

Topic: MS Internet Monopoly
Msg #381712

Date: Wed, Aug 29, 2001, 2:11:07 PM
From ZDnet:

"The Burton Group analyst Gary Hein says Microsoft.Net can be summarized in one simple statement: Microsoft is building an Internet monopoly ... Does the very nature of the Internet prevent one company from monopolizing the Internet? In a perfect world, market forces and open standards would prevail. But this isn't a perfect world"

Continues:
<http://news.excite.com/news/zd/010829/ll/microsoftnet-a-new>

"It's unquestionable that .Net integration will simplify the Internet experience for millions of users. But at what cost? As a society, are we willing to cede control of the Internet to Microsoft for the sake of usability and convenience? Success is far from guaranteed, but Microsoft will do everything in its power to win. Our eternal vigilance is the only barrier between Microsoft and its next monopoly."

<http://www.pcworld.com/news/article/0,aid,59743,tk,dn082801X,00.asp>

Topic: "Software libre!"
Msg #381768

Date: Thu, Aug 30, 2001, 5:34:09 PM
Governments push open-source software
By Paul Festa
Staff Writer, CNET News.com

August 29, 2001, 4:00 a.m. PT
Governments around the world have found a new rallying cry—"Software libre!"—and Microsoft is working overtime to quell it.

A recent global wave of legislation is compelling government agencies, and in some cases government-owned companies, to use open-source or free software unless proprietary software is the only feasible option.

This legal movement, earliest and most pronounced in Brazil, but also showing signs of catching on elsewhere in Latin America, Europe and Asia, is finding ready converts as governments struggle to close sometimes vast digital divides with limited information-technology budgets. So far, there is no evidence that similar legislation is being considered anywhere in the United States, experts said.

Open-source and free software represent a budget-priced alternative to Microsoft's Windows operating system and applications that can cost thousands of dollars a month to license. In addition, access to underlying source code means governments and businesses can fix problems or modify software to work more effectively.

[continues]
<http://news.cnet.com/news/0-1003-200-6996393.html?tag=tp-pr>

Linux Left Behind: Microsoft, Apple Still Kings of the Desktop

By Remy Davison, Insanely Great Mac
December 19, 2001

Linux may well be capturing more and more of the server market, but it has still failed to make inroads into the desktop market, according to StatMarket statistical data, published by WebSideStory.

StatMarket places Linux's web usage at less than 1% of total internet use. As of December 17, Linux's share of world wide web use was a *mere 0.24%.* StatMarket says that while use of Linux to access the net has fluctuated between 2 and 3% over the past three years, the operating system has not demonstrated real growth in terms of internet usage.

"Linux has made inroads as a server operating system, but not on desktops. Its adoption rate among Web users remains miniscule, even in three years' time."

Linux—More Bark than Bite.

<<http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/011219/lawO37-1.html>>

Macintosh OS Global Market Share Less Than 3% for Three Years, But Shows Promise in Some Countries SAN DIEGO, Jan. 8 /PRNewswire/—WebSideStory, Inc. (www.websidestory.com), the world's leading provider of outsourced e-business intelligence services, today reported that the global market share for Apple's (Nasdaq: AAPL) Macintosh operating system has remained at less than 3 percent since January 1999, failing to take significant market share from Microsoft. Mac's global usage share as of January 2, 2002, was "2.32 percent", compared to *Microsoft's 96.28 percent* as of the same date, according to WebSideStory's StatMarket (www.statmarket.com) New Microsoft Program Rallies Forces To Crush Linux Enterprise & Partner Group chief to oversee Linux/Unix escalation process (URL: <http://www.crn.com/Sections/BreakingNews/breakingnews.asp?ArticleID=32424>)

By Paula Rooney
CRN

Redmond, Wash.

7:12 PM EST Tues., Jan. 08, 2002

Microsoft plans to rally its field sales force and partners to crush Linux—and IBM's efforts with the competitive operating system—in 2002.

According to a Microsoft memo dated in December, the software giant will unveil a "Linux Insiders" program at the company's Envision event in January, an expansion of its existing Linux Competitive Champ Program.

Microsoft also created a new Linux/Unix escalation process that is being headed up by Microsoft Enterprise & Partner Group Vice President Charles Stevens, according to the memo, which was written by Brian Valentine, senior vice president of Windows for Microsoft.

Valentine emphasized that Microsoft will take a more aggressive role in beating Linux—and any vendors that supports it. "I want you to know just how seriously we're taking Linux here in Redmond We have the best d*mn sales force in the world backed by the best engineers in the world—of course we will take any non-Windows OS serious," Valentine wrote. "Linux is out there in some

of your accounts and you may not know it. The ground up nature of how Linux is introduced into our accounts means that we need to modify our traditional approaches of finding out about Linux in our customer base. We have to be more hands-on and dig deeper in your accounts."

The Linux/Unix escalation process being headed up by the Enterprise & Partner Group involves getting Microsoft's field sales force and solution providers to tap into the expertise of the Microsoft "Linux Insiders" to advance Windows 2000 and unseat rivals Unix and Linux in the server marketplace. The "Linux Insiders," a task force of Microsoft experts on Linux that will be unveiled at Envision, will assist the sales force and partners in preventing the spread of Linux—as well as IBM mainframes/Unix servers running Linux—in corporate server centers, according to the memo. "By building a virtual team of field staff and corporate resources, we will enable the field to have one place to go for communication and competitive information. The Linux Insiders will have access to a centralized Web site where personnel can request help, route issues and share best practices that the entire field can leverage," Valentine wrote. "If you still need help for Global, Strategic and Major accounts, the Linux/Sun Insiders (or your General Manager) can escalate the issue to the new corporate Linux/Unix Escalation Team. Let me emphasize that you need to work with your local Insider or your GM because they have direct access to this escalation team. The team is committed to provide an initial response within one working day."

Microsoft also intends to commission an independent analysis by DH Brown to attack the perception that Linux is free, the memo said. Another cost analysis comparison case study between Linux and Windows, due in May, will assess a variety of usage scenarios such as Web, file and print.

In the memo, Valentine encourages staffers to snoop around corporate server environments to locate new sightings of Unix and Linux. The software giant apparently is concerned about inroads made by IBM and other Linux backers in the IT segment. "Ask about the 'connector' pieces—you'll potentially find Linux in these areas. This is a great way to not only find out about Linux, but also other IT projects that may include Novell, Sun, Oracle and other competitors," the memo said. "You can expect us to turn up the volume on winning against Linux, as well as IBM."

According to Directions on Microsoft, a Kirkland, Wash.-based newsletter covering the software giant, "Linux ranks second among Microsoft's top 10 challenges for 2002"—next only to engendering trust in the enterprise for security and reliability. "This free but powerful operating system is hurting Microsoft competitors such as Novell and Sun in the server market, but it could also dampen growth in Microsoft's server software sales," according to the Directions on Microsoft report issued on Jan. 8. "IBM is trying to make Linux a household name. Meanwhile, Microsoft is adding to Linux's appeal with higher licensing fees and product activation technologies designed to

prevent unpaid use of Microsoft software." One systems integrator that sells and services both Linux and Windows said Microsoft's big push against Linux is not a problem in the short term, but could pose a conflict in the future. "This will not affect us in the current market because ... our current revenue with Caldera is on Unix platforms," said Rich Figer, vice president of sales at S.B. Stone & Company, Cleveland. "In the future, however, when Linux and Unix become closer to one product we could find ourselves in competition with Microsoft operating systems. Most of the Unix/Linux market is highly driven by application vendors. If application vendors choose not to develop on Linux that would be a much bigger problem. If Microsoft puts their energy in to alienating application vendors from Linux it would cause problems."

S.B. Stone, for instance, does 25 percent to 30 percent of its business with Caldera on Unix platforms, but Microsoft represents the rest of its business.

Copyright 1999 CMP Media Inc.

Topic: MS rigging votes again
Msg #389420

Date: Thu, Jan 10, 2002, 6:47:00 PM

Sinking to new depths of desperation in its war against Java, Microsoft has been caught stuffing ballots during an online vote concerning web services.

<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/4/23612.html>

<http://news.zdnet.co.uk/story/0,,t269-s2102244,00.html>

The vote, run by ZDNet UK was to see which technology enterprises were planning to use, to deploy web services. Java was the clearly winning, having amassed two thirds of the votes. However, the chaps at ZDNet became a little suspicious by the complete reversal in statistics a week later ... MS .NET was the clear winner! A quick look at the server logs revealed an unprecedented number of votes, originating from the same people within the Microsoft's domain. One person had even voted 228 times They also found evidence that automated scripts, executing from servers within Microsoft, were being used to rig the vote. Microsoft's lack of honesty in attempting to carry out such an act, is only matched by the stupid, hamfisted way they executed it.

Topic: Rio Riot: 5,000 songs

Msg #389401

Date: Thu, Jan 10, 2002, 1:36:01 PM

Alan:

What WERE they thinking?! They were thinking, probably correctly, that their largest audience, PC-users, don't have FireWire. So why bother adding it given the "cost" and "complexity" of an Oxford 911. Even so, it's a USB 1.1 device, not even 2.0, which is strange.

This year, all the local employees of the company I work for were offered a sweetener when buying a new PC through the company; the cost was deducted from your gross salary, so your benefit is that you pay less income tax (i.e. if your highest band is 42%, you really pay only 58% of the computer's cost). Brand-spanking new with XP. FireWire was not an option. (Obviously, neither were Macs) Note: This particular person does not live in the U.S. and therefore is not subject to U.S. tax laws.)

2. Unless otherwise provided in the revised proposed Final Judgment, Microsoft shall begin complying with the revised proposed Final Judgment as it was in full force and effect starting on December 16, 2001.

1. Microsoft shall not retaliate against any ISV or IHV because of that ISV's or IHV's: a. developing, using, distributing, promoting or supporting any software that competes with Microsoft Platform Software or any software that runs on any software that competes with Microsoft Platform Software,

I. "ISV" means an entity other than Microsoft that is engaged in the development or marketing of software products.

Thank you for your time.

Gerald W. "Grady" Goodwin, concerned citizen

MTC-00010690

From: Iain O'Cain

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 3:24am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm a consultant whose livelihood is threatened by Microsoft's abuse of their monopoly power. In recent years, I've moved progressively farther from use of Microsoft products in my own and my clients' solutions for office applications and Internet services. Some of the language in the settlement recently proposed by the Department of Justice concerns me greatly. It appears to me that this settlement would not only fail to curtail Microsoft's abuses, much less provide punitive deterrence or compensation to consumers, but could actually help strengthen Microsoft's attacks on openly available software.

Much of the language I've read in this proposed settlement seems to grant Microsoft undue powers for determining their responsibilities. Some examples include:

Section III(J)(2) seems to allow Microsoft to continue restricting access to their API, Documentation, and Communications Protocols from anyone they consider not to be a business! In particular, "... (c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business..." seems outrageous to me. Providing my clients with access to their data often calls for the use of software like Samba,¹ which is developed noncommercially through the collaboration of consultants like myself with the result of helping all our business practices.

Section III(D) appears to further limit Microsoft's obligation to share their API details except to organizations defined as commercial. What about projects like I've already mentioned? What about the government's own projects? I know that many consultants like myself have had to depend at times on the public availability of software developed at public expense by branches of the government.

Microsoft have already destroyed, through the practice of bundling, their main competition in the Internet browser market despite Netscape's huge lead. Their greatest rival now may be the Mozilla² browser,

¹ Information on the Samba project is available at <http://us1.samba.org/samba/samba.html>

² Information on the Mozilla project is available at <http://mozilla.org/>.

which is developed by a diverse collaboration, again noncommercially.

Despite bundling Web (WWW) server software and tying that to their Web content authoring software, Microsoft has yet to dominate that area. Consultants such as myself still prefer by some margin to deploy the more efficient, collaboratively developed Apache³ software. Yet Microsoft continues to attack our ability to deploy such Open Source⁴ solutions when it encourages or even forces by its market position the deployment of its own software, while keeping its software interfaces secret and designing that software to depend on connections with Microsoft's own products.

I urge everyone involved to exact greater remedies. Please restrict Microsoft's ability to wield its monopolies against innovation by other parties as it has so clearly and consistently done. Microsoft should have to publicly reveal any software interfaces they might conceivably use as leverage to block competition because they have proved how cynically they have been willing to exploit every advantage to illegally block competition throughout their existence.

Thank you for considering this input.

Sincerely,

Iain O'Cain <iocain@spamcop.net>
6125 Oakpark Trail
Haslett, MI 48840

MTC-00010694

From: Troy Lister
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Troy Lister
3130 Oak Road, Apt. 418
Walnut Creek, CA 94596-7752
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With

the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Troy Lister

MTC-00010695

From: Harris L. Gilliam
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hello,

I am writing as a concerned consumer and professional in the computer industry to respond to the proposed settlement of the lawsuit against Microsoft. I watched with much interest the trial and events that followed. Many industry experts predicted that Microsoft would indeed be found guilty of anti-competitive behavior. They also correctly predicted that Microsoft would use its considerable financial might to "wait out" its opponents. This is exactly what Microsoft has done. They have dragged out the court battle long enough that the operating systems and products that were originally in question are almost obsolete. They have protected their monopoly position.

The remedies proposed do not go far enough to protect the industry and its consumers from Microsoft's predatory behavior. I welcome the provisions to prevent Microsoft from retaliating against companies that chose to use competitive products. I welcome the provisions that require Microsoft to publish documentation and license APIs. These will provide the possibility for third-party software that competes with Microsoft. Sadly that is all it will do. It will not significantly change the choices that OEMs have because Microsoft has already extinguished all third-party competition. OEMs and other software developers still have a strong financial incentive to *not* compete with Microsoft. There still is no other OS which can replace Windows in the PC desktop market. This is because all the products and software people are dependant on is written for Windows. The duration of Microsoft's monopoly makes it prohibitive for any company to arise and produce an alternative to Windows or Microsoft's consumer products (which, for the most part, work exclusively with Windows).

For so long consumers have been forced to use Microsoft products they have become "slaves" to the software. There isn't a corporate IT manager alive that would attempt to build an office system on anything except Microsoft Windows and Microsoft Office. Schools that train office administrators and secretaries pretty much use Microsoft products exclusively. Redmond would like to have you believe this situation developed because they have superior products. A conversation with anyone who works in an office or the casual reading of a trade publication would dispell that myth quickly. There is barely a day that passes without some report of a security hole or major defect being found in a Microsoft product. The stranglehold that Microsoft has

on the industry must be broken. The only way the damage that Microsoft's monopoly has done can be truly remedied is to create a financial viable market for software which competes directly with Microsoft products.

Possible ways to achieve this include:

(1) Require that Microsoft produce versions of all its middleware products (IE, Microsoft Office, etc) for non-Microsoft operating systems. This will give OEM's and consumers a choice of what OS to use on their machines. It is clear that there is only a choice if OEMs and consumers can still use the products they have become dependant upon.

(2) Require that Microsoft publish documentation for and licence not only the APIs that make software compatible with Windows but also the details of the file formats for their Office suite of products. Again this is intended to allow OEMs and consumers to have a choice of what OS to run on their machines. If third-party software can be written which is entirely compatible with Microsoft's file formats then this software would also be free to run on any OS that a competing company chooses.

There are sure to be other ways to achieve the necessary goal of creating a real opportunity for competition with Microsoft. While the currently proposed remedies do much to prevent certain direct monopolistic behaviour by Microsoft it does little to correct the unnatural position Microsoft enjoys in the marketplace. There are few companies in any industry who can consistently produce substandard products, as Microsoft does, and yet not incur the "wrath" of the consumers. When you have no other choice you settle for what you can get. As they used to say about Musolini: "He is a cruel dictator but at least the trains now run on time." The recent attitude Microsoft has shown with regard to its Windows XP product (continued bundling of Microsoft-exclusive software and technologies to stifle competition) and its overall practice of limiting consumer choice demonstrates that Microsoft is not in the least repentant. It is clear to this consumer that they don't plan to change their behavior anytime soon.

The government's decision to not pursue further legal action is a great disappointment. I can only hope the states, who have refused to cave in to Microsoft, fair well in their continued battle. Otherwise I don't expect to see any change in the situation.

Harris L. Gilliam
Director of Engineering
Supewings, Inc.

MTC-00010696

From: Gheorghiu Alex
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good day,

My name is Gheorghiu Alex and I'm from Europe/Romania. I'm 24 years old and I work with computers since 14 (so I had 10 years of experience). Right now I'm a student at Faculty of Informatics and Faculty of Bioengineering.

1. A few years ago when the Internet emerged Netscape browser was the first and best browser that allow a person to navigate

³Information on the Apache projects is available at <http://www.apache.org/>.

⁴Information on the practice of Open Source development is available at <http://www.opensource.org/>.

on the Internet. This browser was provided by Netscape. After a year or so, Microsoft launched a browser, named Internet Explorer and incorporated it in Microsoft Windows 95 and Microsoft Windows 98. So when you have something that came for nothing and it is imposed you will use it; and so Netscape in a few years almost disappeared from the browser market.

2. Around 95 Sun Microsystems launched a new programming language named Java whose purpose was to allow you to write a program that will work on every operating system like: Microsoft Windows, Linux, Unix, to work with special devices like future cell-phones, palmtops and even to incorporate in a car's computer, microwaves, TV, etc. When they see that this language became so popular among programmers they decide to stop its ascension and try to pervert its basic roles but Sun Microsystems, IBM, Oracle continues to follow initial concept totally independence from platform.

3. Here is a small funny thing when Microsoft take the leadership in browser war, they took all rivals facilities (those facilities included Java) and so Microsoft kept the Java in their browser. Now they have monopoly and because of that they throw away Java from the Internet Explorer 6.0 browser and put their proprietary languages like VisualBasic. All I want to say is that Microsoft step by step take control of very aspect of computer world, from operating system to cell phones.

I know that USA is a country where freedom is the law (my country was under USSR sphere of influence for 50 years and I saw at my grandparents and my parents what this mean) and I hope that this humble mail will be a warning for what Microsoft is trying to do. I do not want my children to live in a Microsoft world and when I'll be very old my computer that will monitor my life signals to crush (or to breakdown) (oh, sorry I've forgotten to say that after THEY become monopolistic in a special domain their products become unreliable and full of errors).

I think that will be best for all to listen to Sun Microsystems and Linux RedHat proposals.

Thank you,
Alex

Please excuse my English.

MTC-00010697

From:

nicku@nicksbox.tyict.vtc.edu.hk@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 7:01am

Subject: Microsoft monopoly

Dear Sir/Madam,

Microsoft has a history of attempting to monopolise the market in every way it can. The competition comes from Linux. Any remedy to Microsoft's monopolistic practices should include the following.

It is almost totally impossible to buy a computer that does not have Microsoft's operating system installed. This is a major part of the problem. A user who wants to install another operating system must pay for the Microsoft operating system even though it is not desired. The first requirement for a reasonable remedy should require that

Microsoft's products should be available as extra-cost options when purchasing new computers. The price that is charged should be the same as that when not purchasing a computer. In this way, real competition could begin.

The proprietary formats of Microsoft's document file formats (both current and future) should be made public, so that competing products may read documents created with Microsoft products. This should apply to all the document formats used by all the Microsoft Office products. 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.

All the Microsoft networking protocols should be published fully, and made available for open source developers to implement. The current proposed settlement limits access to open source development in a way that benefits Microsoft. Open source is the major means of providing competition to Microsoft. The settlement should not exclude open source developers from access to information about Microsoft protocols that can be used directly. Microsoft is not adverse to using open source software, then altering it in minor ways to create a new and incompatible "Microsoft" protocol. See the way Microsoft has "embraced and extended" the Kerberos protocol so that only Microsoft Kerberos servers are compatible with Microsoft clients. You need to take action to prevent Microsoft from embracing and extending the Internet, which till now has been an open environment created by many for the benefit of many, and owned by no one.

Nick Urbanik RHCE

Dept. of Information & Communications
Technology

Hong Kong Institute of Vocational
Education (Tsing Yi)

Tel: (852)-2436-8576, (852)-2436-8579

Fax: (852)-2436-8526

nicku@vtc.edu.hk PGP: 53 B6 6D 73 52 EE
1F EE EC F8 21 98 45 1C 23 7B ID: 7529555D

MTC-00010698

From: Jrsitcer@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 7:29am

Subject: Microsoft settlement of suit

In my opinion the suit against Microsoft should be settled as soon as possible. The continuing litigation is not good for the consumer or the economy. It would benefit all, except the Microsoft competitors, to put an end to this matter. Please accept the judgment against Microsoft and let that be the end of this.

Jill Sitzer (Mrs. Gary)

20 Barchester Way

Westfield, NJ 07090

MTC-00010699

From: Charles R Heilers

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 8:46am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settlement seems just and fair. Needs to be put into action.

Charles R. Heilers

1270 W CR 580 N

North Vernon, In. 47265

MTC-00010700

From: Kit Welsch

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 9:33am

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN ASHCROFT
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
950 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20530-001

DEAR MR. ASHCROFT,

PROSECUTE OPEC, NOT MICROSOFT
OPEC IS THE MONOPOLY THAT HAS
OPENLY CONSPIRED TO CONTROL PRICES
AND THUS ADMITS IT IS A MONOPOLY.
THE ONLY WAY I CAN SEE TO DEAL WITH
OPEC IS TO ORGANIZE THE OIL
IMPORTING NATIONS INTO A GROUP
CALLED OPIC (ORGANIZATION OF OIL
IMPORTING COUNTRIES). WE COULD
THEN WORK TOGETHER TO RESTRICT OR
TAX PRODUCTS GOING TO THE OIL
EXPORTING COUNTRIES IN ORDER TO
FORCE THEM TO DROP OUT OF OPEC.

MICROSOFT, ON THE OTHER HAND,
HAS INCREASED MY PRODUCTIVITY BY
MAKING SURE THAT ALL THEIR
PRODUCTS WORK TOGETHER
SEAMLESSLY. WHEN I GOT MY FIRST
COMPUTER, DOS WAS THE OPERATING
SYSTEM AND NOTHING SEEMED TO
WORK TOGETHER PROPERLY. THE
WINDOWS OPERATING SYSTEM BECAME
THE STANDARD BECAUSE CONSUMERS
LIKED IT. SO, MICROSOFT CAME TO
DOMINATE THE MARKET BY PRODUCING
THE BEST PRODUCT, NOT BY
CONSPIRING WITH OTHER PRODUCERS
TO CONTROL PRICES.

THE ONLY REASON THIS LAWSUIT
HAPPENED IS BECAUSE MICROSOFT
CHALLENGED THE COMPETITION BY
GIVING IT'S BROWSER AWAY FOR FREE
AT A TIME WHEN NETSCAPE WAS
TRYING TO SELL THEIRS. THAT'S
COMPETITION, NOT MONOPOLY. IT WAS
GOOD FOR THE CONSUMER. IF THE
GOVERNMENT CONSPIRES WITH
NETSCAPE TO STOP MICROSOFT FROM
GIVING AWAY THEIR BROWSER, THEN
THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BECOMES
THE MONOPOLIST, AND THE CONSUMER
IS HARMED. PLEASE STOP THIS INSANE
PERSECUTION OF A COMPANY THAT
WAS GREATLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
PRODUCTIVITY INCREASES WE SAW
DURING THE 90'S. PLEASE STOP
PERSECUTING THE ONE COMPANY THAT
HAS BEEN PRODUCING AN
ENVIRONMENTALLY CLEAN PRODUCT
THAT WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO EXPORT
ALL OVER THE WORLD AND HELP WITH
OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS. PLEASE
ACCEPT THE SETTLEMENT PROPOSED,
AND ALLOW MICROSOFT TO USE THE
MONEY THEY ARE SPENDING ON THEIR
LEGAL DEFENSE TO CREATE THE NEXT
NEW PRODUCT WHICH WILL INCREASE
OUR PRODUCTIVITY AND STIMULATE
OUR ECONOMY BETTER THAN A TAX
CUT.

SINCERELY,
KIT WELSCH

216 ARCHER WAY

BOX 1820
ANNA MARIA, FL 34216-1820
941-778-5230
941-778-7229 FAX
hwelsch1@tampabay.rr.com

MTC-00010701

From: Lee Wagstaff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 9:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lee Wagstaff
614 Pine Tree Court
Walled Lake, MI 48390—
Attorney General John Ashcroft
January 12, 2002
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I have very strong feelings regarding the recent settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I believe that the government's intervention in Microsoft affairs has done much to hurt the local and global economy. Mr. Attorney General, wrap up this settlement now. We can not continue to pride ourselves on our "competitive spirit" and then take action against a company that has bolstered the entire economy of our country by that very same spirit. And, worse, this action was taken as a result of a few complaining companies that could not prosper in a competitive environment and, as a result, blamed Microsoft for their failure. When the complaining and ultimate threat of legal action drove Microsoft market value down, it deteriorated the overall market creating a hole that many companies fell into. Again, Mr. Attorney General, put an end to this economy debilitating, legal misadventure.

Everyone knows Microsoft has made very significant strides in the innovation of this industry. These major innovations may have given the impression that Microsoft desired to gain unreasonable control over the market. Not so. But in an effort to placate the punitively sponsored objections of its competitors, Microsoft has agreed to remove certain software features from its Windows Operating System to prevent imposition of future antitrust violations. Several changes have been made in their business practices. Microsoft will disclose the internal interfaces and protocols of its Windows software to competitors; allow competitors to modify Windows to take out Microsoft software and put in their own; and have oversight from a Technical Committee. Their compliance has gone beyond the restrictions and obligations at issue in the lawsuit. I think that this is more than a fair indicator that Microsoft is willing to get back to the business of developing new products.

It is hoped that my expressed views on this issue will aid in the resolution of this matter. I am more than happy to know that there is so much cooperative effort to that end. Thank you for your wise leadership.

With deepest regards,

MTC-00010702

From: iiel@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 9:54am
Subject: READ ON

Hello again:

I would like to see Microsoft made to offer free to all current Microsoft operating systems all of the preceding operating systems that the current one obsoleted.

This is so that the excellent software that was not financially successful for the owners could continue to operate for the users of the operating systems that need to upgrade to the most recent version for other reasons, like keeping current with financially successful software companies newest versions.

I believe that versions like DOS, WIN 3.1, WIN 95 and even WIN 98 could be classified as free to current owners of WIN ME, 2000 and later.

What do you think? When I gave the idea for WINDOWS to the UNITED NATIONS in 1979 and suggested that Bill Gates should develop it, that was FOR the WORLD. Not for Bill Gates personal fortune! He has turned into a greedy . . . ! He was given the idea. He needs to give back!

Very TRULY yours,
Bernard Solomon Katz

MTC-00010703

From: markrussell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:20am
Subject: MS

Gentlemen,

I recently wrote to several State AG's regarding the Microsoft monopoly case. Several responded and asked that I write directly to DOJ. I am a 74 year old Consulting Civil Engineer. My first computer was an LGP30. When I started my own practice in 1965 I "time shared" a GE computer located at their Missile and Space Division at King of Prussia, PA. using a "ground line" and an ASR33 Teletype. (what this proves I don't know, but I was asked by one of the AG's, who actually called on the telephone, that I include this "bio.") I am still practicing, thanks to the PC and without the 50 employees. I went from DOS as an operating system to OS/2 because it allowed me to keep the data of projects in a "file folder" and the files in each project folder were "associated" with the software with which they were created. IBM, at some time in the past, announced a new PC and I thought it was time to "upgrade" to a faster machine. Called IBM. Said I wanted their machine and wanted it with OS/2. Was told they could not sell it with OS/2, only window. I bought from a local PC store and installed the OS my self. I consider this a restraint of trade. Microsoft, at the very least, should be required to open their Application Program Interface to all so that any program written for window could be easily adapted to other operating systems. Thank you.

Marcus H. Russell, P.E., L.S.
3 Foxcroft Court
Voorhees, NJ 08043
856-782-0054

MTC-00010704

From: Konrad Ko(FFFF)odziejczyk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement that Microsoft signed with DOJ and 9 states should be approved by court

because Microsoft didn't violate Sherman Act. The proposal of other nine states goes for far. Microsoft legal tied Internet Explorer to Windows and Microsoft legal commingled Internet Explorer's code with operating system's code.

MTC-00010705

From: Richard Pritchett
To: Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/13/02 10:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a former user of IBM's OS/2 as my personal desktop operating system, I have personally seen the level to which Microsoft has stooped in order to kill off or severely cripple their competitors. As is noted in the court case's record of fact, Microsoft put undo pressure on IBM to get them to stop marketing and selling their highly acclaimed OS/2 Warp V3.0 and OS/2 2.x operating systems. OS/2 Warp V3.0 was a product that allowed consumers to make an easy migration from Windows 3.x to OS/2 and still be able to use their old applications, but to do so on a far superior operating system. Because this method allowed IBM to get around one of the major barriers to operating system competition, i.e. applications use and support, OS/2 was a major threat to Microsoft, and was approaching the 14 million licenses sold mark (from public comments, not official IBM numbers). Microsoft forced IBM's hand by making them either stop their marketing and sales efforts or pay much greater prices on their OEM contracts for the purchase of Windows95. Since IBM is, and always will be, a hardware company first, they made the only business decision they could, which was to stop their OS/2 efforts, and succumb to the pressure from Microsoft. Now I'm stuck using Windows due to application needs. My desire to use OS/2 persists, but most of the software I use is either not available or sufficiently immature for me to use OS/2 anymore.

While this is only one of many companies that have been hurt in this industry, it is clear that a competitive market for operating systems is the ONLY way to return the software market to a competitive, and innovative industry that it once was. The currently proposed settlement fails to address the one key area that is needed to do this. Microsoft's Application Programming Interfaces (API's), the underlying software commands that tell the operating system what to do, and for which programmers must use to properly program a Windows application, MUST be FULLY documented and open source to the public domain. There is no other way to get the market back on track. If the Windows API's are fully documented and released to the open public, in a very timely manner, then many programmers, who currently are trying to bring the ability to run Windows programs on various Linux distributions (WINE Project) and on IBM's OS/2 (Odin Project), will be able to give the Linux and OS/2 operating systems the ability to run Windows applications, including their Office suite, on both operating systems, and any other operating system where enough interest is present to port the applications.

Also, Microsoft should be forced to divest its Office Suite software, as it gives them a dual monopoly which ties into each other and gives it a lot more power to generate new monopolies, and keep raising prices for new features (bug fixes). If this department does not wish to force a divestiture upon Microsoft, then force Microsoft to release the file formats into the open public so that other competing office suite makers (Lotus; Sun; Corel before MS pumped money into them) can allow their suites to use Microsoft Office files natively, thereby allowing consumers the choice to decide which office suit gets the job done better. Right now MS has a huge lock on this market because everyone's documents are in these file formats that Microsoft changes with each new release so that other suite makers can't keep up.

In summary, Microsoft must be forced to open its Windows API's and either divest its Office suite or be forced to publicly document their file formats (in a timely manner for both). Combined with restrictions on their OEM license agreements, this should have the net affect of bringing competition back to the software marketplace. If these things are not done, then it will simply be a slap of Microsoft's wrist, and the marketplace will continue to loose small and innovative companies due to the practices of Microsoft. The list of greatly innovative companies that were killed off is huge. Many have already won court cases, or settlements, against Microsoft.

Thank you,
Richard A. Pritchett
Tampa, FL
rpritch2@tampabay.rr.com

MTC-00010706

From: rsobba
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:46am
Subject: Microsoft Case

To whom it may concern,

First some of my background. I have been a computer professional for 15 years, specializing in data base administration. My professional career has been mostly with mainframe data bases, but I have done extensive work from my home with personal computers. I maintain several web sites for various volunteer organizations to which I belong.

I believe the Microsoft Settlement has been a capitulation by the current administration and the Department of Justice to the big money donations of the Microsoft lobbying and campaign contributions. The US won this case! Why has the justice department settled for this woefully inadequate solution to Microsoft's conviction as a monopolist? This is the penalty phase of this case, and yet there appears to be no penalty for Microsoft, and in fact if implemented as written, could actually increase Microsoft's Monopoly. For true justice to be served, the courts must decide the punishment and not the politically (and monetarily) motivated DOJ. For this reason, the settlement as currently written must be REJECTED!

I would like to point out several flaws in the settlement and recommend some alternatives that would seem to make more sense. I refer to the settlement found at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm>

III.A Microsoft shall not retaliate against an OEM...

Not only should Microsoft not be able to punish the OEM, but OEM pricing should be disallowed for Microsoft. The OEM vendors should be required to pay full retail price for the operating system and office products, and pass this on to the consumer. In other words, strike paragraphs III.B.2 and III.B.3 from the settlement. Furthermore, the OEM should be required to list this cost as part of total cost of the machine, and offer all machines they sell with either alternative operating systems, or no operating system at all installed. This would provide clear disclosure to consumers of the "Microsoft tax" they are paying with each new computer system. Allowing users to remove items from a purchased machine is inadequate, as they have already payed the "tax" and Microsoft goes unpunished.

III.D . . . Microsoft shall disclose to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs, . . . the APIs and related Documentation. . .

While this is a step in the right direction, Microsoft should be compelled to make public, not simply to certain companies but to the public, all operating system APIs, all communication APIs, and every single file format, current and future, created or used by any of their products. The interfaces and file formats should not be allowed to be considered "intellectual property" that would allow Microsoft to restrict access by imposing "royalties or other payment of monetary consideration" simply to interface with their products. This will promote true competition by allowing other companies and the open source community to write programs that can be fully compatible with, and have equivalent functionality to the Microsoft monopoly products.

II.J—No provision of this Final Judgment shall:

1. Require Microsoft to document, disclose or license to third parties . . .

2. Prevent Microsoft from conditioning any license . . . This paragraph reads like a major legal loophole for Microsoft that will allow them to get away with keeping large parts of the interface to their systems a secret by saying that the disclosure would "compromise the security" of that system. The APIs and file formats I mentioned above should be excluded from this paragraph.

Section V. Termination

B. In any enforcement proceeding in which the Court has found that Microsoft has engaged in a pattern of willful and systematic violations, the Plaintiffs may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of this Final Judgment of up to two years, together with such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

So if I have interpreted this paragraph correctly, if Microsoft fails to comply with this settlement in the first five years, their punishment is to spend two more years not complying!?! How is this an incentive for Microsoft to comply with the settlement? This section completely removes what few teeth this settlement ever had. This section should be completely rewritten such that if Microsoft fails to comply with the settlement, any and all intellectual property not in compliance will be forfeited to the public domain. That would be an incentive for compliance!

In summary, the Microsoft punishment for being a convicted monopolist should include the opening and documenting of all Application Programming Interfaces for their products, the documented specification of all file formats for documents created by their products should be public domain, and the complete prohibition of the discounts and "bundling" Microsoft currently engages in with hardware vendors. Additionally, the legal loopholes should be removed, and the penalty for non-compliance should be severe.

A settlement that truly encourages competition is very much in the national interest and national security. A study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk. We can not allow any one company to maintain a strangle hold on something as important to this nation as the information technology infrastructure of this country. It is very important for the future of this nation that a careful and deliberate penalty that restores true competition to the software marketplace be implemented.

Thanks you for your time,
Rick Sobba
Prairie Village, KS.

MTC-00010707

From: Lynn and Ms Leanne Sant
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 10:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lynn and Ms Leanne Sant
P.O. Box 329
Preston, ID 83263-0329
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Lynn and Leanne Sant

MTC-00010708

From: Dave Walsh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 11:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I have been involved in developing computer software for 25 years. I have watched Microsoft's behavior since the very first PCs. I currently own a computer company that focuses on the development of Java software for the healthcare market, with a particular emphasis on the Medicaid sector. I would like to make the following points.

1. In my opinion Microsoft has a tendency to sit back and let the venture community, and entrepreneurs invest many millions of dollars with early stage technologies. Once the economic viability of these products has been established, Microsoft steps in with a free, bundled or tightly integrated product that destroys the competition. Once there is no more competition they begin to charge what the market will bear for the bundled solution.

2. At the heart of the problem is the fact that Microsoft is using its base level software first DOS, then Windows, Windows applications, Browsers to insure that the entire industry propagates their initiative. If a group develops software that is truly innovative, then Microsoft will buy it or build a clone that is offered as a part of the windows initiative. Any settlement that allows Microsoft to pay compensation by giving away software, which will further their ambitions to educate the world that Microsoft products are the only answer, is counter productive. Having Microsoft purchase and distribute computer hardware from a variety of manufactures seems appropriate. This Hardware should be pre loaded with some of the software that has been injured by the Microsoft practices. The latest version of Java and one or more of the excellent development environments for Java should be pre loaded to the exclusion of Microsoft development software. The Latest version of Netscape's browser should be pre loaded instead of IE. Initiatives such as these would be much more consistent with with a resolution to the problem.

3. I believe that Microsoft should be forced to distribute a version of Java that's meets the current Java specification with any operation system that Microsoft ships, including Windows CE. The problem with Java is a distribution problem. Insuring the availability of an alternative to consumers and the ability for developers to assume that a current Java application will run on a consumer device is a huge step towards opening competition.

4. My organization often responds to local, State and Federal RFPs. All too often these RFDs specify that only Microsoft solutions will be accepted. I do not believe that it is the job of our government to promote Microsoft products in any way. The government should be specifying software that is compliant with recognized standards organizations and requesting features that are relevant to the tasks associated with the procurement.

Regards
David P. Walsh
President
eServices Group

MTC-00010709

From: MAHIR1996@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 11:09am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Friends, I believe that it would be in the best interest of the country (even if it weren't in the grip of recession,) to settle the Microsoft case quickly and fairly. I think it was a bad decision to reject the generous offer Microsoft made. Please, please, for the benefit of us all, end this unnecessary case and the waste of the government's money. When you look at the outrageous Enron case which also will cost much of the public's precious money, (this is not a waste,) the Microsoft's offenses disappear.

Mary Daley,
11811 E Terra Drive,
Scottsdale, AZ 85259 (480) 391-1817

MTC-00010710

From: R Carlson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 9, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue,
NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to express my opinion regarding the recent settlement in the Microsoft Anti -Trust case. First of all, this whole case was ridiculous and is clearly an attempt on the part of some of the Microsoft competitors to invalidate the competitive advantages of Microsoft and steal their intellectual property. The government has been erroneously dragged in to a technical discussion it does not have the ability to moderate nor does it have any business intervening in the affairs of a private company. However, what's done is done and this settlement should be the final end to this mess. Spending more time further evaluating the details of the settlement is a waste of money. The most recent judicial decision just complicates and extends the whole silly case. With the existing recession and our newly rediscovered partisan politics our economy can't stand to have our IT industry continue to be burdened in this manner.

I am currently retired, but was involved in the computer industry for nearly 30 years, the last 15 of which were as a CEO of a public computer company. I was closely involved with Microsoft products and still use them for my daily computer use. Given our free enterprise system, I am free to use whichever products I see fit, and nothing Microsoft has done precludes me from using whatever software and hardware I choose to use. Like thousands of other Americans, I use Microsoft because it is easy to use, and more importantly it provides a standard which encourages the rest of the industry to provide compatible products. It is my belief it is these standards issues that have allowed us to become the premier technical and business

country on the planet. The settlement will make it even easier for non-Microsoft products to be used on people's computers. Additionally, Microsoft will be handing over their coding and interface design (Which is intellectual property) to help their competitors compete more fairly (Unfairly??) in the market. I don't see what more could be asked of Microsoft. Please make sure this settlement is respected and that this lawsuit is put to an end.

Sincerely,
Robert A. Carlson

MTC-00010711

From: Phil Patterson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Phil Patterson
6300 Welles Brook
San Antonio, TX 78240
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Phil E. Patterson

MTC-00010712

From: Bernadette Hein
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Bernadette Hein
72 Cambridge Dr.
Hershey, PA 17033
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Bernadette Hein

MTC-00010713

From: SkiSnow@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Go ahead and settle.
Brian Boyd

MTC-00010714

From: Jens Bj(FFFF)rlo Tandstad
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The case against Microsoft is clearly that of a Monopoly exploiting markets and manipulating consumer patterns of purchase. Moreover, the delay and discrimination as to when and to what degree information is disclosed to third party software developers not member of the Microsoft Software production family. The effects of this monopoly includes, but are not limited to:

- Lack of freedom when purchasing software goods.
- Lower quality of products not a part of or cooperating with Microsoft.
- The hardware industry favouring Microsoft because of it's market position, tailoring hardware to the Windows OS, and thus strengtens their position further, hindering competition.
- Security issues due to recurring exploits and weak spots in the Windows system. This is an effect much affected by the Microsoft strategy to include all types of programs in the OS, thus removing the convenience and often possibilty of not using a program in which there is a considerable security hazard. (Internet Explorer, Instant Messaging, Microsoft Network protocols)
- Deliberate neglecting file formats to create inconvenience so that people stop using competing programs.

You all know this, make the right decision. Let us have the benefits of a free market.

Jens Tandstad
NORWAY

MTC-00010715

From: henk@snapper.soneraplaza.nl@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:21pm
Subject: Settlement Microsoft

I am against the proposed settlement in US vs. Microsoft. You should stop criminal behaviour by all means. You should never reward criminal monopolitic activities with a higher market penetration.

I think that if a small company had the behaviour of MS, the management would be punished with sending to prison. Why don't you do that with the MS management?

May be you can punish the MS management with the obligation of developing each application for multiplatform? (f.i. Apple and Linux) Then you can minimalise the effects of the present monopolism. And all users would benefit with a higher degree of freedom.

MTC-00010716

From: Charlie Parker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:41pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Department of Justice,
I applaud the DOJ for finally settling the suit with Microsoft. It is good that the federal government is moving forward to items of far greater importance and not wasting any more taxpayer dollars on an issue it shouldn't have even looked at in the first place. In my humble opinion, this suit did nothing to benefit consumers; it was filed purely at the behest of companies who failed in the marketplace because of their own ineptitude, and the fire was fanned by a bunch of ambulance-chasing lawyers whose egos and arrogance far supersede any other interest.

Charles S. Parker

MTC-00010717

From: Randy Hartley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 12:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Opinion

Competition is what is needed to ensure a good product. Without competition, there is no reason to make a better product or for that matter make the existing product better.

It is for that reason I am opposed to a settlement with Microsoft

Thank You
Randy Hartley

MTC-00010718

From: M. Hermann
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 12:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

M. Hermann
14359 SE 6TH ST, Apt 204
Bellevue, WA 98007-6733
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Martel C Hermann

MTC-00010719

From: George Keselman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Technical Reviewer Board proposed is useless. Those 3 persons will have no effective rights, and will be manipulated by Microsoft during 1 month each serves. One of two Board members is to be assigned by Microsoft, and the third one is also to be elected by that Microsoft assigned person. What a brilliant idea!

The Microsoft phenomenon can be viewed as promoting public computing ignorance through not educating and limiting choices. It is easy due to human nature. That's why it succeeded in the game. The document should forbid Microsoft promote its system in public schools without teaching equal or more time Linux or Unix systems. It is easy, too, but there is a powerful lobby in the US government that promotes Microsoft only. This is the primary reason the situation persists.

George Kesleman
Atlanta, GA

MTC-00010720

From: Jim A Goluch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft—DOJ
2011 "I" St.,
Laporte, IN 46350- 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania
Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
I am writing to express my support of the recent settlement between Microsoft and the US department of Justice. I think the settlement is ion the best interest of the American public because it forces Microsoft to make some concessions that will even the

playing field, but it also allows Microsoft to get this suit off its chest and continue to innovate as it has for over a decade.

Microsoft has really standardized the industry and its products, services, and training are really outstanding. As a computer analyst I would say though that I believe their marketing tactics are a little heavy handed, so the fact that Microsoft will be increasing its relations with software developers and computer makers as well as agreeing to design future versions of Windows to make it easier for competitors to market their products within Windows.

Since the settlement does seem fair and just, I urge your office to finalize it, and help facilitate ending the nine remaining states opposition. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
James Goluch

MTC-00010721

From: limoman 2929
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please See Attachment

MTC-00010722

From: S I
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:28pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dearest Judge K;
Please take a careful look at the Proposed Final Judgement that the Dept of Justice is trying to foist upon the American people. It is an outrage that Microsoft—after having been found guilty time after time in American courts—is about to be let off basically scott free. Why should the strongest and wealthiest Americans get off from obeying the law?

I have been in the software industry for almost 10 years—and I have personally seen Microsoft rip off ideas, patents, products and even entire companies. Repeatedly. But this is no different then what the courts have found. I know run a small company—and we have to tiptoe around MS all the time—as do all software companies our size.

Please protect small, independent software developers like myself. That's the great thing about our country—the rich and powerful don't always win. thank you very much.

Sasha Winston
Menlo Park, CA

MTC-00010723

From: Jane Waski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
420 East 64 Street
New York, New York 10021
January 9, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
Let me begin by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of ordinary consumers. Companies like Microsoft don't become powerful because of competitors, but because of people like me who purchase and use their products. I am an avid user of

Microsoft software, and feel that they have been unfairly singled out. Nevertheless, I also believe that the current settlement satisfies the government and public interest in a way that should allow this suit to end. I feel that the three-year lawsuit and the efforts of the negotiations have culminated in a settlement that is both fair and reasonable.

While new government regulations will be imposed on Microsoft's business and technology practices, this settlement will provide certainty about the new rules and thereby ensure that the company can continue delivering advanced American technology to the marketplace. I also believe that this case has had a direct impact on the federal and state economies. During this difficult time, it doesn't make sense to spend more money on a battle that has already been won. Under the agreement, competitors can sue Microsoft if they feel that the company is not complying with the terms of the settlement, and Microsoft can continue innovating in an effort to maintain its competitive advantage. In short, I think that the necessary corrections have been made to solve the problems, and now it is time to return focus from litigation back to innovation. The settlement agreement is the first step in the right direction.

Sincerely,
Jane Waski

MTC-00010724

From: Matthew Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 1:56pm
Subject: Comments on the settlement between the USDOJ and Microsoft

I am writing to you to state my disappointment at the proposed settlement with Microsoft in the antitrust case. I cannot see anyway that this settlement punishes the convicted corporate felon Microsoft, improves competition or helps the consumer. I work in computer industry, although not with a competitor of Microsoft. However I work on an embedded Internet browser. Because Microsoft Internet Explorer is so pervasive (a monopoly) and because it has undocumented extensions it is virtually impossible to produce a browser that can compete. While it might appear that web browser technologies such as HTML and HTTP are standards the reality is that they are so inadequate and incomplete (and ignored) that the only way to be assured that the page "renders correctly" is to try to guess at what IE does. This forces all competition to chase IE. There is no standard for validating HTML therefore the de-facto validation is "looks good in IE." This is only one example of the problems with Microsoft's monopoly.

I believe that the remedy suggested by judge Jackson makes far more sense than the current proposed settlement. Furthermore some of the parts of proposed settlement will only reenforce Microsoft's monopoly, especially the part about donating software. I suggest the eventual punishment for Microsoft include:

1. Breaking up Microsoft into three separate competing companies. One for operating systems, another for applications and a third for online services such as MSN, Passport, Hotmail etc.

2. Microsoft should be fined billions of dollars for monopoly behavior and producing bug ridden security inept software.

3. PC manufacturers should be forced to provide users with an alternative for pre-installed operating systems. For example, customers should be able to request that Linux is pre-installed.

4. Microsoft operating systems should be required to ship with the latest version of the Java runtime environment from Sun Microsystems.

The current settlement does nothing to benefit this country, the computer industry or consumers. Therefore I urge you to discard it. I also urge you to take the hardest line in punishing Microsoft to the maximum possible.

I would be happy to provide additional information if required.

Sincerely,
Matthew Jones
12918 View Mesa Street
Moorpark, California 93021
Telephone: (805) 531-0474
email: sjmj3us@yahoo.com

MTC-00010725

From: Rick Creson
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/13/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti Trust Case

This entire case needs to be dismissed. Anti Trust made no sense in the beginning and makes no sense now. The people who have made the most noise about this case and have prompted the government to pursue action against Microsoft are the people who want any and all competition to go away, specifically Larry Ellison of Oracle, Scott McNeely of Sun and those in charge of Netscape. Microsoft may have gone beyond the acceptable to "compete", however, the Government has gone beyond sanity in its contention that competition is not acceptable to Microsoft. Regarding operating systems, I believe that everyone who pays attention, knows that a myriad of operating systems will never occur. Effectively, Industry has determined that there are three effective operating systems with which they will participate: 1) IBM and their Mainframe environment, which serves large scale systems, 2) The UNIX environment that serves mid-size and client server systems, and 3) Windows, which serves the desktop and acts as the clients to the client-server environment.

If a company was to create the next "better" operating system, one of the three above would disappear, just as Digital's VM Operating system dissipated and then disappeared with the growth of UNIX and Windows. By the way, the demise of Digital, created the birth of Oracle and SUN. You did not hear Ellison and McNeely complain about that one.

Lastly, Apple Computer has been around for years. They have been unsuccessful, not because of Microsoft but because of their inability to serve the business marketplace and because the business marketplace saw no room for them.

Please stop this nonsense against Microsoft and move on.

Rick Creson

Rick@MeridianGroup.com
 Meridian Technology Group, Inc.
 4949 SW. Meadows Road #440
 Lake Oswego, OR 97035
 503-697-1600 In Oregon
 800-755-1038 Outside Oregon
 503-697-8600 Fax
 www.meridiangroup.com

MTC-00010726

From: Elaine Cohen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 1:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Court of Appeals settlement is fair & just. As a WEB TV Grandfather & GRANDMOTHER Microsoft ha added so much to our lives from letters to & from our Children & Grandchildren to pictures of our Greatgranddaughters—also activities we never thought we could do on the Web. We live in a retirement village & we all are grateful to Microsoft for all their efforts in our behalf. Please settle the case in Microsoft's FAVOR!!!

Sincerely
 Elaine E. & Simon Cohen

MTC-00010727

From: david snyder
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/13/02 1:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 David Snyder
 700 Anne Ln.
 Henderson, NV 89015
 January 13, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 David L. Snyder

MTC-00010728

From: David Thieme

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 2:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 I sent the attached letter to Att Gen Ashcroft & Senator Rick Santorum.
 David C. Thieme
 27 Pine Free Drive
 Mechanicsburg, PA 17055-5568
 January 13, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice,
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to encourage you to finalize the Microsoft settlement. The Justice Departments pursuit of Microsoft has cast a dark cloud over the information technology industry for more than three years. I work for Ciber and our business has slowed down drastically due to the unknown future of Microsoft. Companies are afraid to move forward, new technology is not being used, all because Microsoft's future is unknown. I for one blame the Federal Government for the current recession. This blatant attack on corporate America is, in my opinion based solely on jealous envy of their success. America no longer has a free market system. By interfering with Microsoft our government has impacted our economic system in ways that will take longer to repair than it did to inflict such harm. The current proposed settlement will at least allow Microsoft to refocus its energies in the American arena where it is sorely needed. Yes, Microsoft is the Giant in the market, but they got there by a vision of the future. A future no other company saw. So why do we punish them for making our future what it is? This action has not only impacted Microsoft but the whole Information Technology community. Many have new innovative ideas but are afraid to act on them for fear of winding up like Microsoft.

As a born again Christian, I was so pleased to see that someone in Washington was not afraid to stand up and acknowledge his beliefs. I felt assured that you would be able to evaluate our laws with the insight and beliefs our founding fathers based this country upon. You understand the importance of our freedoms and the reasons why a Free Market is so successful. The tyranny of government must be returned to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Mr. Ashcroft, it is time to allow innovation to continue in America.

While I fear that this settlement will still continue to snuff out the brightness of our potential technological future, I think it is far better that the past six years have been. The settlement as proposed looks like it will satisfy the prosecutions arguments. It also looks like it will please most of Microsoft's competitors, except the ones who would not be satisfied until Microsoft was no longer in business. The settlement forces Microsoft to share its technological break-throughs with its competition, and open the Windows Operating system source code. It also compels them to stop allegedly anticompetitive practices. All monitored by an oversight committee chosen by the Justice Department and the Microsoft's competitors. I believe sufficient concessions have been

made. Most importantly from my view Microsoft will remain a sole corporate entity enabling it to continue to push American Technology into the future we deserve. The economy needs a Microsoft, as does the Information Technology industry and most importantly America needs Microsoft back in the game. Please support this settlement.
 Thank you.

Sincerely,
 David Thieme
 cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00010729

From: Bob Kaufman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 2:29pm
 Subject: antitrust
 Dept of Justice,

The remedies proposed for Microsoft's proven monopolistic and anti competitive behavior are entirely too weak. Look to history as a guide for the proper appropriate response to a trust or monopoly. Have you no spines? These remedies don't even amount to a slap on the hands. Look up what the remedies were for Standard Oil and AT&T after they were proven as monopolists in court. Like Microsoft (MS), they were rich, fought long and hard in court, but were rightly found to be illegal corporations. They were broken up to preserve competition and stop the monopolistic behavior—and their ill-gotten cash gains were removed. All of these steps are crucial.

First, you must remedy the monopoly itself, in this case the suggested solution amounts to the same one used during previous failed attempts to oversee company behavior. Two consent decrees were levied—neither one worked—Microsoft continued (and continues) to tie new features into their operating system at the expense of competitors and consumers. It is time to split Microsoft's OS from direct company control into a new company. Anything less will lead to the same monopolistic behavior that we have seen before and continue to see with the release of Window's XP. MS, with the rushed release of XP, attempts to harm RealAudio by grafting the weak MS streaming media stand alone programs to the pre installed OS that comes on new computers. Thereby foisting one more inferior MS product onto the consumer who wants to buy a new computer but not the MS media players. In the process RealAudio, the key innovator, and maker of the number one media player is hurt—much like what was done supplant the previous number one browser Netscape with inferior new number one MS Explorer. You are fooling yourselves if you think this will change with the current remedy.

Second, you do not let the monopolist use the gains from previous monopolistic behavior to then buy into other industries and continue to profit from the past monopoly. In this, the current remedy is completely lacking. In effect what the latest settlement does is to let MS sit on it's multibillion dollar war chest stolen using the Window's OS monopoly. MS continues to use that cash to buy out promising companies with competing, threatening technologies to protect MS's inferior products. This harms consumers and puts a

chill on innovation and leaves MS free to continue to stifle competition. Make an accurate study of the estimated gains from the demonstrated monopoly and remove that cash from MS and return it to consumers. And we are talking billions here not some bargained down fine that is politically palatable.

MS's influence on the peoples elected officials ranges far and wide, but don't doubt for a second that the people will remember those in government that let the worst monopolist of our times off virtually scot-free. . . .again.

Bob Kaufman
Bellevue WA

MTC-00010730

From: SSteele
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 2:48pm
Subject: Settle Microsoft case
To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into

exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,
Stephen D. Steele
Cortex Medical Management Systems, Inc.
600 Ericksen Avenue NE, Suite 320
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
CC:mrichards@effwa.org;innetgw

MTC-00010731

From: William B. Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department:

The proposed settlement with Microsoft makes it seem as if it is a company that is only concerned about innovation and fair minded capitalism. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Microsoft is a government backed monopoly used to provide a uniform computing platform to simplify subjugation of the citizens. Breaking up Microsoft is the logical solution. I do not expect it because government prosecution of Microsoft is a sham to pay lip service to those who rightly fear fascism.

If there are those in the U.S. Justice Department who admire Teddy Roosevelt ("The Trust Buster"), then perhaps a breakup of Microsoft can be hoped for. Please attempt it.

Sincerely,
William Moore
1215 Oxley Road
Columbus, Ohio

MTC-00010732

From: Frederic Marchand

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hello.

I think that there is an urgent need to open the PC OS market to other solutions than Microsoft. A statu quo at this time will only strangle the market.

If you want to have an idea, go to your local PC store and ask for a PC without Microsoft's OS (an empty PC). You'll see. . .

One action which should be taken is to force Microsoft to have the acknowledgement of the court for all their OEM contracts in order for the court to prevent any monopolistic usage.

I am a BeOS user and I am sure that BeOS development has been put on hold by Microsoft influence or pressure and/or contracts. the result is the bankruptcy for a company which tried to be "innovative", something Microsoft pretended to protect. . .

Frederic Marchand
Paris, France

MTC-00010733

From: Craig Hillemann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Persuant to provisions of the Tunney Act, I am writing to express my opinion on the settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice in November of last year. Apparently nine states are seeking to further prosecute the Microsoft Corporation. As both a taxpayer and purchaser of personal computer software products, I do not believe that the antitrust case against Microsoft should be dragged out any longer.

Please be reminded that the purpose of antitrust laws in the United States is to protect consumers like me, and not to support the self-interests of competitors in the marketplace. The parties that goaded the DOJ and states to file antitrust actions were Microsoft's competitors, not consumers like me. Microsoft's competitors are obviously envious of Microsoft's success, but the reason Microsoft has succeeded is simply that Microsoft has consistently delivered better and more cost-effective products, and furthermore fostered a large market and environment inviting competition. As result, enormously more quality, low-cost hardware and software is available from both Microsoft and other vendors for Windows than for any other operating system (e.g. Linux, MacOS, Solaris, etc.).

Microsoft's Windows product provides excellent functionality for the price. As a consumer, I want Microsoft to bundle as many applets as possible in Windows, and I do not appreciate hardware vendors modifying Windows. My computer-using colleagues feel similarly. Windows as provided by Microsoft works well on a remarkably wide range of computer hardware. The applets included in Windows provide very helpful functionality with dependable stability and user interface

consistency. Their inclusion does not prevent other vendors from developing products with greater functionality, but does provide a useful standard for other vendors to try to surpass.

I have read the entire Appellate Decision for this case, and based on the facts, including my own experience as a computer user, I do not believe bundling Internet Explorer in Windows was unlawful. Frankly, I appreciate the inclusion of Internet Explorer in Windows. Microsoft's alleged misrepresentation of Java support may have been questionable, but the context was a struggle with Sun, one of Microsoft's biggest detractors, for control of the language. Microsoft has since pulled back support for Java in Internet Explorer. Anyway, the proposed settlement goes well beyond any reasonable remedy in view of Microsoft's possible misstep. Under the circumstances, the agreement made between Microsoft and the Department of Justice was certainly more than fair. All parties directly involved (not counting Microsoft's competitors) seem satisfied with the terms reached. Microsoft has agreed to license its software and applicable intellectual property rights to its major competitors. Moreover, Microsoft is planning to format future versions of Windows so that its competitors will be able to introduce and endorse non-Microsoft software in Windows. Microsoft has also agreed to disclose Windows line code to competing computer software producers. However, I personally will want the full version of Windows from Microsoft without it being hacked by other vendors.

I do not believe litigation should continue in this case. There is no need to drag the suit out any longer. You and your office should back the settlement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Craig L. Hillemann
1229 Crestover Road
Wilmington, DE 19803
302-479-0432
Craig-H@msn.com

MTC-00010734

From: Brooks, Rama
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/13/02 3:13pm
Subject: Microsoft needs to slow down

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Rama K. Brooks and I am a CompTIA A+ Certified Computer Technician working for the State of Indiana/Dept of Administration/Division of Information Technology. We are still in the middle of upgrading the state's infrastructure with Windows 2000 from Windows NT 4.0 and now XP and the .Net servers are coming out. If Microsoft took more time in developing newer versions of Windows then we wouldn't have to deal with all these security issues and bugs. Not only that but the Enterprise Agreement we have with them allows us x amount of licenses for desktops, servers, and apps. Because of budget constraints we can't get all the state agencies upgraded to Windows 2000. And now we have agencies that want to purchase XP. I am feeling that we are being pushed for forced upgrades. Upgrading any part of the IT

infrastructure should be done because it is technically a sound idea for the organization, not because a software company wants to force it down our throats.

I started out wanting to become an MCSE (Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer) around 1995. I started to study on my for the Windows NT 4.0 track and then found out it was going to be replaced with the 2000 track. I have been working for the State of Indiana since April 16, 2001 and that is when I started to get the hands on experience for Windows 2000. Now the XP track is coming out. Before you needed at least 2 years experience with the software to pass the test. But with XP, the test it came out the same time as the product. I have invested over \$500 in study guides for the 2000 track. Stop the insanity might be a better term. I feel as a IT professional that because of their greed, Microsoft is going to kill the MCSE credential and the best part is that the Dept of Justice doesn't need to do anything for that to happen. Employers are going to realize that the only way for people to be certified in Windows XP (before this track expires) and not have the 2 years experience with the product is going to mean that they are more likely a "paper MCSE". Unless it is someone upgrading from the NT 4.0 track or Windows 2000 because they have the base knowledge and experience. All they need to do is learn what's new with the XP track.

I find the idea of XP sending information to Microsoft's website from the user's PC rather disturbing and unethical. This presents a rather significant security risk for criminal hackers (crackers) and cyber-terrorists to break into a network. How safe would you feel to know if the FBI had deployed XP on all their special agents desktops? I would say that in some instances this could pose a national security risk (it all depends on who is using XP and how critical their data is kept).

Perhaps a fair solution would be to have Microsoft give those schools money instead of Microsoft products. Breaking up Microsoft would be bad because then they could spread out to all the areas that this lawsuit is trying to stop them from doing. And if Linux takes over more and more desktops then don't be surprised Microsoft porting Office to Linux. They will soon learn the lesson that IBM has just learned (on their own) that you can't be everything to everyone and dominate it all. IBM has regrouped on what it wants to focus on, and that will be the same fate Microsoft will soon suffer.

In their defense Microsoft is a publishing company. It would be like saying that McGraw-Hill has unfair advantage on school text book market. AOL which holds the monopoly on Internet Services Providers had merged with Time Warner to become the "monopoly" for media. But many upstart Internet Service Providers are popping up and thriving. Why? Because of customer focus and satisfaction. When companies get too big, they stop caring for their customers. That is when they start losing business. A case in point would be the phone company or McDonalds. Both have given me (as well other people I know) lousy services, but they make enough that they don't care. You go to a family own dinner and usually you get the

best service. If you want proof that pertains to this case, then look at LINUX. It was created around 1992 by a college student in Finland. He then cut it loose, source code and all to the open source community. He still controls the final say about changing the kernel (the heart of the operating system), and there are companies making money of distributing it, as well as writing programs for it. The result, it is being ported to watches, radios, PDAs, cars, robots, and any electronic device you can think of as well as any kind of CPU architecture. Basically Linux went in 10 years from a "radical underground movement" to a business quality type of Operating Systems that Microsoft has identified as it's main threat. Linux has accomplished everything that Microsoft wanted Windows to accomplish or Scott McNealy (Sun Microsystems) wanted Java to accomplish. Where did these companies go wrong? It is because they tried to dominate the market and control their standards while making a hefty profit. Most of Linux's migrations to different electronic devices you can download the source code free and compile it or pay for a packaged CD.

Linux also has several different professional certifications. And with CompTIA creating a Linux+ certification shows more proof how Linux is business accepted Operating Systems.

Don't split Microsoft up, because that will create a different Microsoft company for each area they are trying to monopolize. Instead let them grow and become more bloated. Their greed will be their downfall. In the early 1980's IBM wanted to enter the PC market, and Texas Instrument (who dominated that market) had pulled it's TI-99/4A off the market. IBM asked CP/M (the dominant company for operating systems) to create an operating systems for their PC. When CP/M told them no, a little upstart company called Microsoft offered to do it. Now it seems that things are coming full circle because Microsoft is where CP/M was 20 years ago. And Linux is where Microsoft was 20 years ago, except Linux is more user driven versus company driven.

Just fine Microsoft a multi-billion dollar fine and end this whole trial. I would also suggest that you take on AOL/Time-Warner as the new monopolistic threat.

Sincerely,

Mr. Rama K. Brooks, A+
Systems Analyst
State of Indiana
Department of Administration
Division of Information Technology
Indiana Government Center North
100 Senate Ave., Room N551
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 232-1052—Office phone
(317) 232-0748—Fax
CC:Zust, Brian

MTC-00010735

From: Guoliang Qian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Hi,

This is Guoliang Qian, a Ph. D. in Computer Science from CUNY Graduate School.

What I would like to see: 1. Microsoft will document OS features and APIs in a complete and timely fashion. 2. Separate from Microsoft OS development and application program development businesses.

What I would NOT like to see: Force Microsoft to open the source of its Windows operating system.

Justification for the above: To promote innovation and fair competition.

Thank you!

Guoliang

MTC-00010736

From: Sally Ciarlo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:27pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please stop wasting tax dollars and time persuing this case. Microsoft has done more for the taxpayers of this country than all of you down in Washington put together.

MTC-00010737

From: Charles A Sellon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Microsoft settlement

MTC-00010738

From: Lisa Starbuck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do not agree to this settlement. Microsoft has shown again and again that they will not play by the rules, and this settlement does not go far enough to ensure a level playing field. In particular, my concern is for the lack of limitations on what Microsoft can include in their "operating system". They have already killed off several companies by copying their concept and integrating it into their system in such a way that few companies can compete. The long this goes on, the worse it will get.

Thanks for your time and attention to this matter.

Lisa Starbuck

MTC-00010739

From: donald j annis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a retired IBM employee. While working in a division principally involved with department of defence contracts, I watched the justice department distract and stifle IBM's business activities for the better part of 10 years only to have the case closed with no significant conclusion.

Much the same can be said for the Microsoft situation. It is time to bring this case to a speedy end. This case likewise is an unnecessary burden to Microsoft, the economy and the justice department.

Regards,

Donajd J Annis
22 Holiday Hill Road
Endicott, NY 13760

MTC-00010740

From: Gary Cauchi
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit.
Gary Cauchi
5935 East McKenzie Avenue
Fresno, California 93727

MTC-00010741

From: Jeffrey Burger
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 3:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jeffrey Burger
1927 Stonemanor Drive
Lancaster, PA 17603
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey L. Burger

MTC-00010742

From: Jonathan Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I am a student at Boston College, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does not stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly. It does not force Microsoft to substantially alter its structure and marketing plans. The inability of the settlement to force Microsoft to change its business structure makes the settlement pointless. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws in the past. It would set a terrible standard if Microsoft was allowed to get away with its monopolistic and abusive tactics. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

All in all, the settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department is weak and does

not fix the basic problems the suit was brought to correct. I urge you to do everything in your power to overturn the settlement.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Hill
Brighton, Massachusetts

MTC-00010743

From: csaxton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 4:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

After reading the final judgement I would like to point out a number of points that are apparently not pin pointed in the document. What is Microsoft in the business of providing? This may sound like a stupid question so I will explain in the following paragraphs.

1. Before you begin to sell software you need a market to sell the software to... Microsoft has saturated the user market with their operating system...business users as well as home users.

2. You need to make sure that you can compete in this market, to be able to write good quality software. Because Microsoft owns the operating system that most home and business software is hosted on it already has an unfair advantage since they will know and already have teams of programmers who have inside information on how to program certain API's. In fact it is not uncommon for Microsoft to add the functionality to the operating system and then add user applications that use that functionality to be released at the same time. This leaves everyone in the world playing catch-up every time.

3. Trust... I work for a software house who developed manufacturing software for the Microsoft platform and spent millions of pounds in R&D to only find out that 3 and a half years down the line Microsoft bought one of our competitors and now develops software with them. This left us competing and relying on a competitor?? Their in house software products all lie in the following fields

Games
Word processing
Accounting
Manufacturing
Banking

Numerous in house business products...

THEY DON'T WORK WITH PARTNERS SO THEY OWN THE OPERATING SYSTEM AND THE BUSINESS SYSTEMS??

Would splitting the company into distinct smaller companies be a bad thing...?

There are a number of other worrying points in the document.

1. After they nearly destroyed all competition in the internet market with internet explorer, why have they not been punished?? Final Judgement should include some sort of punishment so that they know not do it again...

2. The document does not detail and nail down when competitors software becomes suitable for replacing the Microsoft equivalent.

3. Any code to do with the operating system could be deemed important to the security of the operating system...It would be

very easy for MS to keep any code they wish away from the eyes of the TC.

4. The TC seem to be another piece in the RED tape if they have no power to testify in court.

....Point 4.d

No work product, findings or recommendations by the TC may be admitted in any enforcement proceeding before the Court for any purpose, and no member of the TC shall testify by deposition, in court or before any other tribunal regarding any matter related to this Final Judgement. Would this mean that if I went to them with a complaint about Microsoft practises that I could then not proceed with the complaint to the courts? I am not sure since the final judgement does not nail this down...It is very wide open to abuse...

Information is the new monetary system and at the moment Microsoft is holding a very large piece of this currency?

MTC-00010744

From: Henry S. Williams
To: John Ashcroft, Microsoft Microsoft
Date: 1/13/02 4:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to accept the proposed Microsoft anti-trust suite settlement. Please see my attached letter.

Thank You

Henry S. Williams
1304 Adams Ave.
Toppenish, WA 98948

MTC-00010744-0001

Henry S. Williams
1304 Adams Ave.
Toppenish, WA 98948
E-Mail: stein nanwilliams@msn.com
Phone: 509-865-2915
January 13, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing in regard to the proposed settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. As a user of Microsoft products I have found their products to be of high quality and value priced. Consumer complaints with Microsoft are few; unfortunately competitor complaints have driven this "anti-trust" matter. As a resident of Washington State, as well as a stock holder, let me tell you this unreasonable litigation has cost our State millions of dollars and my wife and I thousands of dollars. I believe the proposed settlement is more than fair. I urge you to accept this settlement and put an end to this long drawn out litigation.

The proposed settlement requires Microsoft to make serious concessions to its competitors as Windows systems will have to be made to accept non-Windows software. In fact a government appointed oversight committee would now monitor Microsoft's business practices and insure it abide by the settlement terms. Clearly this settlement is more than just a slap on Microsoft's wrist. The terms should be more than enough to appease the harshest critics of Microsoft, and it will certainly increase competition in the technology marketplace. At this time of

National economic uncertainty we need this great corporation at work. Please support this settlement.

Sincerely,
Henry S. Williams

MTC-00010744-0002

MTC-00010746

From: Shuryl A Potter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 5:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice;

I watch our great country being eaten up by corporations such as Philip Morris, News media giants, and several other powerful corporations and the justice system seems to turn their heads. We can't help but wonder when a company as great as Microsoft, which has created enormous opportunities and wealth for the American people and the world, contributes billions of dollars to some of the poorest nations in the world, is always brought to task. Is it because our government and justice system is being control by corporations more powerful than themselves? My family and many friends are quite happy with Microsoft and their way of doing business. We will always support and buy their products no matter how hard their competitor's try to destroy them. We beg you to search your conscience and not bend to giant corporate pressures.

Sincerely,
Shuryl A Potter

MTC-00010747

From: Dave fenton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 5:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

For the life of me i cannot understand why you wish to punish a company that has been on the cutting edge of technology, has not hurt consumers one bit spends billions on research and development, gives more money away to charities than any other company, and still you want more. These other states and companies just have sour grapes and you are playing right into their hands.

A VERY SATISFIED MICROSOFT CUSTOMER

Dave Fenton

MTC-00010748

From: George McLennon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 5:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George McLennon
458 Rice Circle
Enterprise, Alabama 36330
January 13, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am deeply concerned over further inquiry into the Microsoft antitrust settlement. I thought this issue had finally been resolved. This period of public comment is important so that the Justice Department be advised of the enormous support of the settlement that exists.

I believe the settlement to be extraordinarily just. The licensing of

Windows at a uniform price will discourage most favored policies between Microsoft and PC producers. Now producers will not have to compete against one another to receive the same treatment from Microsoft. This newfound freedom for producers benefits the technology industry immensely. Additionally, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against vendors that use or sell non-Microsoft products.

These benefits will in turn be passed on to consumers. It is clear that this settlement is in everyone's best interests.

Sincerely,
George McLennon

MTC-00010749

From: jerrystuart
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 5:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
For Attorney General Ashcroft.
Jerry Bonow

MTC-00010750

From: Chris Bertelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 5:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ,

I want to urge you to accept the current Microsoft Settlement and move forward. Your energy is best spent on companies who screw their employees and customers like Enron. Leave our most successful USA company alone!

Thanks,
Chris Bertelson

MTC-00010751

From: Adrian Latinak
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Adrian Latinak
5 Wildwood Lane
Amherst, NH 03031
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will

be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Adrian Latinak

MTC-00010752

From: James White
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
James White
11 Sand Fiddler RD.
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James D. White

MTC-00010753

From: Wm G Fuller
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wm G Fuller
360 CR 259
Iuka, MS 38852
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Wm G Fuller

MTC-00010754

From: Barry Younce
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barry Younce
2308 SW Walt Arney Rd
Lenoir, NC 28645
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Barry A Younce

MTC-00010755

From: Shah Raza
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
755 Birkdale Drive
Fayetteville, Georgia 30215
January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to voice my opinion in regards to the Microsoft settlement issue. I feel that this antitrust dispute has gone on long enough, and I would like to see a final resolution to this dispute. I support the settlement that was reached in November, and I believe this settlement will serve in the best public interest.

Microsoft has agreed to carry out all provisions agreed upon in this settlement. For example, Microsoft has agreed to license its Windows operating system products to the 20 largest computer makers on identical terms and conditions, including price. Microsoft has also agreed to design future versions of Windows, beginning with an interim release of Windows XP, to provide a mechanism to make it easy for computer makers, consumers and software developers to promote non-Microsoft software within Windows. This settlement is complete and thorough.

I support this settlement and believe this company should not be penalized for their success.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
Shah Raza

MTC-00010756

From: Don Dennis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attached please find a letter for Attorney General John Ashcroft.
Donald E. Dennis
32727 30th Avenue Southwest
Federal Way, WA 98023-2763
January 13, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I'm writing to express my opinion that the antitrust case against Microsoft has been flawed from the start. Microsoft has not infringed upon any rights of American people and has just operated within the confines by which we set up our free market economy. I have yet to hear complaints from consumers about Microsoft's prices or practices. In fact I feel that their prices permitted me to have a PC at home with software that I could afford and most people I know feel the same way. It seems the only complaints are from their competitors because they can't keep up.

Under the terms of the settlement Microsoft will be forced to not enter into any third party agreements for exclusive distribution rights. That is ridiculous. This is the same as telling Pepsi they cannot sign an exclusive agreement with Wendy's. Also, creating a uniform price list with the 20 largest computer makers is essentially setting up the framework for a monopoly. In fact many of the concessions create situations that do violate antitrust laws instead of appeasing them. It's in the best interest of the American public to end this litigation now. Microsoft is a leading innovator of technology and we need their growth and leadership to lift the IT sector out of its current state. Microsoft has done what other

competitors could not do, but now it's time to let them play it out in a free market, which is what our society, is based upon, not the government intervention that has occurred in this case. I urge your office to make the settlement a reality.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Donald E. Dennis

MTC-00010757

From: james@wt6.usdoj.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the proposed settlement is disgusting from a consumer standpoint. It does nothing to improve the climate of competition in the Operating System/software sector, nor does it contain any substantive penalty for past anticompetitive activity on the part of Microsoft. Microsoft's contention that the status quo allows for improved innovation is patently absurd on its face, and I think actually this proposed solution will have a continuingly negative effect on improvement in the software field. Microsoft through its "embrace and extend" policies does not innovate it takes innovation from competitors, and extends the functionality's with proprietary additions which block any effective counter to its extensions. Due to dominance in the market, secondary to exclusionary marketing practices rather than true innovation Microsoft has effectively prevented useful, timely and economical improvements in the market.

Microsoft has in the past and continues in the present to attempt to block any competitive innovations. They have perverted standards to their own benefit, and refused to allow others to write software which will work well with the Windows OS. They provide crippled renditions of proprietary software included with their operating system in attempt to drive competitors from the marketplace. Microsoft have made it virtually impossible to purchase a consumer grade computer with any operating system other than windows. My own personal experience has required me to spend over two thousand dollars during the past 5 years for software that I have never used, and will not use in the future. By requiring that peripheral companies to only develop drivers for the Windows OS I am prevented from using many pieces of hardware that would make my computers more functional.

I think the proposed solution should be dismissed out of hand. It does nothing to protect consumers and the computer industry in general from the monopolistic practices of Microsoft. It contains no real penalty for MS and encourages continued anticompetitive practices on Microsoft's part.

Jim
James Mellema, CRNA

If ye love wealth better than liberty, the tranquillity of servitude than the animating contest of freedom—go from us in peace. Crouch down and lick the hands which feed you. May your chains sit lightly upon you.—Samuel Adams

MTC-00010758

From: Cindy Kasin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to express my opinion that the settlement reached between Microsoft and the DOJ and other states should be approved. The settlement is fair, and it is certainly in the public interest to bring this matter to an end. The uncertainty and anxiety the litigation is adding to generally uncertain economic times will only stifle innovation in the marketplace.

The only people who stand to gain by prolonging this matter are disgruntled competitors and their highly paid lawyers and lobbyists. It's time to get on with it.

Cynthia D. Kasin

MTC-00010759

From: Ned and Suzy Cheely
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case and get onto more serious problems! We, the taxpayers, through the government, have spent enough time and money on this case. It is time to move on. Please support the settlement as proposed by Microsoft and the Bush Administration. We do.

Thank you.
Suzy Cheely
9 Harrop Parrish
Williamsburg, VA 23188

MTC-00010760

From: Joe and Pam Sherman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case is a colossal waste of every tax payer's money. It's clear that no settlement can be reached that doesn't pass muster with California's lobbying interests. The Justice department should spend it's resources going after terrorists and companies that are truly damaging this country, like Enron.

Joseph M. Sherman
Resident of Washington State

MTC-00010761

From: Louis Parks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 6:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the Microsoft settlement. As a consumer and an American citizen I am sickened that this case ever happened and that it has gone on for so long. Settle the case, and let us and Microsoft move on with our lives.

Louis Parks
Chief Technology Officer
Adsoft Design, Inc.
(801) 627-6300
2404 Washington Blvd.
Ogden, UT 84401

MTC-00010762

From: Adam Jenkins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 7:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a java developer I am extremely worried about what is going on with the settlement, especially when you consider that it hasn't deterred Microsoft from anti-competitive behavior. An example of this is the security restriction they are putting on the java virtual machine on the Windows XP operating system. There is no logical reason to take the actions it has, when you consider that sun has spent many years developing java security, and the current security model is far more secure than Microsoft's competitor to java applets, ActiveX. Sun Microsystems pioneered the internet while Microsoft was still asleep...they developed a great language for distributed computing and really assisted in the development of the internet by providing a lot of software solutions free. The internet would not be what it is today without applets...think about that, all distributed computing through web browsers in the early days of the internet was accomplished through applets, a lot of companies that drive the US economy today (Macromedia, QuickTime) began their lifecycles with java. Now we are in real danger of losing that technology, just like what happened to Netscape. It is very disconcerting that companies that give back so much to the community and advance communication mediums for the benefit of all society are allowed to be wiped out by a company that does none of those things.

If you do not take sterner actions against Microsoft, you are sending a message to all developers saying that it's no use for them to give back to the community with the technology they create...it will be a sad day when software developers are too scared to do something that benefits the community (e.g. java technology from sun, cookies from Netscape), because they risk having their livelihood destroyed by a large monopoly. This is not a small case, it has wide reaching, long term implications for what is becoming one of the major communication mediums in the world. Your decision here will effect global communication for decades to come, please, I beg of you, make the right decision and release Microsoft's hold on the development community, allow everyone in the world to benefit from the internet and not just one company, the world will thank you

Sincerely
Adam Jenkins
Senior Team Leader
Tralee Software Pty Ltd

MTC-00010763

From: Ty Conner
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ty Conner
506 Westmoreland Pl
Jackson, TN 38301
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ty Conner

MTC-00010764

From: Mark Dubosky
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mark Dubosky
1312 Chattahoochee Circle
Roswell, GA 30075
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mark Dubosky

MTC-00010765

From: Ozie Christian

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ozie Christian
3590 Cortez Dr.
Pensacola, FL 32503-3116
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ozie Christian

MTC-00010766

From: William Hildebrand
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William Hildebrand
1420 Whitetail Court
Hermitage, TN 37076
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering

superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
William Hildebrand

MTC-00010767

From: Ray Trees
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ray Trees
150 Avery St.
Walla Walla, WA 99362
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ray Trees Jr.

MTC-00010768

From: William Capella
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William Capella
9 Marlon Pond Rd.
Hamilton Square, NJ 08690
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
William M Capella

MTC-00010769

From: Jim Vaughan
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jim Vaughan
1114 S Juanita Av
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Vaughan

MTC-00010770

From: James Saville

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
James Saville
313 Granada Drive
Vestavia Hills, AL 35216
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

This case should never have been brought—it is a simple case of competitors unable to compete because they are not smart enough—consumers have never been harmed!!! Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James Saville

MTC-00010771

From: Topazjudy@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 7:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice

I firmly believe that the suit against Microsoft was unfair. I think Microsoft has been a boon to the Internet and to computer users all over the world. It was responsible for setting a standard that has made communication between users easier. As a rank amateur on the computer, I at least have found that I can find employment and communicate with my friends with reasonable ease. I liken this to being an American from the west who can converse with a DownEaster or a person from the deep south with only occasional confusion as to terminology, as compared to a person from America trying to communicate with a German or Japanese or Sudanese where the language is so different as to be incomprehensible to me.

Furthermore, the federal government, which brought suit against Microsoft, has reached an agreement. As a taxpayer I helped fund

that suit (even though I did not wish to). Now some of the states wish to impose a different outcome in the suit, although it has already been settled to my satisfaction, and the plaintiff, using my funds to pursue the action. Microsoft has already paid the price through the federal settlement and through the cost to defend itself. The latter alone was sufficient punishment to address issues perceived only by a handful as being egregious.

Again, I did not think there were grounds for a suit in the beginning. In our society those who put forth the most effort and resources generally succeed the best anyway. This is the way free enterprise should work, and this is what Microsoft has done.

Microsoft has provided a service by making it easier to use technology. I remember years back when there were so many different programs and operating systems that only the few could succeed in going from one to another. Now, with some standardization, but with plenty of options, most of us are comfortable with entering new employment or enjoyment with a minimum of training. The savings in money is inestimable.

Please, stop this nonsense.

A taxpayer:
Judith F. Jacobs
1880 Austin
Gardnerville, NV 89410
topazjudy@aol.com

MTC-00010772

From: Arnold Kraft
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 7:18pm
Subject: microsoft settlement case 30 Holly
Circle Weston, MA 02493-1455 January
13, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice 950
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington,
DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

Like most who follow technology news, I am pleased that the Department of Justice and Microsoft have reached a settlement agreement. Three years of litigation have proven to be taxing on the entire IT industry. The settlement calls for Microsoft to renounce its ability to retaliate against its competitors, yet, its competitors retain their right to retaliate against Microsoft in the open market. This action may prove to decrease competition within the software industry, which will inevitably hurt the consumer.

The Department of Justice owes the American IT industry and Microsoft an end to this suit. Prolonging the suit can only serve to further harm the American consumer. Please accept the settlement now.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Arnold Kraft
Arnold A. Kraft
30 Holly Circle
Weston, MA 02493-1455
Tel: 781 235 0560
Fax: 781 235 4345
Cell: 617 413 5426

MTC-00010773

From: chris berger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 7:20pm

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
HONORABLE JUDGE AND AG OF
CALIFORNIA;

AS A LONG-TIME MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN SOFTWARE INDUSTRY, I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE US GOVT AND MICROSOFT. IT APPEARS TO ME THAT THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT HAS A NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES—NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH IS THAT MICROSOFT IS REALLY NOT PUNISHED IN ANY SIGNIFICANT WAY FOR PAST ABUSES. MAYBE EVEN WORSE—UNDER THE PROPOSAL IT APPEARS THAT WE IN THE INDUSTRY—ESPECIALLY US SMALLER PLAYERS

WILL HAVE TO RELY ON MS EVEN MORE...AND THAT IS TRULY FRIGHTENING. I RUN A SMALL SOFTWARE COMPANY BASED HERE IN THE BAY AREA. BUT NOT ONLY IS THE PROPOSED DEAL FRIGHTENING TO COMPANIES LIKE MINE, I BELIEVE IT RAISES SERIOUS ISSUES FOR THE ENTIRE AMERICAN SOFTWARE INDUSTRY...AND OUR NATION'S ECONOMY AS WELL. I HOPE THAT YOU WILL TAKE SERIOUSLY YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO EXAMINE THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT AND FIND IF IT IS TRULY IN THE 'BEST INTERESTS' OF CONSUMERS. IT'S HARD TO SEE HOW HAVING ONE MONOPOLISTIC PROVIDER OF THE LARGE MAJORITY OF CONSUMER SOFTWARE IS IN OUR COUNTRY'S BEST INTERESTS. AND AS MS HAS CLEARLY AND REPEATEDLY SHOWN—IF THEY OWN 95% OF THE MARKET FOR THE OS—THEY'RE GOING TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THAT TIME AND TIME AGAIN.

I HOPE THAT YOU WILL STAND UP TO MICROSOFT.

THANK YOU.
CHRIS BERGER

MTC-00010774

From: Margaret (038) Doug Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Someone want's tohave the internet just like the telephone system when the Feds got through with it a few years ago. Lets settle this as quick and as -painless as possible so we can get on with our lives.

MTC-00010775

From: Robin Thomas
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robin Thomas
9061 East Shorewood Dr.
Mercer Island, WA 98040
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the

wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robin Thomas

MTC-00010776

From: Dave Melvin
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dave Melvin
1633 River Birch Ave
Oviedo, FL 32765-7962
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dave Melvin

MTC-00010777

From: Wai Seen Teh
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Wai Seen Teh
415 Namahana Street
Honolulu, HI 96815
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
The Wai Seen

MTC-00010778

From: Douglas Whitmarsh
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Douglas Whitmarsh
727 whiting Street
Hanover, MA 02339
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and

judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Douglas Whitmarsh

MTC-00010779

From: David Beatson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Beatson
PO Box 1052
Shelter Island, NY 11964-1052
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David R Beatson

MTC-00010780

From: John Hightower
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 7:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Hightower
15 Butterfly Cove
Little Rock, AE 72210
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

It is time for this anti-consumer trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom, when this dinosaur is laid to rest.

Then Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and stop wasting tons of time and other valuable resources on litigation. It's their competitors who can't make it in the marketplace, not the end users and ordinary people who have to rely on their computers to be productive, who benefit from this anti-trust, anti-consumer exercise in poor government.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers, not making it possible for other businesses to keep making products that people don't want and won't buy. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of successful corporations, people who actually use the software—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers. With the chains off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies, instead of funding to the tune of hundreds of thousands or more dollars the parties and politicians who represent these market-loser businesses.

Sincerely,
John Hightower

MTC-00010782

From: Ryan Ware
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 8:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ryan Ware
233 Willow Lake Blvd
St Paul, MN 55110
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

Microsoft unfairly uses its products to leverage market share. Make them open Office up—file formats, possibly a linux version. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ryan Ware

MTC-00010783

From: Jeff Naber
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 8:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jeff Naber
10111 S. College Place
Tulsa, OK 74137
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jeff Naber

MTC-00010784

From: John Smith
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 8:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Smith
1104 Cara Drive
Largo, FL 33771
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John C. Smith

MTC-00010785

From: Colin Lowenberg
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 8:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Colin Lowenberg
5123 Birdwood
Houston, TX 77096
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

Although I was wholeheartedly content when one lawyer attacking our newly elected president was finally taken off the payroll and removed from the Microsoft trial, I also wholeheartedly agree with the views shared below. The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Colin Lowenberg

MTC-00010786

From: David Hill

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 9:10pm

Subject: Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I am a student at Boston University, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does nothing to stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly through the use of its operating system. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws in the past. It would be a terrible standard to set by letting Microsoft get away with its retaliation tactics, bolting schemes, and attacks on Java. All these tactics lower competition in a supposedly free market and also limit software standards. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

To sum up, I'm deeply concerned the recent settlement does not regulate Microsoft enough in the future allowing Microsoft to continue its monopolistic tactics. In addition, Microsoft is not even being punished for laws it clearly broke in the past. This sets a terrible standard. I would request that you do your best to overturn this settlement.

Sincerely,

David W. Hill

Brighton, Massachusetts

MTC-00010787

From: donnar

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 9:17pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
21902 96th Avenue Southeast
Snohomish, Washington 98296
January 12, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

We are writing you today to voice our opinions in regards to the Microsoft settlement that was reached in November. This case has gone on long enough. It is time to embrace this settlement and let this company get back to doing business. We have more important things to worry about.

Microsoft has agreed to carry out all terms of this agreement. Microsoft did not get off easy. This strict settlement contains terms that go well beyond the original terms of the lawsuit. For example, Microsoft will now share information about the internal workings of Windows with competitors, and it will use a uniform price list when licensing out Windows. Microsoft has agreed to these terms so as to hasten this process.

Again, we support Microsoft and this settlement in this dispute. During these difficult economic times, we must focus all our energy in bolstering our lagging economy. Please do your part by supporting this settlement.

Sincerely,

Maurice & Donaleen Ravensberg

MTC-00010788

From: Connie Wickland

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/13/02 9:34pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case with Microsoft in a fair manner. There has been great damage to our economy and to investors and consumers. Please do not squelch innovation.

Thank you.

Connie

MTC-00010790

From: Dennis Lutz II

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/13/02 9:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dennis Lutz II
22526 Savannah Heights
Von Ormy, TX 78073-3009
January 13, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Dennis Lutz II

MTC-00010791

From: Alex Tsukernik

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/13/02 9:30pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Alex Tsukernik
184 Cabot St. Apt 3
Newton, MA 02458
January 13, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Alex Tsukernik

MTC-00010792

From: Jason Prell

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/13/02 9:44pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Jason Prell
350 Cayman Street
Iowa City, IA 52245
January 13, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jason Prell

MTC-00010793

From: Georg Bolch
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Georg Bolch
P O Box 528
Suquamish, WA 98392-0528
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Georg G Bolch

MTC-00010794

From: ACalapai@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:13pm
Subject: (no subject)

GENTLEMEN:

THE JUDGE IN THIS LAST DECISION OF THE MICROSOFT AGREEMENT STATES THAT THEIR OFFER WAS TOO ADVANTAGEOUS FOR THEM AND TOO COMPETITIVE FOR APPLE COMPUTER. SINCE WHEN DOES A JUDGE RULE ON COMPETITION BETWEEN TWO CORPORATE ENTITIES. I THOUGHT THAT'S WHAT BUSINESS WAS ALL ABOUT. WHAT DID APPLE EVER CONTRIBUTE TO THE SCHOOLS THAT ARE IN POOR AND NEEDY AREAS. HAVE THE COURTS IN OUR COUNTRY TURNED SO LIBERAL AND AGAINST BIG AND SUCCESSFUL CORPORATIONS.

THE JUDGE DID NOT BELIEVE THAT A BILLION DOLLARS WAS ENOUGH-IS THAT BECAUSE THEY ARE A WEALTHY COMPANY? ARE THESE JUDGES, POLITICIANS AND STATES ATTY GENERALS TRYING TO ULTIMATELY BREAK BIG BUSINESS. OR JUST TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THEM BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE RESOURCES

DISAPPOINTED AND CONCERNED

MTC-00010795

From: charles varano
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement is fair & equitable and agree that we need to move on with this issue.

MTC-00010796

From: Goldberg, Adrian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a developer of business software using a variety of technologies and platforms I view with consternation the continuing and growing market monopoly by Microsoft. I believe it to be in the best interests of the US IT companies and IT companies worldwide that the US government drastically inhibit Microsoft's ability to dictate and control software usage worldwide.

Adrian Goldberg
GIS Consultant
Sinclair Knight Merz
Melbourne, Australia

MTC-00010797

From: Jim Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/13/02 10:45pm
Subject: Tunney Comments on PFJ in US v Microsoft

Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division US Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530
<microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>
Ms. Hesse:

I am submitting these comments by email since the Department is as affected by recent events as other governmental agencies. I am writing to comment on the proposed Final Judgment in US v Microsoft.

"[T]he suit has been a futile exercise if the Government proves a violation but fails to secure a remedy adequate to redress it."—US v E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. The proposed Final Judgment proposed to the Court by the United States Department of Justice and Microsoft fails to serve the public interest in too many ways to be an acceptable resolution to the case. While serving the public interest must be the primary goal of any resolution to this case, I note in passing that a crucial requirement of any system of justice must be that lawbreakers do not reap the rewards of their misconduct. The proposed Final Judgment fails to meet that goal as it is entirely forward-looking, albeit weakly so.

First, the proposed Final Judgment does not contain "any admission by any party regarding any issue of fact or law." This is unacceptable. Microsoft has broken the law. That is a fact decided by the District Court, upheld by the Appellate Court, and one which any resolution of this case must explicitly state. Independent civil proceedings will rely on the outcome of this case and it is critical that a declaration of lawbreaking be present.

The restrictions placed on Microsoft's business practices by the proposed Final Judgment appear at first glance to be sound but are so riddled with exceptions as to be effectively meaningless. With just a few minutes' thought, I was able to think of sidesteps by Microsoft that would neuter the restrictions and yet fall within the purview of the proposed Final Judgment. I am a layman; I can only imagine the ease with which Microsoft's legal staff can think of sidesteps—especially when you consider that they wrote much of this proposed Final Judgment. For example, Microsoft is not required to "document, disclose, or license" anything that would purportedly hinder security or rights management. That's a gaping hole which would allow essentially all networking and multimedia protocols used in products folded into Windows to be completely undocumented. With the release of Windows 2000, Microsoft claimed that they had included Kerberos authentication mechanisms. They used empty data fields in an undisclosed manner to extend the Kerberos specification in a manner to provide authentication services between Windows servers and Windows clients which were denied to non-Windows clients. When pressed for details, the company asserted that their modifications were security-related and refused to disclose them. That conduct is still permitted by this proposed Final Judgment. Further, the proposed Final Judgment appears to be totally ignorant of the free software movement (sometimes called "open source"). Neither term appears in the document, nor in the Competitive Impact Statement released later. Nearly all the proposed Final Judgment's provisions are predicated on commercial interests representing the only means of competition. Free software is not as a first principle about

making money or gathering market share. It is a philosophical perspective that software can and should be shared so that it can be improved through the the ability and right of its users to correct errors, add features, or provide superior implementations of algorithms. It is important to understand that by "sharing" I do not refer to the violations of intellectual property law best exemplified by the Napster service. This sharing is a decision made by the original programmer which permits or even requires redistribution of the source code (the human-readable information which is turned into the one-and-zeroes of computers to be run as a program). The best known examples of this movement are the Linux kernel and the GNU tools that together provide a computing platform which can run on the same hardware as Windows and which provides a functional equivalent to the Unix operating system. Since the software in a Linux-based computer is largely written by noncommercial interests, the programmers would fail to meet the "business viability" requirement for licensing Microsoft intellectual property needed to allow interoperability—said requirement to be ascertained by none other than Microsoft, in another of this proposed Final Judgment's absurdities. Also, since many of the free software programmers are hobbyists, they lack the financial resources to meet licensing terms that companies like Sun Microsystems or Apple Computer would doubtless find to be "reasonable and nondiscriminatory". Given that Linux-based systems represent the greatest competitive threat to Microsoft's desktop operating system monopoly right now, leaving the free software programmers and their software methodology out of the judgment throws away the single best option to restore competition to the marketplace.

The aspect of this proposed Final Judgment that most fails the "sniff test" is the compliance and enforcement section. For starters, the Technical Committee is a wholly inadequate enforcement mechanism. The fact that one of the three members is to be chosen by Microsoft and one chosen in part by that member means that half the committee will be of Microsoft's choosing. Prisoners do not get to select their jailers and Microsoft should not have any say in its overseers. The fact that such a farcical arrangement could even be suggested stems from the failure of the proposed Final Judgment to acknowledge expressly that Microsoft has broken the law. The enforcement mechanisms read like a partnership agreement, not the lettering of a lawbreaking monopolist. Once selected, the Technical Committee's effectiveness is almost nonexistent. Three people, even with a staff to assist them, are not capable of auditing the tens of millions of lines of software that make up Windows and the Middleware produced by Microsoft. They cannot interview the thousands of Microsoft employees. They are also to be gagged from making public statements about their activities, a shame when simple public statements about Microsoft's conduct can influence that conduct. Staggeringly, the result of their work is not even admissible in enforcement proceedings! Of what possible value is this committee?

Finally, I object to the termination stipulation of the proposed Final Judgment. This wretched agreement will be in effect for five years, with the promise of up to two more years if Microsoft fails to comply with its terms. I find myself compelled to ask what reasonable person could refrain from paroxysms of belly-laughter at the idea that the solution to the failure of a five-year agreement is to extend that same agreement for two more years. The further damage to competition and the public that Microsoft could wreak by the end of that five-year agreement is almost incalculable. It took the company less than five years to annihilate not just Netscape but the commercial market for web browsers. Now that they have set their sights on messaging, home video games, multimedia such as audio and video, online shopping, personal video recorders, authentication services and more, how can the Department consider allowing the degree of autonomy that the proposed Final Judgment would?

I have barely scratched the surface of my objections to this proposed Final Judgment; I trust that others will address the shortcomings I have left out. I would like to take a moment to mention the utterly disgraceful manner in which the United States government has betrayed the American people by throwing in the towel in *US v Microsoft*. After securing a thundering victory in the District Court and then accomplishing the coup of having that victory largely upheld by a unanimous decision of one of the country's more business-friendly Appellate Courts, settling the case with this pathetic excuse for a Final Judgment is contemptible. The career of the head of antitrust at Justice, Mr. James, is a history of justification for anticompetitive conduct and Attorney General Ashcroft is occupied with the September 11 attacks on the United States, but they are officials of the Department of Justice with obligations to the American people. The proposed Final Judgment comes nowhere near adequately discharging those obligations.

The Competitive Impact Statement required as a justification by the proposed Final Judgment has been released and it is as unenlightening as one would expect given the agreement that prompted it. University of Baltimore antitrust expert Robert Lande put it best when he said "I think Charles James is going to spend the next 30 years of his life saying 'I didn't sell out to Microsoft.'" The Competitive Impact Statement is as telling in what it doesn't say as in what it does say. The Department's repetition throughout the Competitive Impact Statement that the proposed Final Judgment restores competition and serves the public interest cannot make that statement true. Its recounting of the history of the case is accurate. Would that the actual impact statement were so. In truth, it reads as little more than a restating of the proposed Final Judgment with a bit more plain English and a bit less "legalese". At least, it reads that way until the end, when the Department tries vainly to justify this unconditional surrender. Their reasoning essentially boils down to "better a horrible conclusion today than a good one in two years." I take particular

exception to this statement: "The remedies contained in the Proposed Final Judgment are not only consistent with the relief the United States might have obtained in litigation, but they have the advantages of immediacy and certainty." That is blatantly false. The District Court's ordered relief was far stricter than this settlement and the Appellate Court was quite clear that their reason for vacating that order was to preserve the appearance of impartiality. The newly assigned judge was expressly permitted to consider that very same ordered relief. The proposed Final Judgment may have "immediacy and certainty" but it is certain that Microsoft will immediately resume Business As Usual—to the detriment of American citizens, businesses, governments. Given the feature-set of Windows XP, one could make a compelling argument that the company has already resumed business as usual.

The Department of Justice had an opportunity to restore competition to an exciting industry that has been hobbled for too long by Microsoft's monopoly abuses. You had the support of two courts and you have come back with a settlement which isn't even a slap on the wrist: it's a loving caress. Shame on you all. You have a chance at redemption, however: withdraw the proposed Final Judgment. Return to Judge Kollar-Kotelly for the penalty hearings ordered by the Appellate Court when it disqualified Judge Jackson from rehearing that stage of the trial. Lay the evidence before her. Include Microsoft's actions since Judge Jackson issued his Findings of Fact, such as Microsoft's incorporation into Windows XP of multimedia players, instant messengers, and online shopping and let this case be ended by a judicial order that can only surpass the proposed Final Judgment in effectiveness.

Let me conclude this letter by reiterating my key points of objection to the government's proposed Final Judgment: it permits the monopolist to retain the fruits of its illegal acts. It provides no incentive for the monopolist to reform its business practices and thereby come into compliance with the requirements and restrictions of the Sherman Act. It ignores past harm to competition and does nothing to constrain future harm. It is in every way a betrayal of the Department's responsibility to the nation and is exceptionally painful given the smashing success the Department had in proving its case before the Court.

Thank you for your time.

James L. Hill, PhD
105 Azure Drive
Los Alamos, NM 87544
505-670-4280
<jimhil1@swcp.com>

MTC-00010798

From: Henrik Bruun
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 10:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Henrik Bruun
2557 Bishop Estates Road
Jacksonville, FL 32259
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Henrik

MTC-00010799

From: gary keramidas
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 10:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
gary keramidas
18722 dale ave
allen park, mi 48101
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
gary j keramidas

MTC-00010800

From: Shane Kelley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 10:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Shane Kelley
10628 Gardenwood Road
Orlando, FL 32837
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Shane Kelley

MTC-00010801

From: Craig Catapano
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 10:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Craig Catapano
8912 North Lamar Blvd Suite 214
Austin, Tx 78753
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. It's time to Drop this none-sense and move ON! There is no "Monopoly", move on to something more important...US Healthcare.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Craig M Catapano

MTC-00010802

From: Sean Phillipson
To: Microsoft
ATR.dougp@intermind.net@inetgw
Date: 1/13/02 11:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The remedies outlined in the current proposed agreement don't go nearly far enough to reign in the monopolistic practices of Microsoft. Microsoft has already violated the spirit of even the proposed remedy, and previous findings, by including even more applications in their new OS (Windows XP). With every application they include, whole software markets are put out of business. I also thought that any remedy should deprive Microsoft of any gains made by the monopolistic behavior. Microsoft made tens of billions of dollars from this behavior, why do they get to keep that money? Why have I never heard of any effort to estimate of how much money was made through Microsoft's monopolistic behavior so a real punishment can be imposed?

The remedy proposal of the 9 remaining states is far better and should prevent the behavior that got Microsoft in court. That is the idea behind this remedy, I hope. Companies are still afraid to anger Microsoft. There are subtle ways in which Microsoft can "get even" with a company for favoring another OS. And now I see in the news that Microsoft actually has a program in place to kill Linux. Microsoft has agreed to the DOJ settlement because it still leaves it with plenty of "Monopolistic" opportunity and loop holes.

As a software engineer I can tell you that Microsoft can modify it's OS code to do the things that the 9 hold out states suggest. They are flat dishonest if they say they can't. Every version of Unix/Linux/MacOS cleanly separates the OS services from any applications. A browser is a application and should never be embedded in the OS. These are smart guys, tell them they have to do something and they can do it. They may not like it, but they can do it.

Thank you
Doug Phillipson
Las Vegas Nevada

MTC-00010803

From: Mmonias@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 11:38pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 it is time to go forward and stop the
 endless litigation mmonias@aol.com

MTC-00010804

From: Art Hilgart
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 11:43pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I urge the breakup of the MS operating system and applications into two firms, along with compulsory licensing of all MS software, now and in the future.

Patents are intended to reward temporarily inventions not obvious to others. They are not grants of permanent monopoly, nor should they be. Academics and journalists rushing to defend Microsoft and disparage the Justice Department display stronger ideologies than memories. Bill Gates is not an innovator serving millions of computer users as he and his defenders would have us believe, but the incredibly lucky exploiter of a monopoly he has kited into scores of billions of dollars for himself. When the personal computer was no bigger than a breadbox, IBM saw little future for the device and entered the market with assemblies of purchased innards. To run programs, a computer needs a controlling operating underbase, and when Bill Gates and Paul Allen falsely told IBM that they had such a system, IBM thoughtlessly contracted with them to license it for their desktop diversion. Gates and Allen then proceeded to buy one of the many such programs that had been written by hobbyists and others. With the help of his attorney father, young Gates acquired Q-DOS from its hapless inventor for a few dollars of his father's money and changed its name from ?Quick-and-Dirty-Operating System? to ?Microsoft Disc Operating System?, or MS-DOS. This cloud no bigger than a man's hand consisted of two programs? COMMAND.COM and CONFIG.SYS? with a combined size of less than 100kb. As it happened, IBM salesmen were as adept at selling PCs to business offices as they had been at selling electric typewriters, and DOS became the industry standard Because IBM did not buy the system outright and because intellectual property law confers a monopoly on the system and its interminable upgrades, Gates now has control of most personal computers in the world.

Nearly all application programs are written for DOS or its successor, Windows, so buyers of IBM-type computers must also buy a Microsoft operating system, and since most computers are now based on an MS system, application software designers must write Windows-based programs if they are to sell many copies. Others are free to design non-Microsoft operating systems, but these are useless in the absence of applications, and applications won't be written for systems not already in wide use. Because of this circularity and constant upgrades conferring perpetuity to MS patents and copyrights, Bill Gates is the proud possessor of an unshakeable monopoly.

This is enough for antitrust attention, but there is more. I recently bought a new

custom-built computer from Gateway 2000. In addition to the ineluctable Windows, the package included Microsoft Excel, Word, and Explorer. When I told the consultant I wanted the WordPerfect/Quattro Pro/ Netscape suite, I was told that Gateway's contract with Microsoft required that they sell and install these Microsoft applications with the necessary Windows. Even were I to take the Microsoft programs and pay extra for the WordPerfect suite, they could not sell it or install it. I bought the WordPerfect programs directly from Corel and installed them myself, but most consumers probably just use the Microsoft programs that come with new computers, extending Microsoft's control into the applications field.

Gates did not write DOS, and his staff copied the Windows user interface from Apple. The Microsoft programs I had to buy but do not use are not marvelous innovations, they too are imitations. Word was copied from WordPerfect, Explorer from Netscape, Excel from Lotus, and Money from Quicken. The dominant shares that the Microsoft ripoffs now command in the applications field are entirely due to Gates's use of the essential Windows to fob off his imitations as part of a bundle. The success of Windows is not due to its elegance. The bloated, slow, and unwieldy system continually requires purchase of bigger and faster hardware. There are innumerable bugs and customer service is mediocre and expensive. A common ?solution? to a problem is a recommendation to back up everything externally, unload all programs, reformat the hard drive, and start over. Of course, upgrades will eventually correct the errors? but carry a new generation of bugs. Octopus like, moreover, Windows has a tendency to sabotage rival software and reset configurations to use MS programs as defaults.

Gates and his cheering section bemoan that the Justice Department is about to cause irreparable harm to millions of computer users. Since Microsoft has contributed approximately nothing to the nation besides a fiendishly clever business plan, the consumers don't need to worry. I urge the breakup of the MS operating system and applications into two firms, along with compulsory licensing of all MS software, now and in the future.

Patents are intended to reward temporarily inventions not obvious to others. They are not grants of permanent monopoly, nor should they be.

Art Hilgart
 ahilgart@kzoo.edu

MTC-00010805

From: Greg Smith
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 11:41pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge,

I like many I know have been viewing the Microsoft litigation with a whole range of emotions. First disbelief that the government was seriously taking on such a powerful force. Next observing some judicial success and what appeared to be a serious effort to right an obvious wrong, I was very encouraged. With the reversals since the

elections and many publicized Microsoft donations, my skepticism of my elected officials returned. However, nothing can compare to outrage I felt when I heard the Microsoft's settlement proposal.

A proposal which is so obviously meant to squash what little competition it has in the education market. The audacity is something I should have suspected Microsoft of. What baffles me is why, when proposed, the instant response was not "Microsoft, you just don't get it?" There are many good options which would create competition in the software industry. Forcing Microsoft to spend money it earns from overpriced software we are forced to purchase on anything seems absurd. How is that solution, it's hardly even a penalty, Microsoft can charge anything it likes for its products. It already charges several orders of magnitude more than the industry for its mediocre products. How about some obvious solutions, obvious to anyone who has been in the computer business for a while, like Microsoft.

How about JAVA. Force Microsoft to include Sun's VM with Windows and make it really work. Or how about "Open Doc." This would truly put the software industry in full motion. Microsoft was so worried about this software at one time it had to force Apple to discontinue it with drastic action. I suspect a breakup may also bring the software industry out in force with new and useful products. I hope you can see through Microsoft's fog of absurd statements and massive political contributions to do something to eliminate the vise Microsoft has on the software industry.

Greg Smith
 Westmont College Webmaster

MTC-00010806

From: Mark Stephens
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/13/02 11:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The US Department of Justice is wrong to attack Microsoft. Their grounds of attack allege that Microsoft included Internet Explorer with their Windows Operating System. The DOJ claims this harmed consumers because it stifled competition. I strongly disagree. Microsoft did not harm me in any way, in fact it more than met my needs in an efficient manner. In University, as in work, there are deadlines to meet and time is a precious commodity. Computers are a tool which can greatly assist in getting things done in a faster, more efficient way.

One thing I did not like about computers is the amount of time and effort it took to install programs. When I needed a report quickly, it took precious time to evaluate and purchase the necessary software. The technical process of installing software was not as simple (as it is today). Microsoft was able to answer this issue by bundling. They sold the O.S, the web browser together, which was exactly what I was looking for. I liked the idea of buying a new PC with all the software included. The US DOJ directly told Microsoft this is wrong, and indirectly is telling me that my personal desires are actually harming others. The result of these actions? Instead of getting a solution I want, I will only be allowed to have software

solutions which are government approved. I will no longer have the choice which was available before.

I can make my own choices about what is good for me. I will not purchase products that do not meet my needs. The DOJ seems intent on removing the choice of packaged software, and is attacking Microsoft for the 'unlawful' process of meeting this desire.

Also, The idea of charging microsoft \$1,000,000 per day seems like extortion. I endeavour to see the DOJ to put an end to what appears to be nothing more than an attack on a prosperous company. (Prosperity being a key factor that differentiates America from almost every other country on Earth.)

Thank you for your time,

Mark Stephens CC:mark-stephens@sympatico.ca@inetgw

MTC-00010807

From: John Muckleroy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:02pm
Subject: U.S. Government persuing Microsoft John Ashcroft, Attorney General

I think that it is downright sinful the way the government is persuing Microsoft. I see it as just another case of jealousy on the part of the competion, with the government acting as "Big Brother" to keep the bully from getting any bigger. We consumers don't need "protection" from Microsoft. We come closer to needing protection from the Government. I think that there is a lot of truth to that line I heard some time ago, and it goes like this. "If Bill Gates had contributed more money to Bill Clinton's political war chest, there would not be a lawsuit in progress at this time. The states that are backing this suit are just looking for money, and that is all there is to it. They didn't deserve any money from the Tabocco settlement, and they don't deserve any from this.

MTC-00010808

From: wladimir.nedo@ps.ge.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:12pm
Subject: Comments

Microsoft continues a pattern of anticompetitive practices designed to thwart competition on the merits, to deprive customers of a choice between alternative technologies and products, and to exclude Microsoft's competitors from the general marketplace. The initial suit concerned the monopolistic practice of Microsoft, to purposefully do whatever it took to make sure significant market participants distributed and used Microsoft's product instead of a competitors—including paying some customers, and using its unique control over Windows to induce others to do so Microsoft has made clear that, unless restrained, it will continue to misuse its operating system monopoly to artificially exclude competition and deprive customers of a free choice. As Paul Maritz, Microsoft's Group Vice President in charge of the Platforms Group, was quoted in the New York Times: "We are going to cut off their air supply. Everything they're selling, we're going to give away for free."

Since the release of the '95 OS version, through to the XP OS release, Microsoft's

conduct has not changed. Where any competitor appears to threaten Microsoft, either through outright purchase, or by 'giving away' similar functionality artificially bundled with the OS, Microsoft strives to prevent market alternatives to Microsoft's products from gaining any foothold in the general marketplace. Microsoft's conduct regarding competitor products has been and, if not restrained, will continue to stifle competition, to extend and to maintain Microsoft's Windows operating system monopoly.

MTC-00010809

From: Kevin Ulland
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Kevin Ulland
6453 139th Place NE #41
Redmond, WA 98052
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. I fully support the settlement between the nine states, the DOJ and Microsoft. I don't believe Microsoft is a monopoly that has abused it's power, and Microsoft hasn't ever hurt me, the CONSUMER. But that's not what's at issue here.

I believe that the settlement that the DOJ and Microsoft agreed to is fine. It not only tackles the anti-trust "violations" but also addresses the market and Microsoft's role therein. I am happy to see that nine of the eighteen states have signed on, but I am frustrated by the remaining states who wish to proceed with the trial. I have a question about those nine states.

I live in Washington State. I am happy with Microsoft, I like Windows XP and it's features. I use Passport and love the fact that it's integrated into the OS. It saves me time! I love Internet Explorer. It renders beautiful web sites, and being a web developer, it's a

great application. Netscape is non-compliant with the standards and mis-interprets code all of the time, creating ugly sites and interfaces. I DON'T want Microsoft to stop innovating. I want the next version of Windows to be even more rich with features. If Massachusetts or California go into the hearings in March and get extra sanctions or limitations applied to the deal with Microsoft, those limitations had better not effect me here in Washington, or any of the other 41 states! Just because California is listening to the special interest groups from Silicon Valley and Microsoft competitors and NOT it's consumers, that should not affect me in my state. I remember my US history, and I remember that we all started out as separate states, like little nations, and we created a federal government to over see national issues. But laws passed in California do not apply in any other state, and I am hoping that a ruling against Microsoft for California, or the other nine states only applies in those states. If California law can't affect me here in Washington, why should a ruling for California affect me as well? Will a ruling for the nine states affect the other 41?

Please answer this question, because I think it is vitally important that as a consumer I know what is going to happen to Microsoft and the software I use in my life and work. It is wholly unacceptable that these nine states' problems with Microsoft affect the rest of the nation. The settlement with the DOJ can affect all of the states, because it is an agreement with the Federal Government...

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views, Kevin Ulland
kevinu@intentionallyu.com
Citizen of Washington State
Sincerely,
Kevin Ulland

MTC-00010810

From: Frank Danaher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:08pm
Subject: Dear sir

Dear sir
Please settle the MicroSoft law suits as soon as possible.

These issues do not belong in the law courts and represent an attempt by the various state departments attorney general to enrich the state at the expense of the the company involved. Please try to do something to move law suits such as these out of the Department of Justice arena and back to the companies that are involved. We need less and not more oversight by your department regarding commercial conflicts.

Frank Danaher

MTC-00010811

From: Steve Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end the persecution of the Microsoft Corp. Microsoft has done much more to help the consumer and help the American economy than they have ever done to hurt it. It is time to stop wasting taxpayer money and end this action bby the Justice Dept. I support the current settlement that is on the table to bring this to a close.

Thanks!
Steve Brown
Reynoldsburg, OH

MTC-00010812

From: Shanmugam, Karthik
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I agree with the terms of the proposed settlement.

MTC-00010813

From: Ron LaPedit
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It pleases the court, I would like to commend the 9 dissenting states 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.

The settlement worked out for dismissal of the class action cases alleging overcharging by Microsoft shows Microsoft's arrogance and contempt for the law. This settlement would have helped Microsoft crush Apple in the education market where Apple is still a competitor. Since when is the loser of a case allowed to settle in a manner which benefits it. Better that Microsoft be forced to distribute coupons for free software to the customers it allegedly overcharged. But I digress here.

I sincerely hope that you will work with the dissenting state attorneys general to create 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 LaPedit
2115 Sea Cliff Way
San Bruno, CA
650-359-9887

MTC-00010814

From: Tim McMullen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft

As a PC user, I believe Microsoft must be broken up to allow competitors back into the market. Please force a spin-off of all MS business other than a basic operating system.

The spun off unit(s) should work totally independently, with the same rights and privileges that all other applications developers get. This will re-enable competition and truly stimulate 'innovation'.

Thanks
Tim McMullen
4615 Sidereal Dr
Austin, TX 78727-5129
(512) 837-9366

MTC-00010815

From: kaydan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has for many years used anti-competitive practices to corner the market and stifle the progression of the industry. Over the past 10 years they've released around 10 different operating systems. All of which have had some level of incompatibility with one another and make it almost impossible to produce an application that will work on their next platform's release. When a market exists that they wish to control they either add the feature free of charge (driving companies like Netscape out of business), or if they wish to control a standard they create their own standard and cut support for the currently accepted standard (DirectDraw, .Net, etc). Or, in the worst type of situation, they try to fork an existing standard to devalue the standard altogether (Java, JavaScript). Being that they control a vast percentage of the market, progression in the computer industry has actually regressed in many ways in the last 10 years.

Sincerely
Daniel Bermender

MTC-00010816

From: landon kelsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:30pm

In a monopoly, there are explicit and implicit acts that are illegal and bad for the USA.

*Explicit acts are those such as the many aggressive acts of conspiracy by Microsoft brought out early in the suit.

*Implicit acts are those such as the inability of small companies to keep up with a company (MS) that can throw 1000 programmers at a project. Norton Antivirus, for example, could be destroyed overnight.

I personally like .NET and C# and it may be the best idea yet, but MS is still not the US National Software Co.

If you don't believe me, look at the service you get from your local telephone company. Many festering sores are left over from a monopoly. A truly putrid bureaucracy left over from a monopoly.

Two types of monopoly. . . a vertical trust and a horizontal trust Vertical. . . example McDonald's could have farms that raise beef and everything else including restaurants Horizontal. . . Safeway (unlikely due to inherent poor management) could own every grocery store

MTC-00010817

From: John Longthorne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:38pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This attack on Microsoft, and the economy, has gone on too long. Please concede that this suit should never have been brought to court and bow out gracefully. The DOJ suit has most likely cost America and its citizens more in lost wealth and economic security than the Enron fiasco. Times are bad enough without our own government trying to stifle job creation and wealth accumulation.

Microsoft is in a tough business and needs support rather than hindrance.

Thank You,
John and Marilyn Longthorne
18 W. Sage St.
Pine Haven Wyoming, 82721

MTC-00010818

From: Seven
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:43pm
Subject: Re: proposed settlement

I strongly feel the existing proposed settlement with Microsoft does little to redress the manifest imbalance in the operating system marketplace or address the monopolistic practices of Microsoft.

The playing field needs to be leveled. The existing proposals don't do it.

Morley Chalmers
for the 7Office team
Seven@7Office.com
416/926-9296

MTC-00010819

From: Duane Odom
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 1:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am concerned that this settlement will do little to change Microsoft's behavior or restore competition. The settlement fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system and it is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism.

Microsoft is a monopoly and has used that monopoly position to force others out of business or to bend to fit their desires. This affects people's freedom to choose among alternatives. It affects the price people must pay, directly or indirectly. It also has longer-term implications for people's privacy and security. It means less innovation and lower quality software.

Thank You,
Duane Odom
Duane Odom
3035 Barnes Ln.
Cottdale, FL 32431
(850)352-2229
duane—odom@yahoo.com

MTC-00010821

From: Jim Robertson
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 1:59pm
Subject: FW: Encourage DOJ to settle Microsoft case

I received the following email message. I am only writing to see if it is a legitimate use of my time (or the people I forward this to) or is it a hoax? Is the DOJ seeking public comment? I receive so many "form/chain"

letter via email, I never know what to believe anymore.

Thanks for you time.
 Jim Robertson
 Olympia, Washington
 From: Marsha Richards
 [mailto:mrichards@effwa.org]
 Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2002 5:31 PM
 To: info@effwa.org
 Subject: Encourage DOJ to settle Microsoft case

Dear EFF Friends,
 As you know, 18 states and the federal Department of Justice (DOJ) have been involved in a lawsuit against Microsoft. Recently, the DOJ announced it has negotiated a settlement agreement with the company (one of America's most successful). The settlement must be approved by the federal judge in the case before it can take effect, and the DOJ is currently seeking public comment.

The case against Microsoft has greatly harmed Washington citizens. Stock values, not only in Microsoft but in the entire NASDAQ, have dropped dramatically and consumers overwhelmingly agree that allowing the case to end with this settlement is good for them, the industry, and the nation's economy.

Please consider sending a letter, fax or email to the DOJ to let them know what you think about the settlement. The deadline for comment is January 28, 2002. I'm including a sample letter below along with the contact information you'll need. Please feel free to edit it as you see fit, or write your own.

I would recommend sending your comments by email or fax since mail has had difficulties lately. Also, if possible, would you let us know if you decide to send a letter? We'd like to measure the impact. Thanks very much.

Cordially,
 Bob Williams
 President
 Evergreen Freedom Foundation
 P.O. Box 552
 Olympia, WA 98507
 (360) 956-3482
 effwa@effwa.org
 [Contact Information]
 Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 "D" Street, NW, Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530
 email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
 <mailto:microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>
 Fax: (202) 307-1454—OR—(202) 616-9937
 [Sample Letter]

To Whom it May Concern:
 As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge

Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.
 Signed,

MTC-00010822

From: Bob Mileti
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:04pm
 Subject: Don't buy the Microsoft Settlement
 Dear US Dept. of Justice:

Please do not allow Microsoft to settle this case with such a self serving plan. They have cost me and my small company untold amounts of money due to poor products and total lack of support. Furthermore I'd like to have all the money I spent for programs that I never wanted in the first place, but were forced to pay for from Dell and Gateway.

Make it hurt and make it hurt good.

Thank you,
 Bob Mileti

MTC-00010823

From: T. Ron Davis
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:10pm
 Subject: Comments on Microsoft Litigation
 BlankRenata Hesse
 Trial Attorney
 Antitrust Division
 Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530
 microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

I'm fed up. This is litigation that never should have been filed in the first place. It has stifled innovation, severely damaged the economy, and impacted or will impact the majority of technology companies in the USA for decades. Anti-trust laws are in place to protect CONSUMERS not COMPETITORS. Consumers do NOT, and never did, support this legal fiasco. I urge you to put this outrageous waste of taxpayer money to bed. Get it settled and get on with real business.

I am encouraging all of my colleagues to contact you as well.

Sincerely,
 T. Ron Davis
 25424 NE 39th Way
 Redmond, WA 98053
 T. Ron Davis
 President/CEO
 iRequest, Inc.
 http://www.irequest.com
 Tele: 425-643-1771
 FAX : 425-898-9726
 "Empowering the Consumer Through Information"

MTC-00010824

From: Richard Saul
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:12pm
 Subject: Settlement in Microsoft Antitrust Case

Microsoft wields enormous power in the computer industry. They are able to share software and computer hardware development. I have been a software engineer for twenty years and I have seen Microsoft grow from "micro" to huge.

Microsoft has a long-standing practice of including new features that directly compete with another company's software into the Windows operating system family. They brought this practice with them from the DOS operating system.

Microsoft has done used this exact practice with:

1. Memory management, inclusion of Expanded Memory Services killed Quarterdeck's QEMM.

2. Disk Compression, inclusion of disk compression wiped out Stac Electronics Stacker.

3. Fax Services, by including fax capability Microsoft has reduced the market for WinFax.

4. Remote Control software (like PCAnywhere) is an example that has just been introduced in Windows XP. Microsoft will enter a market with a very low priced product because they have the scale of economy to afford to dump the product at a loss. They do this until they have wiped out their competitors.

This has been done with:

1. Access, Microsoft introduced Access for \$99 at a time when databases commonly cost \$500.

2. Internet Explorer, Microsoft gave IE away when Netscape cost \$40 to buy.

3. TCP/IP network access. Microsoft gave away free TCP/IP software when ordinarily it cost \$350 or more.

4. The Xbox is a current example of this product. Microsoft "subsidizes" their competition and includes other company's products into Windows. This might appear to be in a company's best interest but in fact it limits the company's ability to succeed because of the contractual obligation they are under.

1. HyperTerminal

2. Citrix

Last and maybe worse Microsoft manipulates standards to their benefit. 1. Java as a language was standardized by Sun Microsystems. Microsoft introduced a "Java" product with different features that competed against Sun's standard.

2. Microsoft formulated the Internet Explorer web browser to understand the HyperText Markup Language different than Netscape; web developers had to choose between developing for one, the other or both.

Microsoft has delivered incredible value for its customers. I have no doubt. But they have done that over the dead bodies of dozens of competitors. Microsoft's ability to create a new operating system version and be the only company to deliver productivity software for the platform is almost the heart of their advantage. Take it away!

If you look at every major Microsoft OS introduction of the last 10 years, Microsoft always delivers a new version of Office simultaneously. They are the only company that can and their competitors spend the next year catching up. Stop this!

The only way that true competition can be restored is if Microsoft's Operating System group is torn away from the Applications group. Break Microsoft up! Breaking Microsoft up into at least 2 and maybe more companies is the only way to restore competition in the software market. I bet if I wrote this in Microsoft Word you could read it, but if I wrote it in Lotus WordPro you couldn't!

Rich

Richard Saul, Engineer

POS Development
Kinko's Field Support Organization
richardsa@kinkos.com

MTC-00010825

From: Walt Perko
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:12pm
Subject: OS vs. Advertising portal?

Aloha,
I love Windows. However, my fear of MS has been growing with the growth of the Internet and Internet Portals. I don't want to upgrade to Windows XP for fear of a marketing blitz and a filtered Internet in it's very near future.

It should be written some basic laws of the Digital Domain—1.email falls under the same rules and procedures as snail mail
2.Operating Systems should be just that and no more, not attached to a 'Profiler' or 'Advertising Portal' unless we get the OS AND UltraBandWidth 'New Global Network' access FREE like broadcast TV. I should be able to do a search on the Internet like it was the Oxford English, American Heritage etc? Dictionaries and all the Encyclopedia's combined etc?

I should be able to do a search on the Internet and find a mailing address, email address, phone number etc. of anybody in the world. NO UNLISTED ENTRIES!

I should be able to be connected to the Internet and see who is connected to me at ALL TIMES!

I've been looking at Linux, it's not ready for prime-time yet, but getting close—but how much will it cost to move some of my very expensive software to run on it??? I'm hoping for a newer and better OS than Linux.

Check my creativity on iFilm.com and MP3.com . . . My goal is simple. To live a good life and know I've learned what is important to life and it's meaning . . . Walt Perko

It's not the bulls and bears you need to avoid—it's the bum steers.—Chuck Hillis

Whoever values peace of mind and the health of the soul will live the best of all possible lives.—Marcus Aurelius

Great people talk about ideas. Small people talk about other people.—Tobias S. Gibson

The person who makes a success of living is one who sees his goal steadily and aims for it unswervingly. That's dedication.—Cecil B. De Mille

The person who goes farthest is generally the one who is willing to do and dare. The sure-thing boat never gets far from shore.—Dale Carnegie

MTC-00010826

From: Himani Naresh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The Microsoft lawsuits have been a waste of taxpayer dollars and a huge burden to our IT sector. They have dragged on too long and should be settled as soon as possible. Having said that, I think the settlement is in the best interest of the American public because it

will allow Microsoft to focus on its own business and the IT sector to return to normal. Some of the terms of the agreement are a little harsh on Microsoft, but overall I think they are fair. Consumers and software developers have to be happy that Microsoft will be disclosing internal interface technology, and designing future versions of 'Windows' so that other vendors can promote their products from within the OS.

The nine states that are in opposition to the settlement are just showboating and should be reprimanded at the federal level. They have no right to continue this suit, which should not be handled at the states level anyway. Please stop the nine states from furthering the deterioration of our IT sector. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Himani Naresh

5306 Lake Washington Blvd. #H
Kirkland, WA 98008

MTC-00010827

From: Gideon Yuval
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:20pm
Subject: settlement

It would seem to me high time that that old MS lawsuit were finally settled.

Thanks

Gideon

MTC-00010828

From: Susan Gibson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:21pm
Subject: Judge Kollar Kotell
Judge Kollar Kotell-

I am writing to express my concern about the Justice Department's handling of the Microsoft case. I understand that the Tunney Act allows review of this decision, and I would like to express my concern about increasing Microsoft's power and monopoly through this decision. My understanding is that every court decision regarding Microsoft and its antitrust/monopoly activity has found that Microsoft abused its monopoly position to prevent competition and restrain free trade. These decisions have been found repeatedly in the judicial system over the past three years. I am very concerned that the Department of Justice is not punishing Microsoft nor moving to stop this behavior. It presents significant risk to free trade and other competitors to allow Microsoft to use their monopoly power to hold customers hostage and reduce their product choices. This sets a dangerous precedent. I believe Microsoft should be penalized for its long-standing antitrust abuses and prevented from exhibiting this behavior in the future. Other products/technologies/companies are at risk for their very existence if Microsoft is allowed to continue this anticompetitive behavior (products based on Java, Linux, AOL, the Mac, etc).

I hope you will take this under consideration in your decisions.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely-

Susan P. Gibson

Susan P. Gibson

President—Eve Group Inc.

1004 Windermere Avenue

Menlo Park, CA 94025
 ph 650 326-8073
 fax 650 326-8073
 cell 650 888-2646

MTC-00010829

From: Bill Zipfel
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The corrupt and criminal Clinton administration is thankfully over and the Executive Branch has been returned to honor. Because of the staggering turpitude of the Clinton administration, there is much work yet to be done to root out the continuing disgrace that it was. One large item on that list must be the settlement of the Microsoft case. I strongly support the settlement. Successful entrepreneurs who create thousands of jobs and add real value to our world ought to be praised and emulated, not sued and mocked.

Bill Zipfel

MTC-00010830

From: Patrick H. Corrigan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion, the DOJ settlement was a gift to Microsoft, not a punishment. Like the previous settlement DOJ settlement with Microsoft it only prevents behavior that is moot because the damage has been done and also allows practices that will tend to strengthen Microsoft's grip on the computer industry.

In every instance in which Microsoft has gained domination of a market segment innovation has ceased and prices have risen. Sometimes the price increases have been hidden in upgrade costs and changes to licensing terms, but the have increased none the less. Little new software is being developed because potential developers and investors know that if a new product is successful Microsoft will use its monopoly power to take over the market for that product. Microsoft is now using its might to make sure it dominates and controls the Internet.

Please find a way to reign them in.

Patrick H. Corrigan
 pcorrigan@corrigan-group.com

MTC-00010831

From: Jerry Burgen
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/14/02 2:25pm
 Subject: Settlements

Howdy,

Thanks for handling the Microsoft judgement this way. It bodes good for us all. In essence, what we've got here is that if I am found guilty of breaking any law of these United States, that if I don't agree with the outcome, that I also have the right to sit down with the prosecution and work out a solution that is agreeable with me, despite what the laws state, correct? Thanks for setting the precedence, this means that every supposed lawbreaker in the future will have the same opportunity to self adjust their punishment that you have given Microsoft. I'm sure that they will be glad to hear it. Oh, and does that also apply to the people that

have broken laws in the past, ie. racketeers, smugglers, etc? Keep up the good work.

Jerome Paul Burgen
 Honest Citizen of These United States
 jburgen@mediaone.net
 CC:'jburgen(a)mediaone.net'

MTC-00010832

From: Bill Buxton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:27pm
 Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

I feel sold out. I can not fathom by what degree of righteousness the DOJ can possibly think that a settlement of a few billion dollars constitutes justice. I have been around, or in, the computer industry since 1980 when I took my first programming class. Over the years I have watched with sadness as one company after another has sought to dominate (control) the industry. My greatest hopes were on Microsoft as they seemed to talk the talk of equity and fairness. Then, from my own experience, I learned that they were one of the worst offenders. They have sought the advantage of every loophole and trick to market their products and control competitors. I have even felt they broke the law in several instances where they sought to extend and embrace competitors, or persuaded companies that it would not be wise to market competing technologies.

The bottom line is that what they have done is illegal and immoral. To punish them with a simple fine draws short of preventing them or other companies from doing the same in the future. Microsoft should be broken up into smaller companies (OS, Desktop applications, Back Office or application integration, and web technologies) so that they do not have the ability to wield such influence to stifle future competition.

PS My view are my own and not those of the company I currently work for.

Bill Buxton
 Web/App Developer
 Miller Heiman Incorporated Tel:(775)827-4411 x257 [PST]
 1595 Meadow Wood Lane Fax:(775)827-5517
 Suite #2

mailto:bbuxton@millerheiman.com
 Reno, NV 89502 http://
 www.millerheiman.com
 <http://www.millerheiman.com/>
 CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00010833

From: Jane Griscti
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:31pm
 Subject: Settlement of little or no benefit to consumers

To the average user there is only one operating system available for PC's ... Microsoft. Most users are not even aware there are options. This is more than just 'branding'; MS has successfully wiped out any consciousness of choice in the operating system market. Their success places developers in a bind; if most of the installed base is MS then they must write applications for MS. Often these applications don't have the newest feature displayed by MS developed applications. This in turn pushes

consumers to use MS applications and MS NEVER writes applications for non-MS platforms.

Developers end up in a Catch-22 situation. The consumer doesn't become aware of competing products because the hot applications get written for MS first then MS releases a newer 'hotter' application taking advantage of the latest MS operating system bells and whistles (known about by MS internal developers) and the external developers play catch up. In the end, the MS operating system becomes the only playing field; one slanted heavily in MS's favour.

Application and Middleware development need to be spun off in to an independent company. As well, the new company should be encouraged to write software for non-MS operating systems as well as MS systems. Not only will that open up the operating system playing field but also the application software field. Then maybe consumer's will begin to learn that PC does not equal MS.

Jane Griscti
 jane@janeg.ca

MTC-00010834

From: Pam Dvorak
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 2:32pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement/Comments under the Tunney Act

The attached file contains my comments on this settlement. Thank you-Pamela J. Dvorak

Pamela J. Dvorak
 612 Woodleave Road
 Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-2921
 610-526-2216 / fax 610-526-2886 /
 pjd190@hotmail.com
 U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft
 Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001
 January 14, 2002

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am pleased that the Microsoft Antitrust case has finally nearing completion. After three years of litigation, it is time. Microsoft can once again focus on what it does best-product development, driving a successful business.

The broad range of the settlement [restrictions and obligations on Microsoft that extend products and technologies not even at issue in the original lawsuit] represents Microsoft's willingness to bend backward to see this case rectified and settled. With Windows XP, Microsoft has already carried out modifications listed within the agreement, making it easier for computer makers, software developers and consumers to reconfigure their Windows setup at any time. In addition to that, Microsoft has also agreed to supply to the competition its protocols used to operate Microsoft's server operating system, allowing opposing software companies to make their products compatible, should they choose to do so.

Microsoft's compliance will be monitored carefully, thus precluding future violations. This may be 'preaching to the choir', but I never felt that the company should have been punished for being competitive- and doing well. The American way is for the market to judge the value of the product. Not everyone

can be on top. From my view, this Operating System made this technology user-friendly and accessible to a great segment of the population. Thank you in advance for your support of this [dare I hope] final settlement. Sincerely,

Pamela J. Dvorak
cc: Senator Rick Santorum Senator Arlen Specter

MTC-00010835

From: Stephen Marney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:33pm
Subject: I don't like the proposed MSFT settlement

No, not one little itsy bit, I don't!
You guys aren't doing your jobs as far I'm concerned.
Stephen Marney

MTC-00010836

From: Tracker@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:33pm
Subject: Microsoft—another word for dictatorship

I would like to present a few comments regarding the proposed settlement offered by Microsoft Corporation in its court case. I firmly believe that Microsoft Corporation has a commitment to a policy of world domination in the computer realm. All the past actions of Microsoft indicate that the company has an embedded policy of control of the computer and computer software industries to the end that Microsoft products will be the only products available to the computer using world.

Microsoft has engaged in manipulation of software functioning and content through financial actions such as purchasing the rights to programs and then suppressing the functions and content by deliberately denying those functions and content to computer users by not including those functions and contents in Microsoft products. Functions and content have also been altered so that they will not perform as originally created to perform, or have been so altered that they will not perform in any venue except a Microsoft venue, thereby denying their usefulness to the computer using public.

An example of these actions is plainly visible in the recent information release of the proposed WMA programs and devices. WMA programs are designed to deliberately alter MP3 sound files so the files will no longer perform properly on an MP3 device. The resultant WMA converted file will only perform properly on a WMA device and cannot be reverted back to its original form because of the proprietary programming that Microsoft has created.

This move, creating a completely incompatible MP3 alteration program, indicates that Microsoft Corporation intends to invade the MP3 device market with an overwhelming effort. The intention could be to eliminate all MP3 market devices and replace them with WMA devices which are the intellectual and marketing property of Microsoft, thereby creating another monopolistic situation.

Microsoft Corporation will attempt to assuage the concerns of individuals and

government offices by stating that their devices work in conjunction with PC format computers and are an enhancement for those devices. Microsoft will not admit that the MP3 alteration program is irreversible or that it will be made available to the buying public as a "loss leader" sale item. Microsoft Corporation should not be permitted to continue its policy of domination through repression and denial. Microsoft should be forced to reveal the source code being used in its programs so that free enterprise developers will have the opportunities to create products and software that competes freely with Microsoft products.

Microsoft should be forced to separate the functions of software program creation and computer operating system production to enable private enterprise development of competing products.

The penalty phase of this issue should be made effective against Microsoft and cause the corporation to make appropriate redress of the wrongs it has already committed. Microsoft should not be permitted to continue to defraud the government and the courts by "giving" Microsoft products and software to a market area that Microsoft has not had a history of effective past presence. Allowing Microsoft to buy its way out of any penalty by "donating" outdated and refurbished equipment and software to schools is not an effective penalty. It only allows Microsoft to freely establish itself in an area and provides further domination of the computer market by creating a situation where children would be exposed to only Microsoft products and programs. This would help to create another market segment, the children become future Microsoft product users through their introduction and indoctrination to those products while in school, which would ensure the monopoly that Microsoft is attempting to continue.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I hope that a sensible and proper adjudication of the monopoly suit will be reached and that proper penalties will be assessed against Microsoft Corporation for its egregious business practices.

Ronald Steinke
701 Bradford Court
Chico, CA 95926-8768

MTC-00010837

From: HP Authorized Customer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:35pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Attorney General:

I think people are after Microsoft because Microsoft is a successful company and has plenty of money. Why penalize success?

I notice ever since the government started with charging Microsoft with wrongdoing we've been in a recession.

Microsoft wanted to donate one billion dollars and they don't think that's enough. Give me a break!

Respectfully yours
Richard Diamond
CC:Microsoft's Freedom To Innovate Network

MTC-00010838

From: Jacy Odin Grannis

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Your Honor; Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing out of deep concern about the proposed settlement plan. It is my contention that the settlement focuses on remedying what are, in the end, minor issues and does not begin to address the larger issue of Microsoft's true impact on the competitive landscape.

As noted in the findings of the court, Microsoft is a monopoly. The most damaging aspect of this is Microsoft's ability to unilaterally set de facto standards for the computing industry. Microsoft argues that by so doing, it is acting in the public interest. Certainly standards do benefit the industry, but it is also certainly not true that Microsoft is uniquely capable of coming up with the best standard. In fact, it is easy to demonstrate that Microsoft is not truly using this power to improve matters for the consumer, but to further extend its own monopoly. For example, RealAudio was one of the first products to offer streaming media for the Internet. It would not be a stretch to say that, at one time, it was the de facto standard. Microsoft saw that it was behind in the game, but rather than working to improve the standard that existed, it came up with its own proprietary standard that would require the use of its products and which would only run on Windows. Not only that, but it began to bundle its own player as the default player with Windows. Now, while Microsoft's Media Player may, now, be technically the match of other media players, but at the time it was not. However, consumers have demonstrated time and time again that what matters most to the majority is not technical superiority, per se, but convenience. Thus, though Microsoft's player might not have been the best; it was already there, and more or less did the job, so they consumers used it if they could. If Microsoft did not have this huge advantage, however, it is very questionable whether their product could have survived. Nonetheless, it did, and now RealAudio is engaged in a pitched (and, it seems, losing) battle to get users to use its products.

There are other very similar examples such as Netscape, Outlook Express, and MSN Messenger. In each case, Microsoft started behind the competition with an inferior product. However, by bundling their product with the operating system and by, in effect, dumping their product for free, they overtook other competitors whose main revenue was selling a competing product.

Microsoft Office is another huge cornerstone in the monopoly. It has, itself, become a standard. It helps reinforce the Windows monopoly. Anecdotally, and speaking only for myself, I can say that I have become very frustrated with Windows over the past several years. It is not nearly as stable as I would like, and it has too much baggage that slows it down. However, I find that I am unable to drop it entirely and go to Linux (which is a technically superior system) largely because I use Microsoft Office, and it is not available on Linux. I am certain that I am not the only person in that position, though I can not offer statistics to

demonstrate what sort of population I represent. However, the point remains that there is a demand for other operating systems. An independent company would likely want to meet that demand, to give users the software they want on whatever platform they want to run. But Microsoft, which has become a monopoly in so many areas of the software industry, has a disincentive to meet that demand. Rather than develop new versions of their programs for other operating systems, they continue to develop almost solely for Windows. Their statements to the contrary, this is not because of any technical superiority enjoyed by Windows. Their only motivation is to further the Windows monopoly.

In the end, these examples become self-reinforcing. Microsoft Windows enjoys a monopoly position in the operating systems market. Microsoft develops new standards that require the user to be running Microsoft Windows. It pushes these standards and creates new monopolies by bundling its technologies with the operating system. It enjoys other monopoly positions with other products, such as Office. It concentrates its development of these products mostly or exclusively on Windows (Microsoft's support of the Mac is laughable, and only exists to give it a chance to say they aren't doing what they're doing). This reinforces their Windows monopoly. Since users have to have Windows to run software they need, such as Office, they use Windows. Other companies know that users have to be running Windows, so they develop for it. This furthers the OS monopoly of Microsoft. In the end, though, everyone but Microsoft loses. They can dominate any market they enter by virtue of their sheer size and position. All the other companies are forced to scrape along in niche markets because they can't really compete with the position Microsoft has built for itself.

The proposed settlement fails to remedy this situation. Even with the settlement remedies in place, Microsoft will still be able to bundle new products and technologies in to Windows, stifling competition. Indeed, this is currently going on. Microsoft has decided that it does not want to support Java because it does not have proprietary control over it. So it has created a new language, C#, as a competitor. Their whole .NET strategy is a prime example of Microsoft using its position to further its monopoly. And there is nothing in the settlement that will prevent them from continuing to pursue this strategy.

What, then, is the remedy? First of all, Microsoft must be broken up. Windows should become its own company. Office should become its own company. And the rest of Microsoft's products should go in to a third company. Secondly, Microsoft should be forced to devote equal development resources to developing its applications, especially Office, for an alternate platform. Preferably this would be Linux, but the Mac OS X would do as well. Thirdly, Microsoft Windows source code should be released to the public. Not as free code, but on an open source license that allows people to see the code for free, but requires them to pay a license fee if they want to use it. Finally, the different companies that emerge from

Microsoft should be forbidden from entering into any collaborations with each other whatsoever for a period of five years.

Thank you for your time.
Jacy Grannis
Senior Software Engineer
Questia Media, Inc.

MTC-00010839

From: Westly.Schmidt@bankofamerica.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern,
I strongly oppose the proposed final judgement because it:

Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected;

Fails to remedy the injury done to the JavaTM technology community;

Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market;

Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system;

Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism. Furthermore, Microsoft is a monopoly and has used that monopoly position to force others out of business or to bend to fit their desires. This approach is EXTREMELY destructive to business where competition is in the best interests of everyone (except Microsoft) involved. The the proposed final judgement is a joke, a slap in the face to anyone with enough education or experience to know what they are trying to get away with. It is pure ignorance, or a desire to profit from the demise of our society, that would enable anyone to accept the terms of the proposed final judgement as being just. For everyones sake, including (albiet, against its will) Microsoft's, do not accept the proposed final judgement.

Sincerely,
Westly Schmidt

MTC-00010840

From: Ron (038) Tynna
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:40pm
Subject: Re: Microsoft
Ronald Davis
412 S Vine Street
Wichita, KS 67213
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

As I read the paper, I get more and more concerned over the status of our economy. Since I know that the technology industry has a great deal to do with the status of our economy, I get concerned over items like the recent Microsoft developments. I was obviously surprised to find out that Microsoft is being delayed even further. After three years of negotiations, it is ridiculous to dissect this agreement any further. The

governments of the US and Kansas State have many other things to worry about, and should not be wasting our resources on a battle that has already been won.

The terms of this agreement have not only been well thought out, but include many substantial changes to which Microsoft has agreed to. Some of these changes include business-related topics such as licensing and marketing, but even extend to engineering, design, and documentation of intellectual property. As we let these terms speak for themselves, we allow the IT sector to work together and focus on maintaining our place in the global market. This is important to the consumer, our technology industry, and our economy as a whole.

Help support our technology industry. We need to get back to business and continue with the innovation that has made us great. Please help stop any further action against this settlement.

Sincerely,
Ronald Davis

MTC-00010841

From: Santiago Alfaro Tornero
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:37pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Escribir estas notas en castellano. Creo que sobre todo lo relacionado con el caso Microsoft hay una cuesti?n clave: para que se cree tecnolog?a y haya investigaci?n, que cuando se aplique lugar a avances para todos, es crucial tener campo donde trabajar e innovar. Lo que tristemente est? ocurriendo es que Microsoft est? comprando cualquier innovaci?n que se produce en el campo de las tecnolog?as de la informaci?n en cualquier lugar del mundo, y con ello, hace que muera la ilusi?n de las personas por dise?ar algo nuevo y las empresas pertenecer a Microsoft. Si hay un pa?s en el mundo que entiende el valor de las personas por luchar por algo propio, ese es Estados Unidos.

Si seguimos as?, va a ser tan dif?cil invertir en Tecnolog?as de la Informaci?n que nadie lo va a intentar, y con ello va a perderse la impresionante innovaci?n que proviene de las personas y las empresas peque?as con capacidad de crear nuevas formas de hacer. No creo que sirvan para nada estas l?neas, ya que lo que mueve el mundo son los intereses ego?stas de grandes conglomerados industriales.

Me conformo con recibir una notificaci?n v?a correo electr?nico de que alguien por lo menos ha le?do estas l?neas.

Muchas gracias.

MTC-00010842

From: Christian BAYER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

I think it is very apparent the proposed Microsoft settlement neglects some significant areas. It does nothing to; prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future, spark competition in the software industry or deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains. I believe the judicial system is required to insure these types of remedies are made when violations of anti-trust laws occur. I

believe the evidence of Microsoft's gross disregard for conducting itself in a legal manner and the costly detriment consumers have suffered should compel an attempt to uphold the law rather than brushing it aside, as seems to be happening. Other concerns regarding the exposure of children to Microsoft's products are additional issues. If the judicial system does not seek to enforce the laws of the United States, what purpose does it serve?

Christian Bayer

MTC-00010843

From: Isaac Ordonez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that allowing Microsoft to push its monopoly into schools as punishment for its monopoly is down right stupid. This company get away with murder and needs to be punished fully. I think the original ruling to break up the company allow companies with actually working products to flood the market. Please do not allow Old bill to rule my Microwave, Video games, Computer, TV, Internet, Car, and even bed. They are taking it too far and should stick to making an OS and office suite.

Isaac Ordonez
Technology Support Specialist II
San Rafael City Schools

MTC-00010844

From: Andre Azaroff
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sirs,

I am opposed to the proposed settlement the DOJ has made with Microsoft. It does nothing to punish or prevent any of the predatory business practices Microsoft has been found guilty of.

I also feel it is deplorable that the judicial (and apparently the executive) branch of our government is for sale and has been bought. Also that it is for sale only to a select few now that the republicans are back in power. Yes, the republicans who supposedly pride themselves on being the law and order group in Washington. I guess the old adage is true that the law only applies to those who can't afford it. The end result of your current actions in this case certainly show that anyone with enough money or clout or connections may choose to ignore any law they see fit (whether or not the law is just is a different matter, it still is a law) and that once a verdict is handed down, if the defendant disagrees with it, he may negotiate a different verdict. This is very disturbing. I would hate to think that this lawsuit will now be cited as precedent in criminal cases allowing murderers and rapists to be able to negotiate lesser sentences.

The settlement negotiated with Microsoft will do nothing to curtail their unfair business practices. Particularly the Microsoft "TAX" everyone pays for buying a new PC. The tax I am referring to is the licensing that is added to almost all new PCs sold, even if there are absolutely no Microsoft products installed on them. This I find particularly disturbing. Since the PC manufacturers have

absolutely no recourse or protection from Microsoft's ability to pull their windows license without any infractions to their business arrangement with Microsoft. I could go on (point by point) but I feel I have expressed my opinion.

Andre Azaroff
St. Onge Company
1400 Williams Road
York PA 17402
Phone: 717 840-8181 ext. 8075
Fax: 717 840-8182
Website: www.stonge.com

MTC-00010845

From: Michael Sean Goppold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Since Microsoft got away with illegally bundling middleware programs, and is a monopoly, further distribution for the next few years of Microsoft Windows Operating Systems should be prohibited from containing such bundled middleware programs, either through discount or use of freeware.

Hardware vendors must give at least 5 choices other than MS Windows, with full interoperability of its hardware.

Other than that, the proposal I feel does do a lot for the time being. I agree with most of the terms of the proposal. Since Microsoft's monopoly is illegal, in case that after the duration of the judgement Microsoft still has ways to run a monopoly on the software scene, perhaps a more generic, more widely applicable set of rules for competitive software distribution will be necessary.

Thanks for considering my opinions.
Mike Goppold

MTC-00010846

From: Mike
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:02pm
Subject: No Deals for Bill

Its incredible to see how some want to continue to coddle Bill Gates and Microsoft. This is the biggest antitrust case since Standard Oil. Instead of considering ways to extend their monopoly into the education system, we should be formulating ways to remove their unfair advantage and punish them for their predatory, imperialistic business practices. A couple of suggests: open source the operating system code; break up the company by OS, Applications, Development Environments and Internet; and apply punitive damages commiserate with past damages and future earnings of its victims. Here's a chance to put real competition back into the software and operating systems business, don't blow it!

MTC-00010847

From: Gregory Brewer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gregory Brewer
1227 SW 149th Lane
Sunrise, FL 33326
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gregory A. Brewer

MTC-00010848

From: Jon Viscott
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jon Viscott
8581 Santa Monica Blvd.
West Hollywood, CA 90069
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jon Viscott

MTC-00010849

From: Jo Ann Sedars
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 2:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jo Ann Sedars
3714 North Shore Drive
Clear Lake, IA 50428
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jo Ann Sedars

MTC-00010850

From: Penney Williams
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 2:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Penney Williams
4946 Mathews Ave
Indianapolis, IN 46227-4223
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Penney Williams

MTC-00010851

From: Lucia Foley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:19pm
Subject: Bonanza

The proposed "punishment" for Microsoft seems, in fact, to be a marketing bonanza for the company that facilitates the sort of non-competitive actions the firm is to be sanctioned for. This makes absolutely no sense whatsoever, and will simply assist Microsoft in killing the competition for once and for all—and far more rapidly than they could on their own. The existence of other operating systems such as Apple and Linux is essential for encouraging innovation and keeping pricing competitive.

Lucia Foley
Lucia Foley
Director of Communications
Hampshire Educational Collaborative
97 Hawley Street
Northampton, MA 01060
413-586-4900 x109 / 413-586-0180 fax
www.collaborative.org
e-mail: info@collaborative.org

MTC-00010852

From: W. Nathaniel Mills, III
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please read my note below originally sent to Richard Blumenthal, AG, State of CT.

Thank you,
Nat.

Forwarding...

Monday, January 14, 2002 3:16 PM

To: "W. Nathaniel Mills, III"

<nat@classobjects.com>

cc:

Subject: Re: Thanks for not supporting DOJ cave-in to MS

"W. Nathaniel Mills, III" wrote:

It makes me proud to reside in a state not afraid to seek justice, regardless of the potential political fallout. Please continue to pursue litigation against Microsoft. They have done so much to constrain innovation in the personal (and now business) computer marketplace, it would be a shame to see them walk away with little more than a slap on the wrist. The first question investors ask small technology companies seeking funds is "what will you do when Microsoft replicates your technology and offers it for free?" How

can you counter such a question, unless you believe you have some remedy in the courts to be protected from such aggressive, monopolistic behavior?

Best Regards, Nat
W. Nathaniel Mills, III
16 Deer Hill Lane
Coventry, CT, 06238
860 742 7646

Dear Mr. Mills:

Thank you for your recent thoughtful correspondence concerning the Microsoft antitrust case.

As you know, on November 6, 2001, the United States Department of Justice and Microsoft filed a proposed settlement. I did not join that settlement because I do not believe it would accomplish the goals we set when we filed the case. Nor would it accomplish the remedial goals set by the U.S. Court of Appeals: (1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future, (2) to spark competition in this industry; and (3) to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains.

You may also express your opinion to the judge of the federal trial court considering this settlement by filing written comments with the United States Department of Justice by January 28, 2002, as follows:

Mail: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530-0001

[NOTE: Given recent mail delivery interruptions in Washington, DC, and current uncertainties involving the resumption of timely mail service, the Department of Justice strongly encourages that comments be submitted via e-mail or fax.]

E-mail: 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

Please keep me informed of your opinions on the case.

Thank you again for contacting me.

Sincerely,
Richard Blumenthal
Attorney General

MTC-00010853

From: john@murphy.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to get on with business. Please accept the settlement that has been reached between Microsoft, the DOJ, and nine states. This bickering is a problem for our economy which is in a tenuous state right now. Let it go!

AGREE TO THE SETTLEMENT ALREADY REACHED AND STOP THE CONTINUING PROSECUTION OF MICROSOFT.

Thank you.

John Murphy
109 Pine Wood Lane
Los Gatos, CA 95032
John Murphy

MTC-00010854

From: Dguildner@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:31pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I wonder how many millions is being spent of taxpayers money to continue the case against Microsoft. Is the government really concerned about monopoly now after they have made a ruling, or is it just politics and competitors getting their state governments to continue on for the special interest of those companies? I am weary of it. Let it go and let the people benefit rather than use taxpayers money to pay for the competitors wish lists.

Diane Guildner

MTC-00010855

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR,microsoftcomments
@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

Date: 1/14/02 3:32pm

Subject: ; Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

I am a 20 year software executive who has had the opportunity to both partner with Microsoft and compete against Microsoft during my career. As such, I have spent time in Redmond, WA and gotten to know firsthand both the culture, and Machiavellian management philosophy that has been a legacy at Microsoft.

In recent days, I have come to know through an ex-colleague some of the details relating to the Proposed Settlement made by the Justice Department with Microsoft, and to say the least, I am displeased by them. This is why I am writing to you today.

Your Honor, how could the Justice Department grant Microsoft a government-mandated monopoly of the software industry and even worse—other technology markets? Clearly, this decision would seriously jeopardize all competitors—both now and in the future. This decision would clearly violate some basic principals of Capitalism, such as our right to choose, our right to fair competition, fair pricing, etc.

In closing, your Honor, I submit to you that like never before in our Country's history, Microsoft has unequivocally shown itself to be the proverbial 800 pound gorilla. Their illegal conduct and activities (bribing & threatening partners and competitors) have been proven time and time again. I would like to see Microsoft be brought to justice for the good of our country, our economy, and most of all- the good of our people. I like millions of other Americans are counting on you, and counting on justice to prevail.

Respectfully,
Joseph Cortale
Senior Vice President of Sales
jcortale@eloquent.com
Eloquent

2000 Alameda de Las Pulgas
Suite 100
San Mateo CA 94403
Tel: (650) 294-6474
www.eloquent.com

This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete all copies.

MTC-00010856

From: Ken McFadden

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom this may concern:

I am a System Administrator and am appalled by the Settlement against Microsoft. Even today, MicroSoft is still trying to impose and force Windows products on all users (this is evident in their latest OS's in their implementation of MIT's Kerberos and LDAP). In today's "Hell'ter Skelter" world of terrorism, it is more imperative that Corporate America be able to secure their computer systems to the highest degree.

Kerberos is one product that allows that higher security needed today regardless of the platform. MicroSoft has once again embedded a standard into their OS, but doing what they know best, and that is disabling it from working with the true standard. As soon as someone devised a solution to higher security along with a means where Windows and Unix machines could talk between each other and maintain common user ID's and Passwords, Microsoft has to block it and once again making it impossible for users to have both Microsoft and Unix products together (or impose Microsoft's solutions to enable it to work).

Every Computer Professional in the US is tuned into the issue with MicroSoft's Monopoly case, of which we are broken into 2 groups. One who only uses MicroSoft products and is ignorant to their practices. And the other who use both types of platforms. As myself, I work for Lockheed Martin, which contracts to the Government, and due to reliability and security reasons we are required to use Unix on certain applications. MicroSoft continuously makes my job harder day to day.

If Microsoft is allowed to continue practicing these methods where one day everyone gets fed-up and moves to Microsoft, thus allowing a tremendous hole in our Corporate America and National Security. As it is Microsoft products are known to be very buggy. Microsoft needs to concentrate on improving the reliability of their current products before attempting to mess-up others with reliable products in an attempt to block others from making a buck.

I pray that regardless of what Microsoft may throw your way to muddy up the water, you will stay true to what is best for this Nation. Personnel opinion is Microsoft should be split where they could focus on Operating Systems only thereby improving the product for all customers.

Sincerely,
Kenneth M. McFadden

MTC-00010857

From: Peg and Phil Walker

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We believe the government suit against Microsoft has gone on long enough. It has been very expensive and we fail to see how it has served the interest of the public.

Sincerely,
Philip & Margaret Walker
2435 Felt Street #118
Santa Cruz CA 95062

MTC-00010858

From: WKOPPE5955@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

THE SETTLEMENT IS VERY FAIR-UNDER ATTORNEY JANET RENO CLINTONITE INVESTIGATIONS WERE STOPPED WITH OUT JUST CAUSE REOPEN ALL.THIS LIBERAL THINKING CAUSED 911.ONLY A COMMUNIST THINKS GOVERNMENT SHOULD CONTROL A FREE MARKET.ARE YOU ONE STOP BEING ANTIBUSINESS AND ANTIAMERICAN.AOL CHANGED THE MARKET SHARE WITH PURCHASE OF NETSCAPE AND THE CONSUMER WAS NOT HURT.IT IS TIME FOR YOU ALLEDGED EDUCATED PEOPLE TO GO BACK TO SCHOOL AND STOP BEING A CLINTON FOOL.BILL GATES AND THE INTERNET ARE AMERICAS NUMBER 1 INDUSTRY AND HE IS LEADING THE WAY AND THIS MAN WILL STAY AT HIS SIDE ALL THE WAY AND THEN SOME.ONLY ONE QUESTION ARE YOU7 A VETERAN IF NOT SIT DOWN AND ZIP THE LIP LIBERAL-I AM PROUD TO BE A REAGAN REPUBLICAN AMERICAN BORN VETERAN WHOSE FAMILY CAME HERE IN 1742 AND LEAD THE WAY WITH COMPETITION AS PRESIDENT LINCLON STATED A SOCIETY LIKE OURS MUST AN SHALL REMAIN FREE.AS A GRADUATE IN BUSINESS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO THE PEOPLE HAVE DECIDED ACCEPT THE DEAL DECERTIFY THE CLASS ACTION FROM THIS POINT WHERE THE REMAINING IDIOTS PAY FOR THEIR STUPIDITY.FOR THE RECORD I NOTE JIM RYAN ATTORNEY GENERAL FELT THE DEAL WAS ACCEPTABLE.THIS MAN WILL BE REWARD FOR HIS UNDERSTANDING YOU CAN ADDRESS HIM GOVERNOR JAMES RYAN-THE GOOD RYAN-END OF THIS STORY AND GOD GETS THE GLORY-END THIS UNAMERICAN ERA NOW AND THAT GENTLEMEN WILL BE THE ORDER-ASK SLICK WILLY WHAT HAPPENED TO HIS LAW LICENSE AND LEGALLY HE ADMITTED LYING WHAT ABOUT THE RENO GROUP WE AMERICANS WANT THE TRUTH AND THIS IS A DEMAND TO REVIEW JANET RENO AND ALL THE LAWYERS UNDER HER SUPERVISION FOR ANY AND ALL RICO VIOLATIONS BECAUSE THEIR SEEMS TO BE AN APPARENT MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE AND MALICIOUS PROSECUTION.START THGE INVESTIGATION TODAY WIRTHOUT HESITATION THANK YO

MTC-00010859

From: morgwyn@willmar.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is in the best interest of our national and international economic enterprises that Microsoft is allowed to continue to bring innovative value to consumers through the content of it s products and services while also providing existing and new business opportunities for the global economic good.

MTC-00010860

From: gstrange@carolina.rr.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time for the suit against Microsoft to be over. The Justice Department should accept the settlement and encourage all the other States to do the same so that our economy can recover.

MTC-00010861

From: deggansr@mbxinc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

What the courts came up with is fine. Let's get on with business.

MTC-00010862

From: blackshack1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's been resolved. Get on with it.

MTC-00010863

From: ceo@ltu.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For the past ten years I have been President of a high tech university in Michigan. Earlier in my career I practiced anti-trust law in Washington DC mostly before the FTC and the DC Circuit. I believe the proposed settlement should be approved. While it is more than the law requires and is ill advised it will at least put the matter behind us. The anti-trust laws are intended to protect markets and consumers not competitors. Regardless of proven monopolistic behavior there has been no showing of harm to markets or consumers. When viewing the loci of the Ps this remaining prosecution itself sounds of champerty on the surface and its sanctions threaten the vitality of technological innovation in this country which will put us at a global competitive disadvantage. My attorney general saw the importance of this competitiveness to Michigan a state which is key to keeping America economically strong and agrees with my recommendation.

MTC-00010865

From: SandraKallander@mediaone.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As I am not a stockholder in any of the companies involved I don't think I or the government has any business in this matter at all. The consumer me has more power than Microsoft and the government put together. We are not threatened or endangered. You are being used.

S.

MTC-00010866

From: jharrison@dataworks-nc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern: I support the settlement crafted between Microsoft and the US DOJ. I don't feel the case was warranted from its inception. Millions of taxpayers

dollars have been unjustly spent in a lawsuit that was targeted at protecting the competitors of Microsoft not consumer best interest. I do believe that some of Microsoft's licensing practices and their heavy-handed approach in working with OEM system builders were in question. The trial and settlement did make progress in that area despite the process being in efferent at accomplishing these specific goals. After being in the technology industry for well over 12 years now I can honestly say that the actions of the DOJ did not reflect the best interest of consumers the technology industry or this nation as a whole. At this point in time proceeding with the settlement and curtailing the actions of the remaining litigation against Microsoft would be the best action taken for all involved.

Sincerely
Jason S. Harrison

MTC-00010867

From: storrsdewolf@worldnet.att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This country is so much better off because of Microsoft's development of software that everyone can use. It is because it is easy to use and because just about everyone who works with computers uses common software that Microsoft has been so successful. This is not monopolistic! Settle and let Microsoft and their competitors get on with developing new and even better software instead of spending so much time on this suit.

John DeWolf

MTC-00010868

From: chiefrob2@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I personally think the economy has been greatly effected by the government's attempt to break up Microsoft. It appears to me that the people who work hard and are successful or that contribute anything to society are punished for their efforts. It is time the producers benefit for a change and in the process the people as a whole will benefit. I say it is time to let this thing go.

MTC-00010869

From: chynadahll1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough you've gotten your pound of flesh from Microsoft. And their competitors are seeking the elimination of Microsoft because Microsoft was a leader in the field and they want only to use the Government to get Microsoft out of their way. And the TAX payers are tired of footing the bill even if you claim the Litigants are footing all the costs. There could be better use of the Judges time on more pertinent cases.

MTC-00010870

From: expressflowers@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hereby strongly endorse this settlement. thank you

MTC-00010871

From: drittler@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Discontinue any further action against Microsoft.

MTC-00010872

From: beefydave@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To R. Hesse People with more education than I have come up with the decision on the Microsoft thing and therefore it must be as close to the fairest of outcomes concerning everyone effected. I suppose in another 20 years or so we'll really know.

MTC-00010873

From: donamill@bellsouth.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle with Microsoft as soon as possible. enough is enough. Let private enterprise live thrive and be free of government control.

MTC-00010874

From: bigmagic@modempool.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I guess you can call it a win for Microsoft but I call it a compromise in Capitalism and Freedom. The US was founded on the principles of Capitalism and Freedom and we should strive to maintain those principles. When IBM ran the PC show and everything you bought had to be IBM compatible no one complained except for the consumers. Microsoft came along and made a better product much cheaper and easier to use and suddenly we have a problem...we have a monopoly not unlike IBM had but because some politicians are in IBM's pockets the DOJ was suckered into taking a communistic act.... We have to break up Microsoft. Because of this action the US economy was thrown into a recession. The suit can argue all they want but many of us knew when we heard of the DOJ's plans exactly what would happen. If I were to cause such an action that would affect the entire country I would be in prison. A win for Microsoft? Maybe. We will see.

MTC-00010875

From: carnut1965@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it concerns: Prolonging the case against Microsoft is a waste of tax payers money. This litigation has gone on long enough. Microsoft's competitors should take the money they are spending to prolong this litigation should be used to improve and research products to compete with Microsoft. They are sore losers because they didn't come up with the ideas first.

MTC-00010876

From: longuski@juno.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement with Microsoft is VERY appropriate. I am tired of competitors who are not willing to work at competition tying up our court system only to cause a higher cost to the consumer. Let s see the courts start working on some real issues!!!

MTC-00010877

From: cu8@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft offer for settlement should be accepted and a closure to this case. The case is slowing down a industry.

MTC-00010878

From: dfessen@tetrinet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let the verdict stand. Our Gov.hounded the Auto Industry so that Imports are taking more and more market share. Let s NOT REPEAT!

MTC-00010879

From: dstev55539@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is fair. Any company in the past had the opportunity to come up with an operational system if they had wanted to the only one was linux who has a lot of faithful followers. This agreement allows competition from all who want to participate. Do whats right and settle it now.

MTC-00010880

From: BelzAcadmy@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let the decision stand as it is presently settled. Sincerely Andrea Belz

MTC-00010881

From: flapolecat@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: It is with great regret that I see this problem is not fully resolved. As a senior citizen and retired living on income derived from investments it is of the utmost concern that this problem is finally resolved. Although I personally would not have agreed to the terms of the agreement they being very bad for an industry based on innovation since Microsoft feels they can continue to support the public under these restrictions the matter should be settled for the good of the consumer and the country.
Fred Budukiewicz

MTC-00010882

From: texmur01@interserv.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the finding of the DOJ and support finalizing the case as is. I sent two page fax last week explaining why.

MTC-00010883

From: dheckh@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The last thing our economy and the entire high tech sector needs is more uncertainty and regulation.

Please settle this lawsuit and end the persecution of Microsoft. This litigation has caused more financial hardship to thousands (probably millions) of stockholders and to the economy than anything Microsoft could ever have done. It s time to move on and let Microsoft get back to the business of doing what they do best—making life better for all of us. Klara Hunt

MTC-00010884

From: blw50@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave the man alone he has done more for the computer world and everyone else is jealous of it this is a free enterprize country isn t it. What a waste of money the people of this country has had to spend to do all of this court bussiness on MS.

MTC-00010885

From: billsuehop@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this misguided suit against Microsoft. The computer industry has benefitted greatly by Microsoft there is no reason to continue to persecut this company. Stop wasting Microsoft s and our country s time and money and end this suit. Sincerely William M. Hopper

MTC-00010886

From: huntingbeagles@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It s my strong belief that this settlement is in the best interest of everyone—the technology industry the economy and especially consumers. Since the settlement newspaper editorials from across the nation and across the ideological spectrum have endorsed the settlement. Microsoft competitors shouldn t be holding up this settlement. We can t allow greedy companies to hold up progress.

Sincerely
Cosmo Stallone

MTC-00010887

From: sthompson292811MI@comcast.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is a sad day for american businesses and the general public if the courts of this land allow competitors to sue because they can not build a better mouse trap and courts order a these companies from building better mouse traps. Where would this country be today if the courts stifled every inventive thought just because somebody else yelled foul. Stop this insanity now and get this

country back on the road that was laid out for use by our founding fathers.

MTC-00010888

From: bskoehler@bellsouth.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to end this on-going legal battle. A society that chooses Capitalism believes in an economic system marked by a free market and open competition in which goods are produced for profit labor is performed for wages and the means of production & distribution are privately owned. Microsoft is a formidable competitor that is to be admired. May the best company with the best products & services succeed!!

MTC-00010889

From: tee@nonantum.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Take the settlement with Microsoft! I m so sick of this dragging on—for what? Some jealous competitors who whine? Focus efforts where it s really needed not in the already-competitive world of technology.

MTC-00010890

From: dwb15@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please approve the settlement made between the federal government and various state attorneys general with Microsoft. Enough already!!!

MTC-00010891

From: bstawink1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Do not attempt to change the current court decision of Nov. 2001

MTC-00010893

From: Chris Norloff
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I oppose the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I find the proposed settlement weak, and not in the customers' best interests. The proposed settlement will not ensure competition in the marketplace, and will not restrain Microsoft from further monopolistic practices.

thank you,
Chris Norloff
508 N. West St.
Falls Church, VA
22046-2517

MTC-00010894

From: pmurphre@indiana.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed settlement being considered in the case against Microsoft. Not only will the settlement in its current form do nothing to restrict Microsoft's monopoly, it does not

actually punish the corporation for a crime of which it has already been found guilty. Therefore, the settlement should include components that force Microsoft to open its documentation so that other companies can design software to make the computer industry truly competitive. This is the reasoning behind antitrust laws, is it not. Furthermore, Microsoft must be stopped from including their software as a prepackaged part of virtually every personal computer on the market these days. I chose not to use the Windows operating system and was extremely distressed when attempting to buy a new computer that I had to subsidize Microsoft with the purchase price of my computer since I could not find one in any mainstream store that did not come with Microsoft software pre-installed. This is an intolerable and monopolistic practice that should be stopped. As a concerned consumer, citizen and someone interested in the fate of information technology, I humbly ask that the proposed settlement be reconsidered so that it will indeed prohibit Microsoft from retaining its monopoly in the computer industry. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Patrick D. Murphree
1015 N. College Ave,
#1
Bloomington, IN 47404

MTC-00010895

From: Terri Dow@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:52pm

Subject: accept settlement

Reed and Terri Dow
12302 NW43rd Court
Vancouver, WA 98685
360-574-9641

terridow@aol.com

U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
601D Street, #1200
Washington, DC 20530

Email: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov

January 14, 2002

To Whom it May Concern:

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call 'product tying' to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to

state that any new burden of proof for 'tying' would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court's drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability.'

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation -the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,
Reed and Terri Dow

MTC-00010896

From: Frank Baxter

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:52pm

Subject: Objection to the settlement

As a member of the computing industry, I do not see how the proposed settlement even comes close to providing remedy for the antitrust violations committed by Microsoft. This company has continually removed competition using their OS monopoly, raised prices for inferior products, and forced consumers to pay for software that they do not use nor want. Despite this, the settlement fails to address these issues, nor any of the other issues they were already found guilty of in a court of law.

Although I understand that the events on 10/11 may cause some to think a quick settlement, no matter how weak, is a service to the country. I completely disagree. Forcing consumers to pay a Microsoft tax will do nothing to promote the economy. The proposed changes to their operating system will reinforce their monopoly, forcing consumers to pay even more charges for transactions that only Microsoft will be able to broker.

I urge you to reconsider this settlement now, before it is too late.

Sincerely,
Frank Baxter
CTO Synthesys Technologies, Inc.
65 Stansel Court
Springboro, OH 45066

MTC-00010897

From: nharding%ou.edu@ou.edu@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:54pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the Bush administration in calling for a settlement in the Microfost case.

Nathaniel Harding
Norman, Oklahoma

MTC-00010898

From: Pete Norloff

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:54pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am against the proposed settlement with Microsoft. The proposed settlement is weak and not in consumer's or the country's best interests. The proposed settlement will not ensure competition in the marketplace, and will not restrain Microsoft from further monopolistic practices. Further, the proposed settlement fails to extract ill-gotten gains that Microsoft has obtained illegally.

Sincerely,
Peter Norloff
10820 Miller Road
Oakton, VA 22124
703-938-4343

MTC-00010899

From: David Schaub

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 3:41pm

I would like to voice my concern about Department of Justice's settlement with Microsoft.

David Schaub
4507 Hollow Oaks Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
davidschaub@mindspring.com

MTC-00010900

From: Frank Vitello

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:14pm
 Subject: Microsoft Comments
 Ms. Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D. Street, NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530-0001
 Re: Comments on the Microsoft Proposed
 Settlement Agreement

Dear Ms. Hesse:

This will serve as the comments of Defenders of Property Rights on the settlement agreement that the Department of Justice has proposed in its antitrust litigation with the Microsoft Corporation. Settlement of the litigation with Microsoft is in the best interest of all parties involved to avoid prolonging a questionable case, which seemed to be initiated more with the anticipated remedy of a multi-million dollar settlement as an objective than sound antitrust policy. Moreover, as our comments below discuss, settlement of this litigation is in the public interest.

Settlement of This Lawsuit Will Bring to An End A Lawsuit That Was At Odds With The Constitution's Protections of Intellectual Property. When the Constitution was ratified, the framers highlighted the importance of protecting intellectual property rights. In Article I, Section 8, the Constitution authorizes Congress to "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." U.S. Const. art. I, § 8.

Moreover, all property rights, including that of intellectual property, were given further protection by the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which states: "no property shall be taken for public use, without just compensation." U.S. Const. amend. V. The purpose of the Fifth Amendment is to ensure that property owners have the right to possess, use and profit from their property, whether that property is tangible in the form of a family farm, or intangible in the form of a computer operating system. There is no question that a bulk of Microsoft's vast assets is comprised of intangible intellectual property, commonly known as patents, copyrights, trade secrets, brand names, market presence and intellectual know-how. In its zeal to enforce the antitrust laws, however, the Justice Department has apparently forgotten the Constitution protects all forms of property, including Microsoft's intellectual property.

Antitrust Enforcement Should Enhance, Not Undermine The Constitutional Protections of Intellectual Property. In its antitrust litigation with Microsoft, the Justice Department has proposed that Microsoft be broken into smaller pieces or that Microsoft should be forced to fully or partially relinquish its intellectual property rights to competitors. In addition, the Justice Department has suggested that Microsoft be forced to disclose its "source code," or the software blueprint for its operating system, Windows, which some consider to be the "crown jewel" of the software industry. Such disclosure would allow competitors to gain access to immediate updates on the Windows

system so they can also release their updated software at the same time that Microsoft releases a new Windows version.

Since competitors, on average, usually release a new product a year after Microsoft releases a new Windows version, the government's plan would preclude Microsoft from, for a limited time, profiting exclusively from the fruits of its labor and investment—which strikes at the heart of the free-market economy. If the government were to have its way, not only would it be destroying the free-market principles on which this country is based, but it would also be taking private property for public use, without payment of just compensation, contrary to the Fifth Amendment's guarantees. See *Kimball Laundry v. United States*, 338 U.S. 1, 3-4, 11 (1949) (holding that loss of intellectual property—skilled management, good will and advertising—was taken and just compensation due: "[T]he intangible acquires a value . . . no different than the value of the business' physical property.").

Microsoft has indeed been successful in the use of its intellectual property rights. However, Microsoft entered the industry thirteen years ago, when computer software and related technological investments were risky financial undertakings. As such, Microsoft earned its wealth as a result of its original ideas and innovative technological breakthroughs in the computer software industry. Thus, by virtue of the patent and copyright laws, the reward to Microsoft for the creation of its intellectual property rights has already been weighed against the rights of its competitors. To force Microsoft to give up its hard-earned property rights, and the reward resulting therefrom, is not the valid enforcement of antitrust laws, but an uncompensated taking of private property.

In short, the Microsoft antitrust litigation has posed various legal and constitutional barriers for the government. Defenders of Property Rights applauds the current administration in its efforts to put an end to the lawsuit. We agree that now is the time to foster the growth of American companies and to encourage the innovative, entrepreneurial spirit of Americans, and not to continue to selectively pursue the innovators of our country, at all costs—at the expense of the economy, the consumer and our Constitution. In sum, Defenders strongly encourages the Justice Department to approve the proposed settlement agreement and finally put an end to its case against Microsoft.

Yours truly,
 Nancie G. Marzulla
 President, Defenders of Property Rights
 Frank A. Vitello
 Defenders of Property Rights
 1350 Connecticut Ave., NW, Ste. 410
 Washington, DC 20036
 202. 822.6770
 Toll Free: 866. 630.9787
 202. 822.6774 facsimile
www.yourpropertyrights.org

MTC-00010901

From: Joe Maranto
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:11pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have attached my thoughts on the above referenced settlement for your consideration. Please let me know that you have received this letter. Thank you.

Respectfully,
 Joe Maranto
 Joseph V. Maranto
 8 Graveswood Court
 Baltimore, MD 21234-1451

January 14, 2002
 BY FAX 1-202-307-1454
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 United States Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to ask that you give your immediate approval to the agreement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I believe this settlement is fair and equitable for the country and for business alike. Microsoft has done as much for the computer trade and its users as Goodyear has done for auto production. Microsoft is the wheels and fuel that make computers work.

With all due respect, I believe the antitrust suit brought against Microsoft was unnecessary and unfounded. Personally, I use Microsoft Windows out of choice because Microsoft's software programs are the best on the market. It is my understanding that Microsoft has agreed in the settlement to assist the computer industry by opening up its intellectual property rights to its Windows internal interfaces, and license its property on a non-discriminatory basis. This is bound to stimulate the economy and do great things for the entire industry.

In conclusion, I am asking you to allow Microsoft to get back to business without this cloud and legal case as a major distraction to its daily business of developing the best software in the world.

Respectfully Yours,
 Joseph V. Maranto
 VP Cignal Mortgage Corp

MTC-00010902

From: sharpe jones
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:17pm
 Subject: Microsoft
 120 Greensview Dr.
 Madison, MS 39110-8854
 601-856-2950
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania
 Ave, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001
 January 14, 2002

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

There appears to be an opportunity to settle the Microsoft antitrust case now. In view of all the other pressing matters facing us, I would urge you to finalize the Microsoft case as soon as possible. My request is not made because I like Microsoft, but because I feel they were shaken down by the previous administration. Their crime was standardizing and promoting software that the entire world liked and used- except for a few of their competitors! These products increased US productivity greatly and the price was reasonable.

It was a very sad day when the Clinton DOJ attacked one of the crown jewels of American

technology and helped accelerate the decline in the US equity market. I pray you will do the right thing and close this bad chapter as soon as possible. Thanking you, I remain

Sincerely,
John S. Jones

MTC-00010903

From: jack williamson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft

The purpose of this letter is to express my ardent support for the settlement reached last November between the department of justice and Microsoft. As a corporation, Microsoft has done more for the technology industry than any other corporation in American history. In turn, the litigation against Microsoft for the past three years is matched by the decline in our once prosperous technology industry. This coincidence must not be underestimated.

The settlement shows much compromise between the two sides of this issue. Microsoft has agreed for the creation of an outside technical committee. Under the stipulations of the agreement, this committee is to come as an outside third party. The purpose of this committee is to ensure compliance with the settlement agreement. This technical committee, then, will assure the efficacy of the agreement.

I hope you will consider the plight of the technology industry when reviewing this settlement. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Jack E. Williamson

MTC-00010904

From: Kelly McCullough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I've been involved in computer centered physics curriculum development for more than 6 years, and have used both Microsoft and non-Microsoft operating systems, development tools, and applications. I am deeply by the proposed settlement, and I would very much like to see Judge Kollar-Kotelly address these flaws. What is included:

1. A five-year limit. Microsoft's antitrust begotten profits have accrued over a decade of illegal monopolistic practices. Five years seems inadequate to restore the marketplace to a level of normal competition. Even if the settlement didn't provide mechanisms (noted below) which Microsoft can use to hamper the implementors of the proposed settlement, the enforcement period should be at least equal to Microsoft's monopolistic practices. Also, certain structural elements of a sound settlement should probably be enforced in perpetuity.

2. Microsoft's voice on the technical committee. It seems unreasonable for a confirmed monopolist to choose its guards. Given the pervasive influence of Microsoft in the market, and its persistent monopolistic

behavior, it is dubious proposition at best that their chosen representative, and representative who can be vetoed by that person, will primarily have the interests of the public at heart. Watchdogs chosen by Microsoft, on the Microsoft payroll, and working fulltime in secrecy on the Microsoft campus, do not meet any reasonable criteria for impartiality.

3. Crafting a feature that allows Microsoft to dispute costs gives Microsoft a built-in mechanism for sandbagging. Quote: "Microsoft may, on application to the Court, object to the reasonableness of any such fees or other expenses. On any such application: (a) the burden shall be on Microsoft to demonstrate unreasonableness; and (b) the TC member(s) shall be entitled to recover all costs incurred on such application (including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs), regardless of the Court's disposition of such application, unless the Court shall expressly find that the TC's opposition to the application was without substantial justification." Given the vast wealth Microsoft has obtained by monopolistic abuses of the consuming public, setting enforcement expenses as "reasonable", and giving Microsoft a mechanism for subpoenaing their overseers is an invitation to trouble. Microsoft's bearing of the "expenses" of such activity will be trivial, and more than compensated by the implicit protection of any future monopolistic behavior concealed from the technical committee. It also allows Microsoft to run out the clock at a very cheap cost. The technical committee should have a free hand, and an unlimited budget underwritten by Microsoft.

4. Microsoft has implicit control over who is permitted to be their competitor. Quote: "(c) meets reasonable, objective standards established by Microsoft for certifying the authenticity and viability of its business..." Why does Microsoft get to apply the litmus test of the "authenticity and viability" of who is permitted to see their APIs? Quote: "Microsoft shall disclose to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs, for the sole purpose of interoperating with a Windows Operating System Product, via the Microsoft Developer Network ("MSDN") or similar mechanisms, the APIs and related Documentation that are used by Microsoft Middleware to interoperate with a Windows Operating System Product."

Doesn't Microsoft have control over who participates in their proprietary MSDN program, and don't they set criteria of participation (eg, nondisclosure, etc)? This is one of the very mechanisms by which Microsoft has implemented its monopolistic strategy. Such APIs should be *freely distributed* to the *public*, not sold to the few acceptable competitors that Microsoft designates, on terms of their own setting. Allowing Microsoft to use their MSDN mechanism and decide which business is authentic and viable is too weak. It specifically gives Microsoft a mechanism to exclude open source developers, academics, etc.

What is left out:

5. Recompense. Microsoft has illegally profited for years from its monopolistic practices. That money rightfully belongs to

the public, and should be returned to the public. It should be fairly straightforward to measure the average profitability of their nearest competitors vs. Microsoft's illegally enhanced profit margins, thus determining how much Microsoft illegally profited. Perhaps this money could be funneled into educational grants for computer hardware and (completely non-Microsoft) software for elementary, secondary, and college tuition. These funds should easily cover the expense of putting (for example) a MacIntosh computer on the desktop of every student in public schools, state universities, etc.

6. Punitive damages. Over and above returning the ill-gotten gains to the public, Microsoft should be penalized for their illegal activities.

7. Document formats. Microsoft enforces its monopoly by keeping its file formats proprietary. Since Microsoft chooses which competing operating systems to support with their applications, companies who have been monopolistically pressured into buying Microsoft applications (eg, MS Office) are trapped on the Microsoft platform by their inability to migrate their (proprietary and copyrighted) corporate data to other operating systems. This is key. Microsoft applications compel users to stick with Microsoft operating systems, this perpetuating their monopoly. The only remedy would be to open up their file formats (or possibly to require them to provide fully and publicly documented import/export features that allowed users to migrate *all their data* (including "objects" such as forms, reports, etc.) to competing products, and to likewise recreate data from compliant import files (even if created by competing products). In other words, the public deserves a way to get all their data out of Microsoft products, and Microsoft should pay for providing such a mechanism.

I've heard the rationale that punishing Microsoft would be bad for the economy. Does that mean that we have two brands of justice? One for those who commit crimes large enough to endanger the economy and one for people who commit smaller thefts? Secondly, the leverage Microsoft has in the economy was acquired through illegal monopolistic practices, and the judgment should not perpetuate the consequences of these practices. Third, monopolists have always been bad for the economy, the contrary arguments of monopolists notwithstanding. And finally, the amount of money from recompense and punitive damages, pumped back into the economy in such a way as to stimulate competition in the computer software field, should provide an enormous economic boost.

American citizens are counting on Judge Kollar-Kotelly to faithfully perform her solemn duty to uphold justice by preventing this weak and flawed proposed settlement from being implemented, and properly addressing the true interests of the United States of America by returning the ill-gotten wealth from Microsoft to the public from whom they stole it, further penalizing Microsoft financially, and crafting structural remedies to prevent Microsoft from committing the same crimes again.

Sincerely,

MTC-00010905

From: raydor@nwonline.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:
 Its time to let this settlement go through. Greedy attorneys should not have more. Its time to let commercial interests work for the market—not being tied up in courts. This country was developed on free enterprise. This is a good settlement. Thank you.

Ray Rogers

MTC-00010906

From: emmert@web-access.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the agreement between DOJ and Microsoft and end the infernal uncertainty that s plagued the markets for years. The suit against Microsoft has probably done more to undermine both investor confidence and citizen confidence in government than any single occurrence over past decades. Please put an end to it!

MTC-00010907

From: weep@gte.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Time for the states attorney generals to call it quits and get about the business for which they were elected and stop wasting taxpayers dollars. The settlement is more than fair. Competitors should not use the government as a crutch.

MTC-00010908

From: mail@hand-shake.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft are the robber barons of today. they steal from the poor or at best pennies on the dollar then claim it as their own. they eliminate competition by hiding their operating system features until they have announced their own products which corner the market before anyone can compete. their contributions to politicians to stop their split is pure pay off. do not let them get away with this. They stifle creativity stifle a free flowing marketplace by blocking others from competing and prevent BETTER products from entering the marketplace by their operating system monopoly. Its like the Detroit car people always saying they knew what people wanted...then the Japanese came along and proved them wrong. Microsoft needs COMPETITION to improve and we need an open market place to give consumers a better option.

Microsoft products are buggy crash often and yet they have cornered the market because they own the monopoly. This is at the core of the anti trust laws. stop them and stop them now.let new businesses grow and thrive by preventing them from their continued cornering of the market place and the flooding of same with mediocre products.

MTC-00010909

From: FIRSTABOREAN@worldnet.att.net

@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to see the Microsoft antitrust case settled now and finally. As a consumer of software products (I am a writer of fiction and other literary materials) I deeply appreciate the way that Microsoft has made my work easier and much less expensive. They should not be punished for being successful they should not be penalized for making computer technology affordable and they should not be made less competitive despite the wishes of their competitors. Microsoft competed in the marketplace and won and their opponents have tried to trump their triumph by competing politically. Those competitors should not get away with that.

MTC-00010910

From: tpatti@mindspring.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is a proven monopolist and is currently working to keep the prices of personal computers and personal computer operating systems unnaturally high with their monopoly status. The company should be broken up into separate companies for each of it s operating systems (a company for MS-DOS Windows 95 Windows 98 Windows 2000 Windows NT etc) and a company that sells software to run on personal computers. Monopolies like Microsoft hurt consumers and keep technology out of the hands of the poor and force obsolescence on older computers by refusing to support older operating systems.

MTC-00010911

From: Egentry5@junio.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop the Microsoft law suit and take the settlement as Offered. We think enough is enough!!

MTC-00010912

From: dougcooks4u.icu82@junio.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please press forward to settle this matter without further litigation. I think the settlement agreement is reasonable. It should be settled promptly.

MTC-00010913

From: dpg-man1@junio.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let the dead dog lie.

MTC-00010914

From: Chinamarine45@junio.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel if tech. companies want to develop new and better products. They should do so. Let the public decide if they want it or will

buy it. We have so many regulation I bet their forgotten who or when it become law.

MTC-00010915

From: wchsr@bellatlantic.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It s time we get off Microsoft s back. Why are we penalizing a corporation for being competitive? Because they re successful? That certainly appears to be the case. The original argument— Explorer vs Netscape— was decided by customers like me. My ISP provided Netscape with its package. I got rid of netscape because it did not satisfy my needs. Case closed. My decision. No coercion from Microsoft.

That s why Microsoft has been successful: people like their product. When the whiners produce a better product people will buy it.

MTC-00010916

From: jim—in—nyc@hotmail.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement reached by the Department of Justice is fair and equitable and deserves to be approved. Please end this case which has been promoted by Microsoft s competitors from the very beginning and has nothing to do with harm to consumer choice. Thank you James F. Shanley

MTC-00010917

From: dwdunaway@junio.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

i feel this was a fair settlement for concerned.i also think the remaining attorney generals should settle with what Microsoft has offered.

MTC-00010918

From: btrask3@hotmail.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The US Justice Dept. and the States Attorney Generals case to bring down one of the most successful American companies has hurt and is hurting not only consumers like myself . . . but ALL of the high tech industries. Competitors of Microsoft who were the motivation for this ill advised proceeding have put their self interest above the interests of America. This proceeding has given our GLOBAL competitors precious time to play catchup . . . providing them with the opportunity to steal our momentum as we lead the world into the Information Age. Enough is enough!!! Please settle this case and lets get back to what we all do best . . . and if Microsofts competitors can t compete with better more reliable products . . . then that is not Mirosofts fault. Consumers like myself will always act in our self interest and buy the superior product at the better price . . . thats why today I own windows office canvas quicken and other products . . . not all Microsoft . . . but the ones I consider the best value. Government should not be meddling in free enterprise. Settle this case now so we may get on with

life! And our 401K s can recover from the justice departments tragic fumble. Bill Trask

MTC-00010919

From: fubecao@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This was a case that should never have happened. The economy has suffered enough because of it let it end NOW.

MTC-00010920

From: DAK7592@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft ALONE the judgment is enough!!

MTC-00010921

From: cwwhyble37@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it was fair judgment that was given.

MTC-00010922

From: jmel@adnc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the proposed settlement is disgusting from a consumer standpoint. It does nothing to improve the climate of competition in the Operating System/ software sector. Microsoft s contention that the status quo allows for improved innovation is patently absurd on its face and I think actually this proposed solution will have a continuing negative effect on improvement in the software field. Microsoft has in the past and continues in the present to attempt to block any competitive innovations. They have perverted standards to their own benefit and refused to allow others to write software which will work well with the Windows OS. They provide crippled renditions of proprietary software included with their own in attempt to drive competitors from the marketplace. Microsoft have made it virtually impossible to purchase a consumer grade computer with any operating system other than windows. My own personal experience has required me to spend over a thousand dollars during the past 5 years for software that I have never used and will not use in the future. By requiring that peripheral companies to only develop drivers for the Windows OS I am prevented from using many pieces of hardware that would make my computers more functional. I think the proposed solution should be dismissed out of hand. It does nothing to protect consumers and the computer industry in general from the monopolistic practices of Microsoft. It contains no real penalty for MS and encourages continued anticompetitive practices on Microsoft s part.

MTC-00010923

From: dan@apl.washington.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Too much taxpayers monies have already been wasted on this matter and now the whiners want to waste more. It s over let s move on . . .!

MTC-00010924

From: hossward@bright.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement with Microsoft is a win/win situation. Instead of a few people getting a few dollars this settlement will provide an opportunity for students to have computers in the classroom. It is a positive step forward in the No child will be left behind effort of this administration.

MTC-00010925

From: exileweb@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is a monopoly for the people. Any action taken against it should not be designed to hurt the company which has done great things for us but instead to motivate them to help more. The settlement is a great idea and should be allowed to stand.

MTC-00010926

From: Kyle_Gross@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It s time to end this suit. From the beginning it was obvious that this suit was brought about by a few companies that could not compete on a level playing field with Microsoft. So they have tried to change the rules to inhibit inovation and creativity so their inferior products would be able to compete. As an end user of software products I have no allegiance to any particular company. If Sun Novell and the others can make a better product I will buy it. If they can not I will not. I don t need the government telling me what products I should buy or supporting inferior products just because they have many congressmen and attorney generals backing them in their individual states. In Utah (a Novell owned state) it is obvious the only reason they are pursuing this case is to further the profits of Novell not the pursuit of justice. If Sun and Novell would put as much effort in making better products as they have done in trying to bring down Microsoft they may have already produced a better product that clearly outsells Microsoft.

MTC-00010927

From: mstrayer@mw.sisna.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel it is time to settle this case. Our Government has let our technology lead slip to Japan. All of the things Americans invented and excelled in such as televisions VCR s camera s microwave ovens automobiles stereo s machine tool s and many more. We have a lead on the World in software let us support and not destroy this. It appears a few States Attorney General are holding up this settlement to further their

own political carriers. Microsoft produces the most productive software for our business and home use at favorable prices.Lets let them continue so that our businesses can continue to have the productivity lead we now enjoy.

MTC-00010928

From: bcschnabel@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This whole thing should never have gone as far as it has. Microsoft has done nothing wrong except be the biggest and the best at what they do. Competition is good for the soul of the company. There have been many times where this is true. IBM and Xerox Apple and Dell. If these companies cannot come out with a better product to market to the general public then they don t deserve to be in business. If Microsoft was to be broken up it would just come back bigger and stronger than before. All one needs is to look at the phone companies like the Bells. They were accused of being A monopoly . They were broken up and the came back bigger and stronger. So lets leave well enough alone. If the others don t like whats going on then like the saying goes if you can t stand the heat get the heck out of the kitchen .

MTC-00010929

From: julwalters@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We have had enough harassment of MSFT. It s time to knock it off! Wrap up the suit against them and let private business get back to work not force them to be tied up in litigation!. Stop listening to anyone who doesn t like a company and tries to destroy that company. Enough is enough.

MTC-00010930

From: dianejacob@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I don t believe it was a good use of our tax dollars. Business is business. There are far more important issues to research and spend money on.

MTC-00010931

From: bobp@marketwriter.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement with Microsoft is the biggest rip-off of US industry and consumers that I have ever seen. I cannot imagine my so called government agreeing with such a lame settlement. Arquments as to the importance of the settlement to the economy are specious and in any event untrue. Microsoft broke the law. That conclusion is very clear. Last I looked this country punished lawbreakers. Microsoft should be severely punished. The proposed settlement does not come close to severe punishment. It is possible that top executives of the company should be imprisoned-yet there is no mention of that possibility in anything I have read. Placing appropriate restrictions on Microsoft given that the

company is a monopoly will only help the US and world economy. Please understand that competition is a good thing. Microsoft has clearly been proven to be anti-competition and must be stopped. There is no other choice if we wish to maintain a society free to make its own choices. Indeed a society that actually has choices to make.

MTC-00010932

From: familiar@acm.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

There are such urgent needs in this country such as public education job creation etc... that I can't believe so much money and time is being wasted on meddling with business. Microsoft and others have created millions of jobs and dozens of markets in this country and around the world. Let them continue to do so!

MTC-00010933

From: lsca@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is being punished for success. Microsoft compelled noone to buy its product. Leave Microsoft alone and let the public decide what it wants by using its buying power. All the states want is MONEY.

MTC-00010934

From: bdog@emptychair.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a small (100 share) stockholder I perhaps should not have a say but I think we should put it behind us and go on down the road!

MTC-00010935

From: olssoneric@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am encouraged by the thought of an end to this needless persecution of Microsoft. As a developer of software it is a very disturbing thought that the federal government can initiate legal action in spite of overwhelming evidence of the non-existence of any faults. I encourage the final resolution.

MTC-00010936

From: glsswrks@gallatinriver.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This settlement is acceptable although it goes further than necessary in punishing Microsoft. I feel that the case is still tainted by the prejudice exhibited by Judge Jackson from the beginning.

MTC-00010937

From: wserra@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is one of the best companies in US history and one of the companies that has done the most for consumers. The bitterness with which the government is harassing

Microsoft is inexcusable. The local phone companies are a true monopoly: they treat consumers like dogs and use all their might to crush competitors. They are so confident the government is looking the other way they don't even try to hide. What does the government do to protect consumers and competition from the local phone companies? ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. Instead they are bent on destroying one of the best assets this country has ever created. Shame on you.

MTC-00010938

From: Joe Barr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 5:19pm
Subject: A few questions

Do the comments submitted to this email address get forwarded to the presiding judge, or do they only get an internal review in the DOJ? What is the deadline for comments on the proposed sellout by the DOJ?

Thanks,
Joe Barr

MTC-00010939

From: rudy petorelli
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General,
Please stop wasting taxpayer money on the Microsoft Investigation. Enough is enough.
Rudy Petorelli
Naples, Fl.

MTC-00010940

From: Rollo, Dan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm sending my comments regarding the proposed settlement involving Microsoft distributing computer hardware and software to schools. I believe this will not motivate Microsoft to stop anti-competitive behavior, and will actually hurt Microsoft competitors in the educational market. Also, the settlement does not appear to address how to prevent Microsoft from forcing computer hardware makers to install only Windows on new machines. The Be Operating System was a viable, free alternative OS that was effectively killed by Microsoft's exclusive license with hardware manufacturers which prohibited the selling of new PC's with any other OS installed if Windows was installed on that PC. This represents a clear lack of choice for the consumer, that is perpetuated by Microsoft. Current Microsoft licensing allows Microsoft to prevent consumers from ever seeing any alternative Operating System, and this anti-competitive behavior is not addressed in the proposed settlement.

Finally, the damage done by Microsoft to the Java platform has greatly delayed the availability of alternatives to many common software programs (i.e. Office productivity applications like Word Processors and Spreadsheets) that could run on any OS. By preventing consumers from gaining access of alternative OS's and alternative Programs, Microsoft is bolstering it's monopoly position. I believe any settlement must provide enforceable constraints on such practices to prevent more damage to

consumers, and I feel the current proposed settlement will not provide effective protection of consumers and our right to choose.

Thank You for your attention,
Dan Rollo

MTC-00010941

From: J-I-T-W-P-M
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I am Raj Bhatti, the executive director of Freedom Christian Transitional Aftercare at Jesus Is The Way Prison Ministries. I am a certified Substance Abuse Counselor by State of Illinois as well as by the World Federation of Therapeutic Communities, New York.

I came to know through a very close friend about some of the aspects of the Proposed Settlement made by the Justice Department with Microsoft, and I am very unhappy. Firstly, how could the Justice Department grant Microsoft a government-mandated monopoly of the software industry and even worse—other technology markets? Definitely such decision would seriously jeopardize all serious competitors—both now and in the future. We're living in a free and open market society, and one of the advantages of having such a system is that people have the right to choose from among several brands of one single item, and in this case, software. I would want to see a healthy competition of several software companies, in order to make prices competitive as well. Secondly, how could the Justice Department condone Microsoft for violating the antitrust law and even for its illegal conduct e.g. bribing other competitors in order to stop their operation. What is the Justice Department's motive behind this action?

Your Honor, I would want Microsoft be brought to justice upholding to democratic values. Sadly to say that monopolies are the trade mark of monarchs and communist governments.

Very Truly,
Dr. Raj Bhatti
P.O. Box 184
Rantoul, IL 61866

MTC-00010942

From: Mac McNally
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
U.S.—D.O.J. 1/14

The Microsoft settlement that was agreed upon recently fits what is needed for the situation. Any further prolonging the case will do just one thing, fatten the already fat pockets of more lawyers. There should be no need to go any further than to settle this thing.

For some reason I do not see Microsoft as the villain that some do and in my use of microsoft products, I have always felt I had someone to turn to and get aid if needed. It has been a long hassle—let it die. F. E. "Mac" McNally, Palm Shadows RV—Site 31—Donna TX

MTC-00010943

From: Robert Anderson

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 6:14pm
 Subject: Proposed Anti-Trust Settlement
 To Whom It May Concern:

I am very alarmed that you have decided to proceed with a settlement arrangement that doesn't resolve the issues at hand. Having been involved with personal computing since the early 1980s, I firmly hold that the bundling approach that Microsoft took was truly an attempt to gain monopoly power, and was not done in the spirit of innovation, rather, was done to simply enrich MSFT's stockholders through unfair competition. Any settlement must not only address the fact that Microsoft now enjoys dominance in the PC operating system environment, but must also set rigid rules that prevent them from doing so again.

The ultimate, and in my mind, most beneficial antitrust settlement would involve a breakup of Microsoft into two operating entities, Operating Systems and Applications. This type of breakup would ensure that multiple companies could fairly compete against one another in a market niche. For example, Lotus 1-2-3 is nearly non-existent, despite its initial market share/acceptance. Why? Simply put, Microsoft was able to out "engineer" them by knowing the strategic plans that the Windows operating system group was going to take . and to have access to the codebase used to create the varying types of Windows. These types of parallels can be drawn on nearly any area in which Microsoft has gained a huge market advantage over a competitor (word processing, database and so on) Having experts at Redmond, overseeing compliance, but having their salaries paid by Microsoft also seems like a conflict of interest if there ever was one.

I agree with some in the community that believe that this constant cloud over Microsoft's head is a distraction for the nation's economic needs. but I don't use that excuse as a way to justify a quick, but faulty, settlement. Instead, I urge DOJ to act swiftly, but forcefully. Either financially hit the company (by forcing payments to consumers for an amount equal to the profits illegally generated by the monopoly) or break-up the company in a manner that will ensure that there will/would be more competition in the application and operating system development areas.

A breakup, although wrought with some initial complications, can be one of the best solutions for the country. as two new high-tech firms would be formed from one monopoly. and enterprising companies may take advantage of the level playing field when it comes to getting "inside" information from developers.

Sincerely,
 Robert Anderson
 2950 Tumbleweed Ln SE #C230
 Port Orchard, WA 98366-2127

MTC-00010944

From: Federico Vezzani
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 6:19pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 please stop Microsoft's monopoly.
 Federico Vezzani

MTC-00010945

From: Melissa A. Kirby
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/14/02 6:21pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 To Whom it May Concern:

Please do not allow this interruption in the computer technology business to continue any longer. As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate and reflects a triumph of the rule of law. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions, ranging from prohibition of what they call "product tying" to breakup of the company. More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case.

These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior. One key area rejected was the basis used for claiming that integrating Internet Explorer and Windows represented monopoly abuse. The court went further to state that any new burden of proof for "tying" would be immense. The court also rejected the breakup order and made it clear such an order moving forward would be difficult to sustain given the court "drastically altered [i.e., reduced] the scope of Microsoft's liability."

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends.

Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court.

In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question. Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants

face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,
 Melissa Kirby

MTC-00010946

From: Dana Goldsmith
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 6:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
 I am writing to you regarding the Department of Justice's Proposed Final Judgment regarding the Microsoft case. Over the past several weeks I've had a chance to study this proposed Agreement and am shocked by what I've found.

It appears that the Justice Department has ignored ALL the court findings in the case (every single court found that MS had aggressively abused its monopoly position for its own competitive advantage)and has basically agreed not only to NOT penalize MS for its long standing antitrust abuses, but to actually grant MS a defacto monopoly in the high-tech industry going forward. I cannot tell you what a disaster this would be for all of us that are NOT Microsoft minions, and especially for those of us working with or dependant upon Java, Linux, AOL, the Mac...or indeed ANY non-Microsoft code base or service.

As a member of the high-tech industry, I strongly urge you to carefully review the Justice Department's Final Judgment and then act accordingly. The future of the high-tech industry and all of its members will be greatly impacted by the outcome of this case.

Sincerely,
 Dana M. Goldsmith
 Silicon Valley, CA

MTC-00010947

From: John A Zambrano
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 6:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft ATR case
 Dear Ms. Renata Hesse,

As a citizen of Washington state, I encourage you to accept the proposed settlement in the anti-trust case involving Microsoft. This settlement is appropriate. Certain Microsoft competitors and other critics of the proposed settlement make the

core of their objections a call for more stringent restrictions. Why? More extreme critics complain that the remedies do not address products that were not even part of the case. These objections ignore the decision of the Appeals Court that reversed much of Judge Jackson's original findings. The Appeals Court threw out findings on many fronts related to Microsoft's anti-monopolistic behavior.

One final objection raised by critics is that Microsoft has a past history of consent decree violation so the company cannot be trusted to adhere to a new decree. This is a patently false assertion. The Appeals Court in June of 1998 rejected the very claim that sent the parties into litigation—the Department of Justice claim that Microsoft had violated an earlier consent decree. Furthermore, this settlement takes the extraordinary step of creating an onsite oversight body. There are, therefore, no legitimate grounds for an assertion that a consent decree will not constrain Microsoft's behavior in the ways the court intends. Rather, the proposed settlement directly and concretely addresses each and every key finding upheld by the Appeals Court, and does so with an undeniably stringent remedy. The areas of violation addressed include requiring OEMs to preserve visible access to Internet Explorer, to preserve the original boot sequence, to preserve all Microsoft-supplied desktop icons; entering into exclusive contracts with Internet Access Providers; threatening companies over support for other middleware technologies; and every other key area identified by the Appeals Court. In my view, there can be no valid objection to this settlement because every major finding of the Appeals Court is stringently addressed with a targeted remedy that specifically prohibits and prevents the behavior in question.

Acceptance of the proposed settlement will send a signal throughout American industry and the country as a whole that in the United States rule of law is alive and well—that defendants face remedies only for those findings against them. Anything beyond this settlement would represent a victory for those who do not seek remedy but rather also unwarranted punishment, and this would be a serious blow to the smooth functioning of free markets and the law that protects them. Participants in the American economy would forever be forced to fear whether the laws they rely upon to safely conduct business will be applied fairly.

I believe in advancing free market competition and this settlement serves the best interests of the American public. It fairly resolves a complex and burdensome anti-trust case that is having severe impacts far beyond one company, a case that is acting as a drag on one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy. Settlement of this case will free the high-technology industry to put its fullest efforts into innovation and creativity, and will spur competition in a way that will directly benefit consumers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,

John A. Zambrano
4205 227th Pl SW
MtLake Terr. Wa., 98043

MTC-00010948

From: gnsbarnett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
301 Rochester Road NE
Poplar Grove, IL 61065-9274
January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
I feel that closing the book on the Microsoft antitrust lawsuit is the best thing to do right now, especially since we are in the middle of a recession.

This settlement will have a positive affect on the IT industry, competition, and both the American and global economies. Under the terms of the settlement, Microsoft will not retaliate against software of hardware producers who develop or promote software that competes with Windows or that runs on software that competes with Windows. Nor may they retaliate against computer makers who ship software that competes with anything in the Windows operating system. The entire IT industry and competition in that industry stands to benefit quite nicely from this. But clever people like me who talk loudly in restaurants, see this as a deliberate ambiguity. A plea for justice in a mechanized society.

I support the settlement, and hope that it is approved as soon as possible.

Thank you.

But is suspense, as Hitchcock states, in the box. No, there isn't room, the ambiguity's put on weight.

Sincerely for American renewal,
George Barnett

MTC-00010949

From: Meta Ukena
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please know of my support for strong remedies designed to curb Microsoft's abusive monopoly practices. Thank you.

Meta Ukena
1 Park Lane—2B
Mt. Vernon, NY 10552

MTC-00010950

From: Torgeir Kateraas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
1-14-2002

I support Macrosoft
Torgeir Kateraas

MTC-00010951

From: Vanhuss28@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Bill Gates ought to be given a medal or a congratulatory declaration. My husband and I are 73. If it were not for Bill Gates improving the computer world, etc., we would not had been able to have one nor been able to understand how to use one. He should not be penalized. Phyllis Van Huss

MTC-00010952

From: David Friedman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft: Extending Monopoly into the Mobile Internet

To the Honorable Judge Kollar-Kutally- I am writing to voice my opinion regarding the recent deal between the DOJ and Microsoft. As an executive in Silicon Valley in the mobile internet/data space, I am concerned that the recent decision will allow Microsoft to propagate their unfair, anti-competitive and ruthless business monopoly into the mobile data arena—which many are trumpeting as the second coming of the internet. This deal could allow Microsoft to expand its monopoly into the next frontier of mobile data. Allowing this shadow to be cast over the mobile data arena will deprive many start-ups who are the seedbed of innovation of the hope and potential future success that drives them to take the risk in the first place.

Please carefully review the facts and ensure that the framework that gave rise to innovative business practices and thus Silicon Valley as the engine behind the US economy is preserved.

thanks,
David Friedman
Principle
Friedman Advisors
David Friedman
david@friedman.net

MTC-00010953

From: Chris and Judy
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 7:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I support the recent antitrust settlement and hope that it comes to fruition as soon as possible. Although, I believe that Microsoft did not make any antitrust violation, I believe this is the quickest and best way to end this Clinton era witch hunt.

Under the terms of the settlement, there are generous provisions that will allow software developers and computer makers to more effectively promote their own products. Also Microsoft has agreed to disclose technology and design future versions of Windows' with competitive handicaps. As a shareholder I am paying the price for this and I don't like it but it is more important to settle and get this behind us.

Before the matter is settled I ask your office to attack the nine states that want to continue litigation. They are showcasing for political and self-interest reasons and not thinking about what is in the best interest of the American people and American economy. Settle!

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Chris Zahnle
2458 Westwood Ct
Clarkston, WA 99403
(509) 758-5869

MTC-00010954

From: Craig Morehouse
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 7:34pm
Subject: Make the penalty more harsh. Ban

them from government use!

Dear Sirs;

I have been an IT professional for 22 years, and am currently CEO of a high-tech Printing and Publishing firm.

12 years ago, I had to sue Microsoft because they refused to license me a product that was already 5 years obsolete and out of production, one that I could not even BUY if I wanted to. I was trying to pay them for their MS-DOS 2.1 from 1984, and they wouldn't allow it. They wanted me to license their current version only. Well, I wanted the OLD version because I wanted to distribute a collection of OLD programs, and needed that particular version of COMMAND.COM to make the disk bootable and the programs runnable. The current version wouldn't work; the programs would freeze, which is a result of deliberate engineering on their part as well.

This is a sample of their attitude. They treat customers like cattle, and they treat their Dealers like slaves.

In all my 22 years, I have NEVER, not on one occasion, had a Microsoft product become my Product of Choice on its merits. On a couple of occasions, they ranked as high as 2nd or 3rd, (this was their Microsoft Pascal and Microsoft Fortran compilers in the mid 80's, but even then they were not the best product available.)

This company has succeeded like the Mob operations of New Jersey and Chicago, and I think there was clear evidence to that effect in the trial. They deserve nothing but the harshest treatment, and they should be banished from authorized use by the U.S. Government, their largest customer.

Craig Morehouse
President and CEO
The Foundation Project Inc.
Winter Park, FL.

MTC-00010955

From: Edward F.(038)Kathryn J. Carrier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 7:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
12-A Highland Road
Rochester, Pa. 15074
January 14, 2002
The Honorable John Ashcroft
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I believe the antitrust case that has been brought against Microsoft for the last three years is ridiculous and has been dragged out too long. I am glad to see that Microsoft will not be broken up, but feel that many of the concessions Microsoft will be making are more than are really necessary. For one, the contractual restrictions Microsoft will be making limit their ability to gain and maintain market share. Companies in many other industries rely on the ability to enter into third party agreements which demand exclusive or fixed percentage distribution rights. Second, the disclosure of Microsoft interfaces to competitors violates Microsoft's intellectual property rights. Microsoft has spent extraordinary amounts of time and effort to develop their technology and it

would undermine the whole reason for being innovative in a business if their developments become free information for everyone.

The bottom line is that it is in the best interest of the American public to have this matter settled. It will be good for the states, the IT industry, for Microsoft and for the economy. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Kathryn J. Carrier

MTC-00010956

From: Chatfield (038) Osborn Family
To: Microsoft ATR,attorney.general
@po.state.ct.us@inet...
Date: 1/14/02 7:59pm
Subject: MIRCROSOFT Antitrust Comment

Dear Department of Justice,
I am concerned that the Microsoft's proposed punishment does not adequately (nothing?) to address correcting is predatory antitrust behavior that stifles others innovation and rewards them for being big and continuing to control the desktop AND the applications that run on the operating system and desktop. My personal opinion is that short of splitting the company, the only thing that might help is forcing them to sell a completely stripped version of their operating system at a correspondingly low price.

They have destroyed all competition not only for the operating system, one operating system probably enough just like one gauge of railroad track, but also destroyed all competition for applications on the operating system (read trains, shipping companies, etc.) I suggest you revisit separating the operating system division of the company from the applications division.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Ronald J Osborn
5301 Talbot's Landing
Ellicott City, MD 21043
wizos2@home.com (for now, soon to be wizos2@comcast.com)

MTC-00010957

From: Peter Rulison
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/14/02 7:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Peter Rulison
P.O. Box 644
Kremmling, CO 80459-0644
January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Peter Rulison

MTC-00010958

From: santorf@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern;
I am appalled at the terms of the settlement. If the same terms were applied to any of the other corporations convicted of breaking antitrust laws, there would be an outcry from other companies and the public.

Richard F. Santopietro, PhD

MTC-00010959

From: Wilbur W. Wiley
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/14/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wilbur W. Wiley
PO Box 285
Chester Heights, PA 19017
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Wilbur W. Wiley

MTC-00010960

From: FULTZ Randall A
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:05pm
 Subject: Please end Microsoft's monopolistic practices.

Dear Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly,
 I am aware of Microsoft's unprecedented market dominance, and I do continue to use their products. But I do not feel it is in the best interests of American enterprise for the DOJ or the US Government to support the ongoing monopolistic practices of Microsoft.

Open competition and fair-market practices MUST be upheld in this landmark case, or else the current rate of technological growth, and the development of better, more stable, innovative products will surely suffer.

I am also concerned that Microsoft's lack of meaningful market-share competition for alternative Operating Systems, Web-browsers and Windows-based software, can only lead to increasingly poorer functionality in their product lines and an ever-increasing disregard for the need of America's business, corporate and home-based consumers.

Please deal responsibly with Microsoft—end the monopoly, now!

I request you immediately stop Microsoft's regrettable dominance and control of America's Information Systems. Help keep America free!

Sincerely,
 Randall Alan Fultz
 —Randy Fultz
 Oregon Employment Department

MTC-00010961

From: WJKIV@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To Whom it May Concern:

I understand that we are in a public comment period between now and January 28th after which the District Court will determine whether the Microsoft settlement is in the ???public interest.??? As a concerned citizen and a taxpayer, I am writing to tell you that I believe the settlement is fair and just and that I believe that the case should be settled so we can all move forward.

This case has been a complete waste of the taxpayers' money and has done much damage to Microsoft, one of the most important engines in our entire economy. Let's settle this case and get it behind us.

Regards,
 William Kennedy

MTC-00010962

From: Deo Reaido
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a programmer and honestly speaking i am using microsoft products on my day to day job. As much as i hate microsoft products, i cannot do anything as it is being used by the company where i work for. i actually prefer other softwares than that of microsoft. it's a shame that when somebody is going up and leaving us behind, we would try to pull him down in any way. why do most people complain when they feel they are being defeated? It is hard to imagine the

kind of thinking people particularly those involved mainly in the case, judges, attorneys, etc. What is "monopoly"? i guess you have a "stupid" and "one-sided" meaning for it.

this is in defense for microsoft but rather a personal opinion.:-)

MTC-00010963

From: Janet Richards
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:15pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I agree with this settlement and sincerely hope that this matter will be brought to an end. To be honest, I do not trust the government to do what is best for me and my choices as a consumer. In addition, the taxpayer money that has been spent on the pursuit of Microsoft could very well have been spent on much more dangerous and severe problems, such as, monitoring and tracking terrorists. I truly believe that the Clinton justice dept. was by far the most incompetent and corrupt, in addition to being an American nightmare.

MTC-00010964

From: Deb
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 8:20pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To: Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Judge Hesse,
 Please do not accept the Microsoft settlement. Please only agree to something that will:

- (1) prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future,
- (2) spark competition in this industry, and
- (3) deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
 Deborah Antkoviak

MTC-00010965

From: edge oo
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:29pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

For the benefit of everyone that uses a computer please stop microsofts monopoly.

MTC-00010966

From: Bill Barnhart
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 2113 Arrowhead Drive
 Olathe, KS 66062
 January 14, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US DOJ
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to express my opinions on the Microsoft antitrust settlement. I do not believe the suit was fair to Microsoft to begin with. The Microsoft Corporation and its employees have attained their dominant status in the IT industry through hard work

and innovation, not through a concerted and conscious effort to block the advances of competing software producers. Nevertheless, Microsoft was found to be in violation of antitrust laws and was brought to trial in the federal courts to answer for these violations. After three years of negotiation and mediation, Microsoft and the Department of Justice finally came to an agreement that would seem to be beneficial to Microsoft's competitors while at the same time allowing Microsoft to remain intact. Unfortunately, there are those who wish to see the settlement overturned and Microsoft destroyed. This is extreme.

Microsoft does not need to be rent asunder. The settlement has provided well for Microsoft's competitors. Microsoft has agreed to license intellectual property rights that fall under terms of the settlement to its competitors. Additionally, Microsoft will refrain from retaliatory behavior when software is put on the market that directly competes with Microsoft products. Microsoft will also not enter into agreements wherein a third party is required to endorse Microsoft programs or products either at a fixed percentage or exclusively.

Mr. Ashcroft, I do not believe further litigation against Microsoft is either necessary or wise. The economy has suffered while Microsoft has been tied up in this suit, and the IT industry has likewise been stunted in its growth. Microsoft has, through this settlement, appeased the demands of justice. I urge you to let the settlement stand. Thank you.

Sincerely,
 Bill Barnhart
 bill@barnhart.net

MTC-00010967

From: Tony D
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Suit

I support Microsoft in this antitrust suit. I never thought the suit should have been brought in the first place. I also, believe the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable.

A. DeBerardino
 23 Schooner Lane
 Okatie, SC 29910

MTC-00010968

From: Joel Gossett
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:37pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

U.S. Department of Justice,
 The settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case is very important. I have heard comments from my customers and family that the case is a "joke" "not right" "not fair" and I believe it degrades the DOJ to a level that the American Public lose their trust in our "system". Anytime a Judge is so obviously biased in any type of case the people of this Country feel they could wind up in front of a similar Judge. Settle this as fast as possible to prevent greater erosion of public trust in our Justice system.

Joel Gossett

MTC-00010969

From: Lock Hunter
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 8:40pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is my opinion that this suit be settled and the matter closed. Enough public funds and times have been spent on trying to disable a company that changed corporate America forever. Settle!!

Lock Hunter
Alabama

MTC-00010970

From: Harry Mullin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam;
I urge the Justice Department to end its litigation of Microsoft and do what ever it can to end litigation by States. I am a long time computer user beginning with the Apple Mac at its first introduction. Microsoft has done nothing to hurt me as a user of its products—quite the contrary, it has provided extraordinary opportunity. As an independent developer and web designer I can only applaud Microsoft's efforts in the computer field and look forward to future development when the company is allowed to do so.

Thank you for your attention.
Harry Mullin
Laguna Niguel, CA

MTC-00010971

From: Miles B. Kehoe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Enough already!

I am a partner in a small software development firm—I've been making my living for over 25 years in computer programming and consulting. Perhaps none of the organized Microsoft opposition are happy with settling this unjust legal action by the United States: they would have us step back into a time of operating system chaos and incompatibility. None of the States Attorney Generals are required by law to use Microsoft products; let them go out and buy a competitive operating system and then find software to use with it.

There ARE operating system AND application choices out there. It is not Microsoft's fault that their competitors, with less vision and less concern for the ultimate end user, made serious business and technical mistakes that caused their products to flounder while Microsoft spent billions of dollars on user testing, quality testing, and innovative software development. No company anywhere in the technology world has done more for end users, developers, and for the industry as a whole than Microsoft. The government, seeing someone making a great deal of money in return for their investment, has decided that the best way to get their piece of the action is to hassle, fine, and intimidate Microsoft. When several competitors get together to try to negatively impact another company in an industry, it is called 'restraint of trade'—unless, that is, you can buy more congressmen, senators, and politicians to rule in your favor.

It's no accident that the NASDAQ market index collapsed on the day Microsoft was

charged in this foolish waste of taxpayer money; and that the entire industry has been depressed since the government has been pursuing this folly.

Get it over—end the harassment and let the industry get back to innovating.

Miles Kehoe
President
New Idea Engineering
mbk@ideaeng.com
408-446-3303
10140 Hillcrest Road
Cupertino CA 95014

MTC-00010972

From: nolandpeebles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

Your Honor, Judge Kollar-Kotelly: I am a business consultant and a user of Microsoft software. I do, however, urge you to rule that Microsoft must comply with all previous court rulings and cease their monopolistic practices. I support a fair business market place and would expect a company of Microsoft's reputation to honor that ethic, not control or force competitors out of business.

Thank you. Noland Peebles
nolandpeebles@attbi.com 541.726.1361

MTC-00010973

From: Scott Guthery
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:45pm
Subject: Candidate Gets 100% of the Votes

If a political candidate got 100% of the votes in an election, would we disqualify him or her and declare the opponent the winner? I don't think so. So why can the public elect a person unanimously and not pick a product in the market place unaimously? Microsoft is successful because Americans have voted with their dollars.

The government shouldn't be in the business of picking products any more than they should be in the business of calling election outcomes. Lots of us like Mr. Gates' products better than Mr. Ellison's or Mr. McNealy's.

So be it!
Cheers, Scott

MTC-00010974

From: Lexx
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Why can't we put this behind us for other more pressing matters. Why can't the Department of Justice settle this matter...the users, the employees, the stockholders, and the general public are beginning to think there are some personal agendas going on with reference to this suit.

ENOUGH ALREADY! SETTLE IT! GET ON TO IMPORTANT MATTERS!

MTC-00010975

From: Tom Layson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

At a time when the entire country is reeling from an economic down turn, it is ridiculous to drag this issue out any further. The political motivation behind the states

refusing the settlement is despicable. Our country and economy needs closure, not this kind of divisiveness.

I urge you to see that ending this matter is in the public interest. The terms of the settlement are tough, but fair. Our country needs to dig itself out of this recession and further punishing one of the few companies weathering the storm will only hurt the employees of Microsoft, the people of Washington state and the United States as a whole.

Thank you
Tom Layson
Software Design Lead
Microsoft Corporation

MTC-00010976

From: Milton Karafilis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You should settle the microsoft case as the settlement now stands. If the settlement is for the People rather than Microsoft's competitors what better way than to benefit School Children. M. Karafilis

MTC-00010977

From: PomFam2000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,
I'm 55, married, children, homeowner, have voted both Democrat and Republican, contribute to social and political causes, no industry or investment connection to Microsoft or its competitors. I'll give you my opinion in the short version. Settle up and leave Microsoft alone already.

Very truly yours,
Paul Pomerantz

MTC-00010978

From: hsr Rodgers@UCLAAlumni.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:58pm
Subject: Proposed settlement(s) with Microsoft

In the olden days of personal computers, 10-15 years ago when people were getting interested in this new medium, there were more than a few companies making computers with both different components and different operating systems. And there were lots of companies making software programs to work with the various systems.

Thanks to the competitive atmosphere that prevailed at the time each had to not only keep up with the others but stay a jump or two ahead of them. It was a kind of leap-frog thing that benefited users and at the same time kept the computer industry adjusting, improving and advancing in every way.

In those days we had a lot of products, hardware and software, to choose from—to fit our personal preferences.

How things have changed! Microsoft's Windows not only dominates the field now, but Microsoft has been adjudged not only a monopoly, but designs it's system in such a way as to make it difficult, and sometimes impossible, for other company products to work in conjunction with Windows.

That's an unfortunate and giant step from the competitive atmosphere that put a

personal computer on nearly every desk—and even two or more in many homes—to a predatory monopolistic enclave!

No wonder the current class-action suit that holds Microsoft guilty of overcharging for Windows may not be settled by allowing Microsoft to further permeate the field by furnishing Microsoft-only programs in reconditioned computers to be given to underfunded schools. (Some complain that Microsoft's offer would cost only about \$1 million of their reported \$36 billion of cash and short term securities.)

Wouldn't it be nice if the courts, U.S. or EU, could do whatever is needed to get us back to the old handsomely progressive competitive days by requiring Microsoft to loosen up and cooperate with other computer companies so we could again enjoy constant improvements, and choices, in software and hardware—at competitive prices?

At least we can dream, can't we?

Howard S Rodgers
<hsrogers@UCLAumni.net>
Tel & Fax 928 445-7781
PO Box 10487
Prescott AZ 86304-0487

MTC-00010979

From: SamTharp@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 8:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please let Microsoft continue to operate unfettered by government interference. They produce products that are of great use to businesses and consumers alike. Settle the case as soon as possible.

The suit never should have happened in the first place. Don't compound the problem by drawing out the settlement.

MTC-00010980

From: Sharon Chiu
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I am writing this email to express my strong feeling about the Microsoft settlement case. It is very clear and obvious that Microsoft has violated the antitrust laws with the intention of wiping out her competitors at all cost.

That said, I feel that any government settlement with Microsoft, in order to protect the technology community and the larger public, must cover the following issues:

1. Terminate Microsoft's illegal monopoly immediately,
2. Deny to Microsoft the profits of its past violations (give it to our government for budget or community for profit sharing), and
3. Prevent any future anticompetitive activity.

Thank you very much for taking my comments into consideration when making the settlement.

Best regards,
Sharon Chiu
Chief Financial Officer
Elibrium Inc.
www.Elibrium.com
Direct (W) 650-212-9388
Fax: 650-345-8562

MTC-00010981

From: Georg Bolch
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Date: 1/14/02 8:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Georg Bolch
P O Box 528

Suquamish, WA 98392-0528
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Georg G Bolch

MTC-00010982

From: Benoni Nowland IV
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Date: 1/14/02 8:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Benoni Nowland IV
10398 Ridge Road
Nevada City, CA 95959
January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering

superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Benoni Nowland IV

MTC-00010983

From: MMRHART@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement of the suit against Microsoft should be settled and put to bed. To begin with, there should never have been a suit against the company that has really put the USA as a leader in the computer arena. Thus no more litigation.

Lets go forward, not waste time and money against a company that has provided so much.

Joe Hart mmrhart@aol.com
Naples, FL

MTC-00010984

From: John Berthoud
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:05pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Attached please find our letter commenting on the settlement of the Microsoft case.

We are also sending it via fax.

Thank you for considering our input.

John Berthoud
President
National Taxpayers Union &
National Taxpayers Union Foundation
jberthoud@ntu.org www.ntu.org

Phone—703-683-5700
Fax—703-683-5722

January14,2002
Ms. Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530
VIA FAX # 202-307-1454

Dear Ms. Hesse:

On behalf of the 335,000 members of the National Taxpayers Union, I am writing to comment on the Proposed Final Judgment in United States v. Microsoft.

As you may know, it is our position that this case was brought to protect Microsoft's competitors - not competition itself. Furthermore, we remain concerned that many state Attorneys General continue to push the suit forward for ideological and political reasons.

We are, however, pleased to see that after four years the parties are prepared to settle a case that has produced many unfortunate results. Taxpayers have been forced to underwrite the litigation to the tune of at least \$35 million. Microsoft was compelled to shift considerable resources into the legal battle that would normally have been spent on product innovation, and also faces a tangle of private antitrust-spawned litigation.

And as NTU Foundation research has shown, the government litigation has imposed billions of dollars worth of stock market losses on millions of American investors.

The Proposed Final Judgment contains many references to "consumers." Indeed, the antitrust authorities have insisted from the beginning that this case was about consumer welfare. Yet the original purpose of the suit against Microsoft was to enjoin the company from including Internet Explorer as part of its Windows operating system, which the plaintiffs deemed to be a grievous threat to Netscape (later purchased for \$5 billion by Internet giant AOL, a Microsoft competitor). In a suit supposedly brought on behalf of consumers, we remain puzzled as to how it would have helped consumers to make them pay for an Internet browser they could otherwise get for free. Consumers place a high value on the ability to use a standardized, integrated operating system. In fact, public opinion polls taken throughout the Microsoft antitrust trial showed that sizable majorities of the public viewed Microsoft and its products favorably.

The Proposed Final Judgment's emphasis on "network effects" as a "barrier to entry" for Microsoft competitors in many senses disregards consumers' demonstrated preference for standardized software. The government's suit was premised upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the way in which consumer markets operate: Microsoft did not build up its large market share through anti-competitive practices; instead Microsoft became the nation's largest software company by providing consumers with the products they prefer. Several state Attorneys General are refusing to sign the Proposed Final Judgment on the grounds that it is not strong enough. However, the agreement appears to provide the plaintiffs with exactly the type of relief they were seeking.

The settlement gives each of the settling states and the Department of Justice the power to enforce the decree and to seek a broad range of remedies in the event of a violation. An independent Technical Committee that reports to the plaintiffs would be afforded full access to Microsoft's facilities, employees, records, and even the Windows source code. And the settlement binds Microsoft to provide information to its competitors so that their programs will be Windows-compatible. Based on the strength of these remedies and the fast pace at which the software industry is evolving, we believe that the five-year duration of the decree—as opposed to the customary ten-year period—is appropriate.

The antitrust laws do not exist to preserve specific products or specific competitors. They exist to preserve competition itself, and we believe that consumers freely chose Microsoft's products—which provided a standardized, integrated operating system that revolutionized personal computer use. The results included a huge jump in desktop computer usage, much-improved efficiency, and robust growth in the software industry throughout the 1990s. Thus, we believe that this case constituted unnecessary, and harmful, government interference with the private sector. Rather than a victory for

competition, we believe the Microsoft case represents a defeat for taxpayers, consumers, and investors.

With the economy in recession, Americans simply cannot keep paying the high price of governmental attempts to dictate winners and losers in the marketplace. We welcome settlement of this regrettable case.

Sincerely,
John Berthoud President

MTC-00010985

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge:

I trust that you will do the right thing in this case. Clearly, allowing Microsoft to abuse its monopoly going forward will hurt our software industry, our economy and eventually, our nation's overall standing in the world.

Thank you.
Dawn Scardina
Sunnyvale, CA

MTC-00010986

From: Joel Schermerhorn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I, as a concerned citizen of the US, want the government to end Clinton-Era, Anti-Trust Law Abuse of this Microsoft case. Let's get this case over with and get on with life!!! Please seriously consider this email by a concerned citizen. Thank you sincerely, Joel Schermerhorn.

Joel Schermerhorn
74 Huff Road
Delhi, NY 13753
Have a great day and a blessed forever!
Sincerely,
Joel Schermerhorn

MTC-00010987

From: JSondhi@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe the lawsuit by the states should be settled. Microsoft is a great company and should be allowed to do what it does best—innovate. The DOJ settlement was fair and reasonable. There is no basis for the separate states to not settle along the same lines that DOJ did.

Jay Sondhi

MTC-00010988

From: RJEckhardt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
202 Kin.q Avenue
Westmont, New Jersey 08108
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I implore you and your department to please end this ongoing litigation against Microsoft and to finalize this settlement. This

court-negotiated settlement meets the public interest and deserves to go forward.

The provisions and terms of this settlement agreement create a system of accountability and work to foster competition in the technology industry. Microsoft, by the settlement, is required to share its intellectual property with a competitor, if that competitor, by applying the terms of the settlement, infringes on Microsoft's intellectual property. In order to maintain accountability and compliance, Microsoft has also agreed to submit to a technical oversight committee that will review their business practices. Clearly this settlement is more than a slap on Microsoft's corporate wrists.

This process has gone on long enough and should end. Please let us implement this settlement, agree with the public interest and not waste anymore time or money.

Sincerely,
Richard Eckhardt

MTC-00010989

From: Jen Lucha
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:22pm
Subject: [Fwd: Antitrust Settlement of Microsoft]

Dear DOJ:

I am outraged by the settlement you have negotiated for Microsoft. It seem to have been written by Microsoft and it not in the best interest of American citizens. You are letting Microsoft go unpunished for its business practices.

What kind of message at you sending?

It is ok for criminals to go unpunished. I was wondering how I am going to explain this to my children. That we had a chance to right a wrong in the computer industry and make it move forward, but chose instead to do nothing! You are holding the computer industry hostage. And you will be responsible for the holding back of years of progression.

I would like you to disapprove of this settlement. And punish Microsoft the way it deserves.

Thanks,
Jennifer Lucha
(909) 485-7426
jen-lucha@pe.net

MTC-00010990

From: Geokezelpstl@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:22pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I hope that the suit against Microsoft will be settled in favor of Microsoft and the American people without creating the mess that was created when AT&T was broken up. The Justice Department should turn its attention to Enron.

Lee Williams

MTC-00010991

From: Pawan Bali
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom It may Concern!

The Government of United States of America should leave Microsoft alone because:

1. No other Company or Corporation (including, of course, the Government) than Microsoft has contributed more to the economic, social and global development of not only the United States of America but also the Entire Universe.

2. It is becoming very obvious recently that Elected Officials of the Govt. serve the interest of a very few influential and rich individuals only who ... This would provide the Government the first opportunity to serve the general public whose day to day living conditions depends on good economic situation at home.

Thanks.

Pawan Kumar Bali
bali@acpub.duke.edu

MTC-00010992

From: Claude Cavanaugh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:31pm
Subject: The Microsoft Case

Please consider what the world would be like if there were only one automobile manufacturer that owned all the steel mills, one oil company that owned all the refineries and one grocery store that owned all the farms.

The same applies to one PC applications developer that owns the operating system. Microsoft broke the law and should be punished for it. It is a good solution to split the company into two entities. One for applications and one for operating systems. Not unlike United Technologies. You didn't let them build the engines and the airplanes to use in their airline company. Microsoft should not be able to build the applications that use their operating system.

This will not cause Microsoft any real grief. It will only make them compete in the marketplace like everyone else.

Sincerely,

Name withheld out of fear of reprisal from Microsoft.

CC:Cringly@bdcimail.com@inetgw

MTC-00010993

From: Erin Diehl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Case
847 North Van Dorn Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22304
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing today to voice my opinion regarding the settlement in the Microsoft Anti Trust case. This settlement has been long awaited and I see no reason to prolong its implementation. As part of the lawsuit's terms, a mediator was assigned by the courts to assist in the negotiation efforts. Microsoft certainly did not get off easy, as some may think. They are giving way more than is necessary, given that they are a private company and should be able to keep their research and technology to themselves.

However, they are handing over coding and interface information to their competitors who weren't smart enough to

come up with their own. They are also making it easier for Windows users to install and use non-Windows products. Given the fact that most computers come with Windows because they are the most user-friendly, I don't see why this was an issue in the first place. I decided to install non-Microsoft products on my computer and had no problems in doing so. But as part of the settlement, Microsoft is going above and beyond their responsibility and nearly promoting other companies' products.

I am a graduate student and throughout my years of schooling and research, I've depended on Microsoft for everything having to do with computers. Doing papers and research would not have been as easy had I not been able to use my computer. I remember how difficult word-processing programs were before Microsoft's Word program. Since then young computer users have easily picked up the ins and outs of software and computers. Microsoft has changed the way people learn. I would be hard pressed to learn other products such as UNIX or Oracle. Although anyone is free to use them, these products are inferior to Microsoft's products in that they are much more difficult and not very user-friendly. However, the terms of the settlement now call for these products to be made more easily available.

The terms of this settlement go above and beyond what is necessary. It would be ridiculous to think otherwise. Microsoft has served the public interest for years; this settlement certainly does the same.

Please maintain this settlement and ensure this lawsuit is laid to rest.

Sincerely,
Erin Diehl

MTC-00010994

From: James R. Ryder
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,

While I fully appreciate the influence the Bush Administration may have had on expediting a settlement in the matter of Microsoft vs. DOJ it is my contention that this charge was baseless from the beginning. I am truly ashamed as a Conservative that this was ever taken on in the first place!

Good luck to Microsoft and I hope the DOJ spends more time going after AOL where the same amount of public control is being had.

James T. Ryder

MTC-00010995

From: Lisa Moore
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I for one am tired of knowing my tax money is being used for this witchhunt and want this case to settled immediately. Don't waste our tax dollars on companies that want a fair shake in our capitolistics society.

If a company cannot make it on its own well, that is healthy competition ! Sincerest regards

Lisa Moore

MTC-00010996

From: Mary Spero

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Aloha Judge!

PLEASE stop persecuting Microsoft! Hey, we all had a chance to decide what we wanted. I chose Microsoft and my daughter chose Apple. NOBODY forced either of us to make our decisions. I *DON'T* use MS's browser; I like Netscape better. What I really don't like is the recession brought on by *MY* government's persecution of the people who gave us the superb economy of the 90's. Soooo, PLEASE, let Microsoft do what they do best... provide the world with some very good products—and some junk ones, too! <g> Me ke aloha, Mary in Honolulu

MarySpero@prodigy.net

MTC-00010997

From: John Bailey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Yes I am in agreement with the Microsoft settlement and I would like it to go forward.

Sincerely

Catherine Langone-Bailey

MTC-00010998

From: IndnGr102@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

It has come to my attention that a settlement has been reached in the Justice Department's three-year case against Microsoft regarding alleged antitrust violations. I am glad that this case will be finally ending because of this settlement. I think Microsoft did not do anything wrong to have litigation brought against it.

However, I believe that the settlement that has been reached is fair and reasonable to all of the parties involved. Others will tell you that Microsoft is getting off easy in this case. I strongly disagree with that statement, because the company will be making a number of changes to their products, and business practices. For example, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against software or hardware developers who develop or promote software that competes with Windows or that runs on software that competes with Windows.

Also, I would like to remind you that Microsoft has agreed to document and disclose for use by it's competitors various interfaces that are internal to Windows operating system products. I ask that the Justice Department accept the settlement, and no further action be taken against Microsoft.

Sincerely,

Monika Puri
8514 Magnolia Drive
Lanham, MD 20706

MTC-00010999

From: Cathy Chavasse

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:38pm

Subject: Microsoft Rollover or DOJ WimpOut

Oh please! For God's sake. We—American public/tax payer in the person of the DOJ—won! Why do we have to feel so guilty that we total capitulate in favor of the one that is really guilty? We are not guilty. We are not guilty. Keep saying that if it helps. Microsoft is guilty. Microsoft is guilty.

Microsoft is a convicted criminal. Treat if like one. If I get a speeding ticket, do I get to negotiate my punishment after I am found guilty? And promise to speed on all the unpaved back roads too. If I rob a bank (more like what MS has done), do I get to keep the money, and buy a couple of real banks to further my crime. They have been doing the same crime for more than ten years. I only speed once in a while. And I have not robbed a bank yet. But if I get the same treatment that MS is getting, I may just speed all the time and get into robbing banks.

How can you guys do this? At least make them pay the (tax payers') court cost!

The tax payers should not have to pay again. And again. And again.

You guys should be ashamed.

Senior Engineer

Dataway West

Christopher B Chavasse

MTC-00011000

From: Harold H. Burbank, II

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:51pm

Subject: Settlement

I object to the settlement terms without reading them as I have long believed the lawsuit is simply a witch hunt against Microsoft, which, like it or not, made it on the same rules of American capitalism available to its competitors. My boss, CT attorney general Richard Blumenthal, is a clear example of how far some politicians will go try to get publicity for themselves at Microsoft's expense. He has wasted millions of state dollars trying to set American commerce policy which should be set in Congress, not the courts. The fact is the state AGs who persist in suing cannot succeed in Congress. The whole case should have been thrown out. Implicitly, the settlement is unfair and unlawful toward Microsoft, which in no clear way violated the law from the start.

Attorney Harold H. Burbank, II
Office of CT Attorney General

MTC-00011001

From: Peter R. Newell

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:52pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Microsoft should not be allowed to continue its monopolistic anticompetitive practices. Microsoft's ill-gotten domination of PC operating systems (Windows) through monopolistic practices and sheer marketing have done a great disservice to the average consumer, who is not technologically savvy enough to understand what is going on. Microsoft can get away with virtually telling the consumer what they want or need by virtue of this monopoly, and can likewise stifle competition by not fully disclosing the

workings and interfaces to Windows. For the short and long-term good of the computer user as well as the industry, Microsoft must be prevented from continuing these practices.

Peter R. Newell

Affordable Technical Solutions

Glenfield NY

MTC-00011002

From: JGibbsF33@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:55pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

I wish to add my voice to the many Americans who believe that the settlement agreed to by Microsoft is in the best interests of the economy and the thousands of children whose education in the area of informational technology and computer skills will be wonderfully enhanced. Despite the obvious public benefits of this settlement, nine different states refuse to settle, hoping to get more cash to pour into the black sink hole of state coffers and into the pockets of the lawyers urging them on. Their cavalier approach ignores the long term benefits of the innovations of Microsoft and their positive impact on all Americans. Enough of the Microsoft bashing. Let's get on with it and, in doing so, encourage Microsoft to continue to lead the way to even more invention and innovation in this exciting realm.

J. L. Gibbs, MD

Canton, Ill

MTC-00011003

From: RR-

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:55pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

Microsoft has tried in Good Faith to settle this litigation. Please do not allow politics to stop this settlement. The offer that was agreed to by the Department of Justice as well as the nine states is more than fair.

The tech world as well as the consumers need this to be settled.

Ray Reid

3355 Deer lake Court SE

Salem, Oregon 97301

MTC-00011004

From: scn@san.rr.com

To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov

Date: 1/14/02 9:56pm

Settle the Microsoft case now On the terms agreed to with DOJ. To prolong this ridiculous lawsuit with the maveric states is counter productive to the economy and increased productivity. It only caters to the states who are fronting for weak companies in their respective states. SETTLE NOW!

Wm. Necoechea

MTC-00011005

From: cape—pss

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:58pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We support Microsoft and their settlement offer. It is in the best interest of all parties to settle this and move on from here. In the spirit of having the "freedom to innovate", we suggest the parties settle this case now.

Jerry & Nancy Cape

3109 Woodland Fern Drive

Parrish, FL 34219

MTC-00011006

From: Kim Rubin

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 9:59pm

Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Proposed Settlement

As a company CEO, I am against the proposed settlement with Microsoft. I am an avid capitalist who trusts the free market. However, Microsoft's effectively monopoly has permitted them to engage in a long pattern of anti-competitive behavior that has deprived companies and individuals of reasonable choices.

Microsoft has some great products. I consider them the most brilliant marketing organization of last decade. As a company, we borrow from their marketing strategy.

The Settlement that would benefit everyone, including Microsoft shareholders, would break the company into three companies: operating systems, application software, and internet operations. There would be no overlapping boards, management or infrastructure. All dealings between the three new companies would on a equal footing with other companies, and subject to court review.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Kim Rubin, CEO, findtheDOT

510 302-3463 x207 office

650 799-0059 cell kimr@findtheDOT.com

MTC-00011007

From: Leonard and Agnes Tillerson

To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Date: 1/14/02 9:25pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leonard and Agnes Tillerson

244 Osprey Circle

St Marys, Ga 31558-4101

January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Agnes and Leonard Tillerson

MTC-00011008

From: Ron Carns
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:09pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I think it is time to get off Microsoft's case.

I have been using Microsoft since the late '80s and have not found other to take its place. I do not view Microsoft as a monopoly. I have used other operating systems and have found Microsoft has the most sound systems for users and is very user conscious.

When installing new versions of Microsoft I have options for different internet access and can set my system to run how I want it. I can easily get updates and software upgrades to keep my computer safe from hackers and viruses. Other companies have the equal right to try to be better than Microsoft but not by degrading one of the backbone companies on our soil.

It is time to redefine what a monopoly is and let our country get back to business at hand. Turn Microsoft loose and spend the governments funds on more important things like "NATIONAL SECURITY"!!

Thanks you.....

Ronald A. Carns
46596 Twp Rd 479
Coshocton, OH 43812-9573
740-829-2061
rcarns@coshocton.com

MTC-00011009

From: Bill Belvin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dept. of Justice,

Please confirm the settlement already reached between Microsoft and the DOJ, and do it quickly. The remaining 9 plaintiff states are acting on the basis of their AG's, in my opinion, and not on what is good for the citizens of their states...which is an end to the uncertainty, and the release of creative software energy. This whole suit has been about protecting vindictive competitors who seek the courts intervention, rather than compete. Great injury has been done to Microsoft, and me the consumer by the whole process. So put it behind us, ratify the settlement, and let the market participants compete!

Thank you,
William S. Belvin

MTC-00011010

From: George Alexekos
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:13pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly;

Like most people, I was too busy with everything from the approaching holidays to the war (not to mention making the quarter) to pay much attention to the PFJ. But over the past couple weeks I've had a chance to study this proposed Agreement a bit more—and what I've found has really shocked me.

For some reason the Justice Department seems to have ignored ALL the court findings

in the case (over the past three years every single court involved found that MS had aggressively abused its monopoly position for its own competitive advantage—which is no great news to anyone in the software industry). But in fact the DoJ has basically agreed not only to NOT penalize MS for its long-standing antitrust abuses, but to actually grant MS a de-facto monopoly in our industry going forward. I don't have to tell you what a disaster this would be for all of us that are NOT Microsoft minions (and especially for those of us working with or dependant upon Java, Linux, AOL, the Mac...or indeed ANY non-Microsoft code base or service). The good news is that you can still do something about this impending disaster before it's too late.

I tend to get pretty involved when I believe deeply in something. And I sincerely believe that the PFJ is a potential disaster for all non-Microsoft players, big and small, in our industry, and potentially for consumers and for our nation as well. As much as I love the current Administration, our Justice Department fumbled the ball on this one.

Thank you for helping to correct the very, very serious flaws in the PFJ.

Sincerely;
George Alexakos
Boston, Mass

MTC-00011011

From: Dawn Scardina
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:15pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement.....

Dear Judge Kollar Kotell,

I just wanted to write you a short note to let you know how disappointed I am in how the justice department is handling the Microsoft case. I understand that the Tunney Act allows you to review the opinions of the public concerning this case.

Microsoft should not only be fined for their anti-competitiveness, but steps should be taken to ensure that no other company is overlooked (and for so long) for exercising their monopolistic power to gain an unfair advantage in the marketplace.

I would like to say that while I do like Microsoft's products and services, I feel that competition is always good for consumers.

Thank you for your time in regards to this matter.

Sincerely,
Dawn Scardina

MTC-00011013

From: Bruce Hagen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

So Bill is rich. Very, very rich. So what!! What he has done for the computer industry and all of us that use computers cannot be comprehended by many. Is he perfect? No, but only the best we have. Isn't that what the US is (use to be) all about? Work hard, produce, and you get the rewards or have I missed what has happened to this country during the last 30 years. Let's get on with life and let MS get back to what they do best.

Bruce Hagen

MTC-00011014

From: Shahid Chaudhry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

My name is Shahid and i want to comment on this matter in such a way that Microsoft Settlement should be made by now and it should not be further litigated. I think this thing is in the favor of all people.

Shahid

MTC-00011015

From: Steve Weik
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:41pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT IS A BAD DEAL...

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly

I recently saw this Op-Ed in the San Jose Mercury News—and I think it conveys very clearly some of the main problems with the DoJ's proposed settlement with Microsoft. I understand that you are now charged with reviewing the PFJ—and as a long-time software industry veteran (and someone who is not strongly affiliated with any of the "camps" on this issue) I'd ask you to make SURE that the final agreement allows for a free and fair software industry—and one that will produce secure code (something that Microsoft doesn't seem to know how to do).

Thanks.

Steve Weik
LA, CA

SECURITY IN DIVERSITY

By Greg Papadopoulos

The antitrust case against Microsoft isn't just about competition; it's about security.

Over and above the usual economic risks presented by an unchecked monopolist—rising prices and monochromatic innovation—the country's (and the world's) computer infrastructure will be increasingly vulnerable to attack if a single software system predominates. Imagine what would happen if producers of, say, corn were able to use their market power to eliminate wheat, rice, and oats. Suppose that 90 percent of the world's grain supply came from a single variety of corn. We would be faced with the unacceptable risk that some blight, some single disease, might wipe out an enormous portion of our food supply. So far, the possibility of bioengineered attacks on food crops has been largely theoretical, but engineered attacks on the Internet's software infrastructure happen all the time. We've seen what can happen when hackers exploit flaws in operating systems and Internet browsers. Last year's "I Love You" virus infected several million computers and caused as much as \$10 billion in damages, while this year's "Code Red" and "Nimda" worms caused another \$4 billion. And the number of incidents is on the rise.

Having only one kind of operating system or one kind of browser would make it much, much easier for saboteurs to bring the entire Internet to its knees.

In a perfect world, software would be free of flaws for attackers to exploit. Quality control does reduce the number and severity of such flaws, but the current state of the art is that nearly every software release contains

a few. Diversity is currently the best defense against attacks on the flaws of any particular software component. For increased reliability, a standard technical strategy at all levels of computer system design is redundancy and diversity. Fortunately, the connectivity of the Internet routing infrastructure is now highly redundant and built out of routers from multiple sources. It's the next layer or two—operating systems and software applications for desktop computers and other Web-enabled devices—that need attention. For very high reliability software, a well-studied solution is to have multiple independent teams each create their own redundant versions. This way a single design error or bug doesn't take down the whole system—the other software versions take over instead.

I believe that it's crucial to the health of the Internet—and to the worldwide economic system that has come to rely on it—that the infrastructure include measurable diversity. By that I mean we should have, at a minimum, three operating systems and three browsers, independently designed and constructed. That way, if a software virus were to incapacitate the most widely used version of either, we could have enough residual capacity to continue at least partial operations and recover from the damage.

For a single entity to control 80 to 90 percent of the market for PC operating systems, Internet browsers, e-mail readers, and office productivity software (which can also spread viruses) is clearly a significant security risk. To then allow that monopoly to actively attempt to drive out its remaining competition would hardly be in the public interest.

It's now up to Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly to decide whether the proposed settlement between Microsoft and the Department of Justice is a just solution. But from where I sit, it contains too many loopholes to measurably effect Microsoft's behavior, much less bring about the kind of diversity that would enhance our security.

MTC-00011016

From: GERALD THOMPSON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:44pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE SETTLE WITH MICROSOFT. 90% OF THE WORLD LOVES MICRO SOFTWARE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT IS WRONG WITH THAT. I DON'T USE THE INTERNET EVEN THOUGH IT WAS ON MY DESK TOP. I GOT A LOCAL CO. & I HAD NO TROUBLE DOING THAT. THANK YOU

MTC-00011017

From: Andyman568@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:47pm
Subject: (no subject)

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
I am a student at Boston College, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does nothing to stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly through the use of its operating system. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws

in the past. It would be a terrible standard to set by letting Microsoft get away with its retaliation tactics, bolting schemes, and attacks on Java. All these tactics lower competition in a supposedly free market and also limit software standards. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

To sum up, I'm deeply concerned the recent settlement does not regulate Microsoft enough in the future allowing Microsoft to continue its monopolistic tactics. In addition, Microsoft is not even being punished for laws it clearly broke in the past. This sets a terrible standard. I would request that you do your best to overturn this settlement.

Sincerely,
Andrew Goldberg
Brighton, Massachusetts
CC:stopmicrosoft@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00011018

From: MARSHALL MOORE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT...

Dear Judge:

I am a member of the high tech community here in Virginia—and am also a lawyer. Although I do not practice antitrust law, I have had the opportunity to research the PFJ which you are now charged to review. It appears to me that there are a number of VERY serious issues with the PFJ, including:

a. No Penalty For Undisputed Illegal Activity. Microsoft is not penalized for any past misdeeds. In other words, they are being allowed to retain all the profits gained from their illegal activities. Every court involved with this case has acknowledged that Microsoft broke the Anti-trust laws. Through this Agreement, the Justice Department is sending the message that this sort of anticompetitive behavior is acceptable. Every large potential monopolistic company is being told that they can get away with this sort of illegal behavior without fear of losing any of the gains made from such conduct. In other words, get away with as much as you can until the Justice Department brings an action. There is every incentive for future monopolists to engage in this type of conduct and no incentive not to.

b. Middleware: As part of the Agreement Microsoft is required to allow the PC manufacturers to hide Microsoft middleware programs and allow them to install icons or links to competing middleware programs. The only problem is that the PC manufacturers are not allowed to remove the code that could be used to reactivate Microsoft's middleware programs. In other words, two weeks into owning the machine, a consumer could be asked if they want to reconfigure their desktop, install all the Microsoft middleware and delete all the competitor's middleware.

c. Communication Protocols: The Agreement states that Microsoft must now share information on how its middleware and server software work together with Windows. However, Microsoft does not have to disclose this information for middleware it does not distribute separate from windows, or for middleware it has not trademarked.

This is a huge loophole, because if Microsoft wants to drive a competitor out of business, they just attach the specific type of software the competitor is involved with to their Windows platform. Once they do that, they do not have to share the coding information that allows the competitors software to work with Windows, thus driving the competitor out of business. Once the competitor is out of business, Microsoft can separate the software from the Windows package, sell it separately and derive huge margins. In addition, Microsoft does not have to disclose their information to companies that in their view? do not have a viable business?. This loophole will allow Microsoft to prevent new software start-ups from forming which, to say the least, is very bad for competition, and therefore, the consumer.

Judge, I know that you will be looking at these matters closely. I trust that you will do the right thing for ALL Americans, software producers and consumers alike, and remedy these very serious problems in the PFJ.

Thank you for your time.

Marshall Moore, JD
Charlottesville, VA

MTC-00011019

From: George Lien
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:56pm
Subject: Good for the government!

Recent decision for NOT allowing Microsoft to give away so-called free Microsoft software and trainings for schools is one of the best decisions ever made.

Ask the software gaint to pay in cash. That's right—CASH!

And let the schools decide what to do with the cash.

Regards,
George Lien

MTC-00011020

From: Jack Bond
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 10:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jack Bond
C25 Scotty Hollow Drive
North Chelmsford, MA 01863
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering

superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jack Bond

MTC-00011021

From: Tom Fennell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I have sent a previous message quite a while ago but I am sending another to state my feelings on this lawsuit. I have been using computers for many years now. I became involved before there was a company named Microsoft. In those old days, computers were a real challenge to operate. Then Microsoft came along and changed things forever. Their development of an operating system which took all of the confusion out of the normal users hands was a godsend. In all of the years since the introduction of their first system, I have never had a really serious problem with their so called "bundling" of various other software packages within their operating systems. I have used Netscape as my browser with no problems. In no way did the operating system ever interfere with my choice of browsers. I help many people with their computer systems as a hobby in my retirement. I never hear any negative comments from anyone regarding problems with their operating systems (Microsoft Windows 95, 98, ME). Yes, they experience problems but it is usually related to their inexperience in operating their systems. Yes, they do experience conflicts with programs but they can usually be resolved. All of the resources that have been expended against Microsoft is a waste of taxpayers money and should be stopped. I urge you to look at this and find a way to resolve this in a fair and reasonable manner.

The longer this drags on the more damage our economy will suffer especially in the present state of the economy of the United States and also the world economy.

Respectfully,
Tom Fennell
La Quinta, Ca.

MTC-00011022

From: Stephen North
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:10pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dear Judge;

I see two major problems (and many minor ones) in the PFJ as currently configured.

1. The Three-Man Compliance Team. The Agreement requires a three-man compliance team to oversee Microsoft's compliance with the Agreement. Microsoft will appoint one person, the Justice Department another, and the third will be chosen by the two people already appointed. This new team will not be

allowed to inform the public of their work, and cannot impose fines. Their sole remedy for infractions is informing the Justice Department of the infraction and then the Justice Department will have to commence litigation to stop the infraction. The Justice Department does not need a compliance group to tell them when Microsoft is doing something wrong, so in reality this group is just a smoke screen.

2. Market Share. All other businesses in the U.S. market that have a ninety percent market share are considered per-se monopolies and are regulated or have some sort of government oversight (i.e. utilities, local phone companies, cable companies etc.). This is done because it is in such a company's best interest (in the interest of their shareholders) to abuse their position. In other words, to gain maximum shareholder value, they are almost required to abuse their position. Why is Microsoft allowed a waiver to this general rule? Does Microsoft not try to gain optimum share value for their shareholders?

Certainly these are just two of the issues in a very flawed agreement. As a member of the consulting services industry for almost 20 years—my firm depends on a free market for software in order to support and satisfy our clients. Microsoft has, from my personal experience, never believed in free markets -and has done everything they can to extend their defacto monopoly at the expense of many, many others.

Please make the Dept of Justice do what is right for America—not just for the current Administration and their fat cats.

Thanks.
Stephen North
Chicago ILL

MTC-00011023

From: Michael Kramer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please find my comments related to the proposed Microsoft settlement.

Sincerely,
Michael J. Kramer Stonewall Capital LLC
mk@stonewallcapital.com

277 West End Avenue # 5D
New York, NY 10023
January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft US

Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to take advantage of this public comment period and voice my opinion on the recent events surrounding the Microsoft antitrust case. First of all, this lawsuit is frivolous and has become a political game for those wanting media attention. Much time and money has been wasted on lawsuit, and now that a settlement has been reached, I think it is ridiculous to spend even more time on it.

It is very clear that the attorneys general of the dissenting states are more interested in pursuing a populist political agenda than in protecting consumers. The interests of consumers will be best served to put this issue behind us and allow the American

economy to recover from its current recession.

In the past decade, I think that Microsoft has created the single best consumer product in the market. Given how much time people and businesses spend using computers, a very small price is paid for a superior product. I see no indication that there has been any harm to consumer interest in Microsoft's products or their practices. Please uphold this settlement and allow Microsoft and our economy to return to normal.

Like most settlements, this settlement in the Microsoft case has been reached after much effort, under the supervision of a court-appointed mediator. The settlement goes above and beyond what was called for in the problematic issues of the suit. To ensure its compliance, there has been a Technical Committee created to oversee any possible dispute resolution.

Sincerely,
Michael Kramer
cc: Representative Jerrold Nadler

MTC-00011024

From: Jeremy Svinckelstin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To the Honorable Attorney General Ashcroft:

The Microsoft case, which has been pursued for a decade by the federal government, has ostensibly been pursued on behalf of consumers. However, the very consumers it has sought to protect are being harmed by the detrimental impact the case has had on the technology market and the entire national economy, which is now mired in a recession. Furthermore, the American taxpayers have had to fund this prosecution, diverting government funds from investigating harmful antitrust violations and illegitimate monopolies. The proposed settlement encourages product-choice, promotes product innovation, and provides non-Microsoft related computer and software manufacturers with confidence in marketing their own products. It also frees up Department of Justice resources to pursue antitrust violations that currently harm the public.

Therefore, I humbly request that this litigation concerning Microsoft be stopped, and the proposed settlement accepted. Commercial success should not be penalized.

Very truly yours,
Jeremy D. Svinckelstin
20 Huntington Street,
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1002,

MTC-00011025

From: Drinkwine, Paul
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 11:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Renata B. Hesse,

I am an employee in the technology industry who resides in Washington State. I strongly encourage breaking up Microsoft. The business practices Microsoft uses continuously stifle progress in this industry and promote a culture of homogenous second-rate technology.

It is a well known fact that the products Microsoft produces are not the best around

yet everyone must conform to their technology due to the monopoly they hold on the industry.

I wish my State had the integrity to join the other states suing yet understand that the money Microsoft brings into this state is addictive.

Paul Drinkwine
Avocent—Redmond U.S.A.
Testing and Certification
www.avocent.com

MTC-00011026

From: fred l mckinney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:22pm
Subject: MY COMMENT
FRED MCKINNEY
2903 COUNTRY WAY
DANVILLE, IL. 61832
2174423322

Dear DOJ,

I'm a share holder of MICROSOFT, AOL, SUN MICROSYSTEM, INTEL, CISCO, ECT.

I have been following this case for years, and feel that SUNW, AOL has use the DOJ to try to slow down Microsoft. They have use every tactic to try to hurt the consumer and MSFT. They feel its bad for MSFT to have a monopoly, BUT ITS OK FOR THEM TO CREATE OR HAVE ONE TO THEMSELVES.

This bickering between who should own MSFT HAS TO STOP. I feel the monopoly MSFT has is legal. The consumer and the manufactures decided which software we wanted the most. If any company was to come up with a software package better than MICROSOFT WINDOWS, we would dump them the next day or months ahead.

Microsoft has a CHOSEN MONOPOLY, BECAUSE WE THE CONSUMER WANTED IT THIS WAY. FIFTEEN YEARS AGO NO SOFTWARE PACKAGE WORK WITH EACH OTHER AND IT WAS A PAIN SETTING IT UP. MSFT came along and eliminate all of these setup and non compatible hardware and most of all "NO STANDARD AMONG VENDORS".

These companies I own want the consumer and businesses to be at their mercy when it come to installation. This create more revenue for them and also establish the setting as "YOU HAVE NO WHERE TO GO" SO YOU HAVE TO CALL US!!! MSFT HAS CHANGE ALL OF THIS. We have a company which feels its being chase all the time by their competition. They brag how they will "EAT MSFT LUNCH", AND everyone knows MSFT thrives on this competition. It's not about money, its about WHO'S THE BEST. NOT ALL THE PRODUCTS I USE IS MICROSOFT. I USE COREL QUATTO PRO 8, THIS IS EXCEL COMPETITOR.

I USE PRINTSHOP DELUXE, I DON'T EVEN USE MSFT HALLMARK VERSION, AND I EVEN HAVE A LICENSE VERSION OF THIS SOFTWARE... IF IT WAS FREE I STILL WOULDN'T USE IT.

Final:

MSFT is not forcing their software on us, WE DECIDE WHAT WE WANT TO USE.

Fred Mckinney.

MTC-00011027

From: tina power
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 11:24pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Dear Judge;

Like you, I am a woman professional in a man's world. I have been in the software industry for 15+ years—and I have again and again seen Microsoft take unfair advantage of its position in our industry to crush, kill and destroy potential competitors.

The PFJ doesn't even begin to address the true situation—and trusting MS to effectively police itself is trusting the proverbial fox to guard the ever shrinking henhouse.

I was especially angered to see that our Dept of Justice didn't even pay attention to the guilty verdicts that have been unanimously rendered in the case.

I work for a medium sized company here in the Boston area. We have had to dance the MS dance for ever...and we would LOVE to have a viable competitor to work with. Unfortunately, MS has done everything they can to tie us (and our software systems) to their lousy OS...and that is not fair. It's especially not fair to allow them to capitalize on thier OS monopoly to force really crappy application software down our throats...but that is exactly what happens.

Please, please, please—send the PFJ back to Justice and tell them to put the interests of consumers FIRST—before that of wealthy campaign contributors.

Thank you very much.
tina power

MTC-00011028

From: Dennis Behrens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department Of Justice,

I am writing in support of the recent settlement of the long-running antitrust lawsuit between the U.S. Department of Justice, state attorneys general and Microsoft Corporation. Though I applaud the nine state attorneys general that decided to follow the federal government's lead and settle the case, I am thoroughly disappointed that remaining state attorneys general and the District of Columbia have decided to further pursue this baseless case. The settlement is fair to all. It will allow Microsoft's competitors to use Microsoft's Window's operating system to incorporate their software programs and will give consumers more services and products to choose from.

As you are well aware, members of Citizens for a Sound Economy have been unrelenting in our opposition to the federal government's antitrust case against Microsoft. For nearly 3 years, activists like myself have called, emailed, visited, and sent letters to the U.S. Department of Justice and to state attorneys' general offices explaining that Microsoft's actions did not harm consumers, but provided them with great benefits by lowering the cost and increasing the availability of software products. We have stressed that Microsoft is a pioneer in the high-technology market and that their products increased our familiarity with the Internet. Once again, I thank you for your decision to settle this unfortunate lawsuit against a successful and innovative company.

Respectfully,

Dennis Behrens
921 Lewis Blvd
Sioux City, IA 51105-3254
A very happy Microsoft consumer!

MTC-00011029

From: MSUSS@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Dept. of Justice
Subject: Tunney Period Comments

I'm highly opposed to further burdens on Microsoft as sought by the remaining States Attorney General. My reasons are these:

1) The responsible Judge insisted on settlement talks which were then accomplished and agreed to by more than half (I count the federal gov't as equivalent to multiple states) of the participants. The remaining 9 are malcontents driven more by special interest companies (seeking to gain by litigation what they couldn't gain in the free market) than by fairness. They should be harshly described as such by DOJ.

2) The whole anti-trust case against Microsoft strikes me as the government interfering in a rapidly moving technology arena where it is ill-equipped to render judgment. The anti-trust laws are not modern enough to deal with new technology company competitive issues, wherein companies rise and fall in a very few years depending on their decisions and products and where they must be agile and proficient enough to win consumer confidence.

3) Consumers often make their purchasing decisions in a single season. The government can't even develop an internal consensus in a season, much less analyze, bring to trial and administer impartial judgment.

4) Some consolidation of influence within a single company, in the case of high tech, is often highly beneficial to the consumer. Lack of a publicly-endorsed Windows standard would have left millions of PCs unable to converse, yielding a tower of Babel, instead of a reliable, innovative, efficient new network of communication.

5) Although I've followed the case reasonably closely, I have not yet seen much from Microsoft's detractors concerning how consumers like me have been hurt. My own feeling is that Microsoft products continue to grow exponentially in capability, while growing only very modestly, if at all, in price. I feel Microsoft's economic impact to me has not been adverse, but on the contrary has been highly beneficial. DOJ should force dissenting states to provide an economic-impact-to-consumers (not business competitors) statement as a basis for any complaint. This statement should be reviewed by competent economists. I'm skeptical such a statement could be assembled.

Sincerely,
Mark Sussman
MSUSS@aol.com

MTC-00011030

From: Grant K Rauscher
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:32pm
Subject: bootloader
let alternative OS's live

http://www.byte.com/documents/s=1115/
by20010824s0001/
thanks
Grant K Rauscher
GeeKieR Enterprises
http://www.geekier.com/

MTC-00011031

From: Charles Dooks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
STINKS

Dear Judge:

I recently was forwarded Jim Barksdale's recent comments before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I thought that some of them were very powerful arguments against the current Microsoft monopoly. I especially found compelling the following:

"If the PFJ had been in effect all along, how would it have affected Netscape? More important, how will it affect future Netscapes?"

Impact on future Netscapes.

As discussed in the attached document, the unambiguous conclusion is that if the PFJ agreed upon last month by Microsoft and the Department of Justice had been in existence in 1994, Netscape would have never been able to obtain the necessary venture capital financing. In fact, the company would not have come into being in the first place. The work of Marc Andreessen's team at the University of Illinois in developing the Mosaic browser would likely have remained an academic exercise. An innovative, independent browser company simply could not survive under the PFJ. And such would be the effect on any company developing in the future technologies as innovative as the browser was in the mid 1990s.

That leaves the question of whether Microsoft itself would have developed browser technology necessary for Internet navigation. My belief is that Microsoft would not have developed that technology. It is abundantly clear that Microsoft viewed the browser and the Internet itself as the principal threat to their core business of selling operating systems and applications for desktop computers.

This PFJ allows Microsoft to employ the full fury of its multiple monopolies against anyone who would develop a browser or any other technology that might have the potential to challenge any aspects of Microsoft's business. I have reviewed the PFJ, and my impression continues to be that it is a document whose principal purpose is to protect Microsoft from competition, and not to open up the market to competition with Microsoft. I note, again with pleasure, that the remedy proposal by the state Attorneys General who remain as plaintiffs would significantly open the market up to competition.

If the PFJ provisions are allowed to go into effect, it is unrealistic to think that anybody would ever secure venture capital financing to compete against Microsoft. This would be a tragedy for our nation. It makes a mockery of the notion that the PFJ is good for the economy. If the PFJ goes into effect, it will subject an entire industry to dominance by an unconstrained monopolist,

thus snuffing out competition, consumer choice and innovation in perhaps our nation's most important industry. And worse, it will allow them to extend their dominance to more traditional businesses such as financial services, entertainment, telecommunications, and perhaps many others.

Four years ago I appeared before the committee and was able to demonstrate, with the help of the audience, that Microsoft undoubtedly had a monopoly. Now it has been proven in the courts that Microsoft not only has a monopoly, but they have illegally maintained that monopoly through a series of abusive and predatory actions. I submit to the committee that Microsoft is infinitely stronger in each of their core businesses than they were four years ago, despite the fact that their principal arguments have been repudiated 8-0 by the federal courts."

Judge, that is absolutely what my experience as a software programmer tells me. I am not an expert in antitrust matters—but what Microsoft is doing is wrong.

Please help correct the deeply flawed document that our Justice Dept produced.

Thank you.

MTC-00011032

From: RainAZ@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:42pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Yes, for Microsoft and a Big No to You the government that continues to harass a very important and wonderfully worthwhile Company. While you folks work away doing God knows what, Microsoft actually does help real people in real time. Get off it. Now.

Lorraine Grover

MTC-00011033

From: John Stage
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:43pm
Subject: MICROSOFT IS A PREDATOR

Dear Judge:

I am a former Microsoft executive—and please excuse me but I'm not going to give you my full name in this e-mail for fear of reprisal.

Net-net: there is no question that MS explicitly targets competitors and uses every dirty trick in the book (and more) to put them out of business. I've seen it—more than once.

I have no idea why the DoJ totally rolled over on this one...looks like they just took a dive. Maybe MS is giving to the GOP big time—I don't know. But I do know that the PFJ is a very bad deal for everyone who's not a MS millionaire—and even many of us that used to work there are not proud of what we did.

I'd ask you to make sure that Microsoft is held accountable to the same laws as everyone else. No one else will.

John
Seattle, WA.

MTC-00011034

From: Joseph Gadoury
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
From: Joseph Gadoury
17 Mason Rd.

Dudley MA 01571
508-943-2516
jgadoury@bellatlantic.net
To: Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to express my satisfaction that the Department of Justice has finally decided to settle the anti-trust litigation against Microsoft. While I believe that the original case against Microsoft was weak, unsubstantiated, and not necessary, this settlement seems to satisfy the public and the government's interest.

The terms of the settlement keep Microsoft accountable, foster innovation and increase competition.

According to the settlement, Microsoft has agreed to submit its technology and business practices to a three-person, government-appointed, technical oversight committee. This committee will be responsible for ensuring Microsoft's compliance with the agreement, and resolving disputes. Microsoft has also agreed to change its licensing practices to ensure that the maximum amount of technology is available to the industry.

This settlement goes beyond the government's original complaints and ensures that the company will be a viable entity in the future. I am sure you'll agree that it is time to turn our national resources to more fruitful and productive ends.

I hope that this is the last step in this drawn out process and that the government ceases all further federal action.

Thank you for your careful consideration,

Joseph Gadoury
jgadoury@bellatlantic.net

MTC-00011035

From: Claude David
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I for one do not consider it unfair for Microsoft to bundle "goodies" with their operating system, so long as nobody is compelled to use them. Their competitors are free to make their own products as attractive to the consumer as possible. But they don't seem to be prepared to give anything away "for free", yet they have the nerve to ask the federal government to use its resources to dismantle a company that this country should be so very proud of.

There are matters of greater moment that the department of justice and this government should be devoting their resources to. Let us not shoot ourselves in the foot for the sake of a few greedy CEOs and jealous States.

MTC-00011036

From: bubbalaura@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement 100%. This case has dragged on far too long. Too much of the taxpayer's money has been spent that could have spent on other issues. This has been a witchhunt against Microsoft for the

beginning. Approve the settlement and let's move this Great Nation forward.

God Bless You and God Bless America.

MTC-00011037

From: Mike Moses
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mike Moses
323 N Narberth ave
Narberth, PA 19072
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mike Moses

MTC-00011038

From: Michael Giesler
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Michael Giesler
11111 109th Pl NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Michael Giesler

MTC-00011039

From: Chad Myers
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Chad Myers
6437 Clay Allison Pass
Austin, TX 78749
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Chad Myers

MTC-00011040

From: Elias Gelat
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Elias Gelat
7004 Live Oak Dr
North Richland Hills, tx 76180
January 13, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
E.A. Gelat

MTC-00011041

From: Steve Sheldon
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/13/02 11:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Steve Sheldon
15233 Greenhaven Way
Burnsville, MN 55306
January 13, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will

be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Steve Sheldon

MTC-00011042

From: Adam Bockhorst
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:06am
Subject: Decision shows awareness of school budgetary realities

Judge Motz' decision to scuttle this ill-conceived settlement was appropriate. He clearly recognized that organizations making procurement decisions quite often follow a path of least resistance. Allowing Microsoft to seed thousands of school districts with free equipment and products likely would have made the adoption of its products a fait accompli, at least in some districts. A Federal district court would have been complicit in expanding the very monopoly recognized by the DOJ—a nasty example of the government's left hand not knowing the activities of its right.

Adam Bockhorst
Computer Assistant, Kirkwood School District
St. Louis, Missouri

MTC-00011043

From: Jeffrey Jimenez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:44am
Subject: Objection to Microsoft Proposed Final Judgement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I am filing my personal objection to the proposed final judgment on the Microsoft case. Supposedly, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating all rules of proper business ethics and practices. However with the PFJ (Proposed Final Judgment), the Department of Justice throws out, if not abandons all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In fact, the PFJ permits Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the proposed settlement:

The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets.

Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past, such as AT&T and Standard Oil, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb altogether. Also, Simple slaps on the wrist or severe reprimands by the Department of Justice will not radically alter Microsofts existing operation methodologies. As history has proven over and over again, Microsoft will undoubtedly abuse its monopoly

position at the expense of others. Unless something extraordinary is done such as breaking up Microsofts business into several parts or meting out severe punishment, Microsoft will persistently continue to implement illegal business practices. I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment does not solve the Microsoft issue.

Respectfully,
Jeffrey Jimenez
3061 La Selva Ave Apt C203
San Mateo, CA 94401

MTC-00011044

From: Jeff Daniell
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 12:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jeff Daniell
PO Box 1444
Lampasas, TX 76550
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jeff Daniell

MTC-00011045

From: Jonathan Hughey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 12:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jonathan Hughey
4240 Cuesta Dr.
Irving, TX 75038
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jonathan N Hughey

MTC-00011046

From: Steve Moore
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 12:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Steve Moore
1306 Island View Ct.
Nashville, TN 37214
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Steve Moore

MTC-00011047

From: John Thibodeau
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/13/02 11:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 John Thibodeau
 366 S W Main St
 Douglas, Ma 01516-2505
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 John Thibodeau

MTC-00011048

From: Jesse Cook
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 12:46am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Jesse Cook
 5784 Ohara Ct
 Boise, ID 83703
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting

valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Jesse Cook

MTC-00011049

From: Chance Cartwright
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 12:13am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Chance Cartwright
 12 Perkins
 Lampasas, TX 76550
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 Chance Cartwright

MTC-00011050

From: Hao He
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/14/02 1:21am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It appears to the rest of the world that justice is only as much as you can afford it in the USA.

Microsoft has been found to be a monopoly and has used that monopoly position for its illegal gains. However, Microsoft can get away with its wrong doings without any effective punishment.

Dr. Hao He

Software Architect
 The above statements only reflect my personal views.

MTC-00011051

From: root@smtp.sunflower.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 1:43am
 Subject: Microsoft

This is a terrible settlement. I do feel that those in the Justice Department that made it were well meaning, but they simply do not understand what Microsoft is doing. Most developers will flat out tell you that Microsoft is an impediment to technological advancement, they are a monopoly, and have massively abused that position.

I could go on and on. But let me just make one example, Internet Explorer.

Microsoft was nonexistent in the development stages of the Web. But they ended up cloning the good work of others, and then using their monopoly power to drive those who were the innovators, out of the picture.

This is what Microsoft does every time. They were a decent and innovative company, up to the mid 90s. But that changed. Microsoft no longer creates, it does not innovate. It clones, and uses its monopoly position to drive those that really do innovate out, leaving Microsoft with control of the market.

If this is not monopoly abuse, what is? Please tell me. And what is really frightening, is what Microsoft has planned for the future.

Frank Kalich
 Software Engineer
 915 Alabama
 Lawrence Kansas 66044
 785 331-3413

MTC-00011052

From: Jason Carreiro
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 1:07am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Jason Carreiro
 376 Hailes Hill Rd.
 Swansea, MA 02777
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling

progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jason Carreiro

MTC-00011053

From: Mayssam Sayyadian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 5:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

hello,
In my opinion, the proposed final judgement:

Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected.

Fails to remedy the injury done to the JavaTM technology community. Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market.

Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system.

Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism.

Regards,
—MS.

MTC-00011054

From: Blanc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 2:56am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

What is it called when there is centralized control of private enterprise? What could be better for consumers than to have Big Brother sitting in Microsoft's office, at Microsoft's expense, watching every move it makes?

What a great precedent for the future of business and the "free market" in the "free world"!

What could be better for fostering personal resolve, self-reliance, and independence of mind, than to have a "higher" agency make the decisions for OEMs, ISP, and OSPs who lack the courage to reject exclusionary agreements or refuse to do business under those terms, since otherwise they'll miss out on the large piles of money they're sure to make in the deal?

What could be better than knowing it is a crime to protect the integrity of products for which a company is liable, and that it is required by law to include the competition in the designs? Perhaps this country should also include a link to communism in its charter, to provide it equal opportunity to attract our attention and fealty.

If I owned Microsoft, I would say to hell with it—let them use Linux. After all, there is no obligation to continue producing this operating system, make improvements or add features to it, or creating new software applications—and all the while suffering imposed indignities in order to operate the business.

Nor are consumers obliged to continue using computers and software: these things are not like air or water or food, and large numbers of people hardly know how to use them. Those who do have become used to their benefits, with much thanks to Microsoft, among others. But it *is* possible to live without them: it was not so long ago that they did not exist as choices for the average consumer.

Where is the harm to consumers from products they are free to desist from using, when they are not required to go to the store and put their money down to buy any of them, but once having done so are at liberty to roam the internet and discover all sorts of other free downloadable software to use in replacement, limited only by their time and curiosity?

I have experienced no harm from using Microsoft's products, but this settlement, though less destructive than the previous proposal, makes me ill.

Blanc Weber

MTC-00011055

From: Frank Bohnem
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 2:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Frank Bohnem
3247 Nowhere St
T.O., CA 91362
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Frank Bohnem

MTC-00011056

From: Mike Larson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 2:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Mike Larson
3672 Falcon Way
Eagan, MN 55123
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

It's time for this anti-consumer trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will put competition back in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom, when this dinosaur is laid to rest.

Then Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and stop wasting tons of time and other valuable resources on litigation. It's their competitors who can't make it in the marketplace, not the end users and ordinary people who have to rely on their computers to be productive, who benefit from this anti-trust, anti-consumer exercise in poor government.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers, not making it possible for other businesses to keep making products that people don't want and won't buy. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of successful corporations, people who actually use the software—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers. With the chains off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies, instead of funding to the tune of hundreds of thousands or more dollars the parties and politicians who represent these market-loser businesses.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mike Larson

MTC-00011058

From: Charleen Hoffman
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 3:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charleen Hoffman
PO Box 80927
Fairbanks, AK 99708-0927
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be

over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charleen Hoffman

MTC-00011059

From: Jani Pohjanraito
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 4:05am
Subject: Antitrust Division's case against Microsoft

Dear Sirs!

I would simply like to point out that before just competition in the OS and browser market and developing field is ensured (even in the simplest possible manner), the consumers will be paying extra price, and software developers will have 3-4 times the workload per project.

—For years Microsofts unethical conduct (middleware bundling with OS, 'harassment' of other browser developers, ...) has been slowing down the development of the web, made developers job next to impossible and has in my experience reduced the quality of services available to consumers on the internet.

—All of the above at the consumers expense: people have paid for the operating system, believing that Windows will increase their productivity and possibilities, when it, in fact, has brought limitations to the services available to them. This is an outrage!

—Web-service and software developers have been paying the dearest price: Microsofts business conduct has forced developers to invest at least 3-4 times more time and energy in bringing their products to markets—extra work is required because developers have to 'work their way around' the limitations and barriers set by microsoft (brought forward by the OS and the browser and programming language 'discrimination' practiced by Microsoft).

I hope you really consider this case as the case of the future of efficient internet and desktop computing—it is 'make it or break it' case. Outcome will be either outdated and limited OS/Service market, or contemporary and rich OS/Service market. Best Regard, Jani Pohjanraito Web Developer since 1996

MTC-00011060

From: Peyman Afshani 78179805

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 7:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In particular, the proposed final judgement: Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected; Fails to remedy the injury done to the Java™ technology community; Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market; Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system; Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism. In addition, Microsoft has unlawfully gained popularity for its products, by forcing everyone that installs Winxxx to use its applications including Players, browsers, editors and ... and in this "proposed final judgement" there is no solution for this unlawfully gained popularity. This popularity consists of forcing end users, which are mostly novice or beginners to forcibly use Microsoft's product and have no desire to change the software.

MTC-00011061

From: Angela Watkins
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 4:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Angela Watkins
Rt1 Box173-6
Durant, Ok 74701
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Angela Watkins

MTC-00011062

From: Matt Frankford

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 4:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Matt Frankford
17000 sw 17th cir
ocala, fl 34473
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Matthew D. Frankford

MTC-00011063

From: Charles Salber
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 4:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Salber
3833 Edgewood Ave.
Fort Myers, FL 33916-1054
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With

government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles Salber

MTC-00011064

From: Craig Hillemann
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 5:16am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

A FINFlash Alert: The DOJ wants to hear from YOU[RESENT IN PLAIN TEXT] January 13, 2002 Attorney General John Ashcroft U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Pursuant to provisions of the Tunney Act, I am writing to express my opinion on the settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice in November of last year. Apparently nine states are seeking to further prosecute the Microsoft Corporation. As both a taxpayer and purchaser of personal computer software products, I do not believe that the antitrust case against Microsoft should be dragged out any longer.

Please be reminded that the purpose of antitrust laws in the United States is to protect consumers like me, and not to support the self-interests of competitors in the marketplace. The parties that goaded the DOJ and states to file antitrust actions were Microsoft's competitors, not consumers like me. Microsoft's competitors are obviously envious of Microsoft's success, but the reason Microsoft has succeeded is simply that Microsoft has consistently delivered better and more cost-effective products, and furthermore fostered a large market and environment inviting competition. As result, enormously more quality, low-cost hardware and software is available from both Microsoft and other vendors for Windows than for any other operating system (e.g. Linux, MacOS, Solaris, etc.).

Microsoft's Windows product provides excellent functionality for the price. As a consumer, I want Microsoft to bundle as many apples as possible in Windows, and I do not appreciate hardware vendors modifying Windows. My computer-using colleagues feel similarly. Windows as provided by Microsoft works well on a remarkably wide range of computer hardware. The apples included in Windows provide very helpful functionality with dependable stability and user interface consistency. Their inclusion does not prevent other vendors from developing products with greater functionality, but does provide a useful standard for other vendors to try to surpass.

I have read the entire Appellate Decision for this case, and based on the facts, including my own experience as a computer user, I do not believe bundling Internet Explorer in Windows was unlawful. Frankly, I appreciate the inclusion of Internet Explorer in Windows. Microsoft's alleged

misrepresentation of Java support may have been questionable, but the context was a struggle with Sun, one of Microsoft's biggest detractors, for control of the language. Microsoft has since pulled back support for Java in Internet Explorer. Anyway, the proposed settlement goes well beyond any reasonable remedy in view of Microsoft's possible misstep.

Under the circumstances, the agreement made between Microsoft and the Department of Justice was certainly more than fair. All parties directly involved (not counting Microsoft's competitors) seem satisfied with the terms reached. Microsoft has agreed to license its software and applicable intellectual property rights to its major competitors. Moreover, Microsoft is planning to format future versions of Windows so that its competitors will be able to introduce and endorse non-Microsoft software in Windows. Microsoft has also agreed to disclose Windows line code to competing computer software producers. However, I personally will want the full version of Windows from Microsoft without it being hacked by other vendors. I do not believe litigation should continue in this case. There is no need to drag the suit out any longer. You and your office should back the settlement.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Craig L. Hillemann
1229 Crestover Road
Wilmington, DE 19803
302-479-0432
Craig_H@msn.com

MTC-00011065

From: Tom Kirkwood
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 5:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tom Kirkwood
4362 Rice Street
Shoreview, MN 55126
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial was well worth the cost in taxpayers' dollars, was a blessing to consumers. It is high time for this trial result in real changes that will stop the destruction of small companies. Many Americans think the federal government should have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft will be aware they cannot do these kinds of things, and not waste valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tom Kirkwood

MTC-00011066

From: Faraz Hach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected;

Fails to remedy the injury done to the JavaTM technology community; Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market;

Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system;

Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism.

Microsoft forced the users to work with its components like ie (Internet Exp . . .)

—F.Hach

MTC-00011067

From: larry mahoney
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:42am
Subject: End Microsoft Anti-trust Case
Please put a STOP to this Clinton-era corporate witch hunt!!!
Thank you.

MTC-00011068

From: mark oliveri
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 7:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
mark oliveri
626 chestnut st
mifflinburg, pa 17844
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
mark oliveri

MTC-00011069

From: John Quigley

To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 7:46am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 John Quigley
 15 e charlotte ave
 wyoming, oh 45215-2113
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
 John E Quigley II

MTC-00011070

From: David Secret
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:19am
 Subject: I urge you do not go light on Microsoft: Consumers and innovation will suffer.

This was sent via US Mail, I decided to copy you via EMail due to the risks of US Mail to Washington these days.

I wanted to make you aware of the opinions from industry regarding the irreparable harm Microsoft has done to the computing world. They have been blatantly anticompetitive, destroying any competition they could using their OS monopoly and continually expanding into new areas by leveraging their OS: Web Viewing, Web servers, Music(Media Player). No one can compete in any area if Microsoft simply bundles their product with their Operating System for free at first, they stave out all competition then charge because they are the only viable player in the market.

They were blatantly apathetic at the charges leveled at them by the court, they were mocking and even faked an exhibit in order to show removing Internet Explorer from a Windows computer was harmful.(Even though any computer expert knows it isn't).[There were different icon layouts on the computers during the video, showing it had been cut and another computer used instead of the original.]

It is clear, without stiff penalties and controls on their future actions a company like this will not deviate from it's illegal ways. I urge you to consider a breakup of Microsoft into at least two companies: Operating System, and Office. This would at least stop some of the leveraging they are doing in those two areas which they control.

Respectfully,
 David Secret
 MIS Director
 Kearney Development Co., Inc.

MTC-00011071

From: Smith, Janet (123)D 101
 (126)Indianapolis(125)
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/14/02 8:36am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please see attached letter.
 <<USAGSmith_Janet_1009_0109.doc.dot>>

Janet
 9115 Hague Road
 Indianapolis, Indiana 46256
 January all, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 US Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530
 Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
 As a concerned citizen, I write you regarding the recent Microsoft settlement. It is foolish, to me, to continue to dissect an agreement that has been meticulously negotiated for three years. How can it be, that there may be further litigation on this subject? The terms that have been outlined are in the interest of the entire IT sector and can only benefit our position in this highly competitive global market.

The many concessions that Microsoft has made in this settlement are directed toward promoting non-Microsoft software. This alone, shows that Microsoft is working in the interest of our entire technology industry. Some of the major changes they are willing to make include licensing, marketing and even future design. Using these terms as a guideline to get back to business is helpful to the consumer, the IT sector and our economy as a whole.

Please help to get this settlement moving forward. We need these guidelines to help pull our IT sector together to be productive in this global market. Let's make sure that there be no more litigation against this settlement. I thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
 Janet Smith

MTC-00011072

From:
 tom.szymanski@exgate.tek.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:41am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I am writing this to urge you to reject the proposed Microsoft settlement. I believe the settlement as it currently stands would neither punish Microsoft for the anti-competitive actions it has taken in the past, nor prevent it from repeating them in the future.

On the contrary, it think it would provide MS with additional ways to strengthen it's

monopolistic grip on our country's home and business software.

I believe that the only remedy to this problem is to subdivide Microsoft into separate business entities that would compete in the marketplace with each other and other technology companies.

Sincerely
 Tom Szymanski

MTC-00011073

From: Agnes S Heller
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 8:52am
 Subject: settlement

At a time when companies like Enron fraudulently squandered the public's moneys(mine included), it would be best that one of the most outstanding and profitable companies be allowed to operate without further interference. The states that do not wish to accept the settlement are going to spend a lot of their constituents money for lawyers' fees. This whole suit was ridiculous, belly aching by the likes of Scott Mc Neily and his company. He and the other competitors are just not smart enough! That is what it comes down to.

The stockholders of Microsoft should sue the justice dept.You are NOT SERVING PUBLIC INTEREST by further litigation.

Sincerely Agnes Heller
 (Microsoft stockholder)

MTC-00011074

From: Mark Rapp
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 8:25am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Mark Rapp
 96 Linn Drive
 Verona, NJ 07044
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mark Rapp

MTC-00011075

From: Doody, Scott (FUSA)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/14/02 9:04am
Subject: Microsoft monopoly

As an informed consumer, I find Microsoft's corporate behavior extremely distasteful. I find Microsoft's products useful, but lacking any meaningful alternative I have no basis for comparison. Microsoft is clearly a monopoly and clearly continue to abuse their power even in the face of antitrust prosecution. Even the recent "settlement" propagates their power by placing them in a position of prominence in one of the few software markets they don't control—our children's schools.

The development of Passport and the other components of .Net is truly alarming, given Microsoft's incompetence with security, obsession with controlling "revenue streams" and thinly veiled contempt for consumer's wishes. I plan on purchasing a new computer soon, at which point I will feel forced to wipe Windows XP from the hard drive (having paid for a license) and installing an older version of Windows, simply to safeguard my privacy and financial safety.

The best way to correct a problem like Microsoft is market forces, but the market is powerless in the face of Microsoft's influence over software developers and would-be competition. The role of the government is to protect the market from influences such as Microsoft, and I am amazed at the lack of progress on the part of Federal prosecutors. I have read excerpts from Bill Gates' testimony to Congress, in which he states that maligned Microsoft is not a monopoly and that consumers have plenty of choices. However, confronted with the breakup of his company, he then states that Microsoft is central to the entire personal computing industry; and that thwarting the company will imperil the entire industry. This, from a man who stated under oath that the does not know what "market share" is.

The DOJ needs to get busy.

Scott Doody
Project Manager
Phone: 302.282.7713
Graphic Production Services (GPS)
First USA Bank

MTC-00011077

From: PTemeles@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Letters have been faxed to Ashcroft and R. Santorum.

MTC-00011078

From: Michael Willems
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:31am
Subject: MS

Hello,
For what it is worth, our company, while it tries to take a balanced view and uses many MS products, feels that MS is hindering the industry by its anticompetitive behavior, and that a split-up is the only

remedy that will provide both justice and growth. Please persevere.

Sincerely,
Michael
Michael Willems
<mwillems@digitalview.com>
Chief Technology Officer
Digital View Group
http://www.digitalview.com

MTC-00011079

From: Robert Wheat
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:39am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

January 11, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

As a software developer, I am writing to voice my opinions on the settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft Corporation. I want you all to know that I support the settlement that has been negotiated with Microsoft.

It is my belief that the only reason the Justice Department is in the middle of this is due to other competitors' inadequacies and complaining (we are starting to call it—the software complaint lobby—if you can't sell it then go complain to your congressman). When Lotus was suing everyone for similar spreadsheet programs, we all thought—hire more developers—not lawyers. Make your product better to compete with the competition. That is what I do all day long. Where is Lotus today? I believe the products that Microsoft develops are the best in the business. It is the job of the competition to improve their products in order to be successful as well. It is my understanding that this settlement was reached after extensive negotiations with a court appointed mediator. As I understand it, Microsoft is not getting off that easy. They are required to make specific changes due to the settlement. For example, Microsoft has agreed to document and disclose even more interfaces that are internal to the Windows' operating system products for use by its competitors.

I urge that no further action be taken against Microsoft. We all want to get on with the next generation—not the last generation software.

Robert Wheat
13423 Post Oak Glen
Cypress, TX 77429
cadworx@coade.com
281-890-4566

MTC-00011080

From: norris dalton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:39am
Subject: Bill and the Boys

If any part of your paycheck comes from tax dollars, you should give it back. Try this. Stop using any and all software that is made by Bill and the boys. See how far you get. People like you are the reason he has done as well as he has.

Norris A. Dalton
norrisdalton@hotmail.com

MTC-00011081

From: Thomas Angioletti
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern:

I am a software developer in the defense industry and have been following the anti-trust case against Microsoft. I do not think that the proposed settlement adequately punishes Microsoft for its crimes against the American people in restraining free trade, nor will it discourage Microsoft from similar future behavior. Microsoft has shown no remorse for its actions; anything short of a heavy penalty (such as removing copyright protections for Windows) is an insult to the rule of law. Furthermore, attempts to monitor Microsoft's good behavior in the fast-paced tech industry will always be several steps behind.

In my view, the software industry, due to the high fixed cost and very low marginal cost of developing software, has a weakness for monopoly formation. We need a government willing to actively police our industry and enforce the antitrust laws.

Sincerely,
Thomas C. Angioletti

MTC-00011082

From: Greg—
Ambrose@Vanguard.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:42am
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Please read the letter I've attached. It expresses my opinion on the Microsoft case.

Thank you,
—Greg Ambrose
1250 Warwick Furnace Road
Pottstown, PA 19465-8903

January 13, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to inform you of what I think about the recent settlement between the Justice Department, and Microsoft. I think that this case should not have been brought to court in first place. However, it is in the best interests of all parties involved to accept this settlement and move on to other things.

The terms are more than fair and reasonable for the government to accept. Microsoft will be making a number of specific changes to their products, and business practices. For example, Microsoft has agreed to license its Windows operating system products to the 20 largest computer makers on identical terms and conditions, including price. Also, the company has agreed not to retaliate against computer makers who ship software that compete with anything in its operating system.

As you can see, Microsoft did not get off easy in this case. Please accept the settlement, and take no more action against Microsoft. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Greg Ambrose
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00011083

From: Will Hitchcock

To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/14/02 9:53am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was inspired to submit a comment by an article posted on Sun's web site. This article continues to convince me that we live in a world rife with thieves. Thieves that now have the US government working for them. I will keep this short since there must be thousands of comments to sift through. Microsoft has only done one thing wrong: a contract violation with Sun in terms of their implementation of the Java Virtual Machine (they added Windows specific logic). Absolutely that is a contract violation and should be punished. Every single other allegation is bogus. The US government has become the henchman for Oracle, Sun and the rest of the thieving whiners out there. Microsoft crushed Netscape because they bundled internet explorer. Good. I would like to sell a calculator program but Microsoft includes one in the operation system. Is a calculator part of the operating system? Isn't Microsoft using it's monopoly to keep me down? Shouldn't everyone be forced to pay for my calculator program?

Please keep in mind, that the only true monopolies (100% market share) that have existed in the history of this nation were created by the government. The free market has never yielded a monopoly—not a single one. Standard Oil's market share was smaller than Microsoft's for example. The government's law suit is an attack on freedom and therefore the foundation of modern civilization.

Thanks for your time.

Will Hitchcock

Principal Software Engineer

Delphi Technology Inc.

Phone: (617) 494-8361 x2046

Email: whitchcock@delphi-tech.com

MTC-00011084

From: Jeff Whicker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 9:56am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I would like to add my voice to the 9 States and the European community in a plea to reject the proposed Microsoft settlement. The settlement provides no remedy for the past abuses of Microsoft's monopoly, and it provides no effective means of insuring that Microsoft will end it's abuse of that power.

I was very dismayed that the Monopoly was not broken up. Why should developers such as myself be given sub-standard documentation concerning Microsoft's APIs while Microsoft's own developers are given access to "secret" APIs? A company which owns the most popular operating system simply has no business being in software development. They are competing unfairly with the very community which MADE their operating system popular in the first place.

If the software community had not propelled Microsoft's OS to the forefront then it would be understandable that Microsoft would develop software to be written on it's own OS in an attempt to make their system more useable. But it obviously didn't happen that way. Microsoft first let companies like Wordperfect, Netscape, Lotus, Quicken, and

thousands of others develop software for their OS. Then after their OS was already a monopoly, they went into direct competition with those companies and they did so entirely unfairly. They developed secret APIs which were never documented for the general community of software developers while documenting them fully to their own developers.

I realize that the proposed settlement prohibits Microsoft from continuing this practice. Yet the settlement does not make any remedy for the damage this practice has already done. Nor is any agency with real teeth going to be able to enforce the agreement. If Microsoft again fails to completely document it's own APIs they will simply claim it was a mistake. And then only if they are caught. They need to be broke up.

Sincerely,

Jeff Whicker

MTC-00011085

From: Chris Lovett
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 9:27am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Chris Lovett
 2155 Grand Brook Circle
 Orlando, FL 32065
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Chris Lovett

MTC-00011086

From: Gene Averett
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 9:06am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Gene Averett
 3889 Marlesta Drive

San Diego, CA 92111
 January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Gene Averett

MTC-00011087

From: Scott Prugh
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/14/02 9:13am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Scott Prugh
 2840 N Lincoln Ave
 Chicago, IL 60657

January 14, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
 Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and

judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Scott Prugh

MTC-00011088

From: Account CONSULT-SMI AI/SM-I
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 9:58am
Subject: Trial against MS
** Confidential **

Dear Sirs,

I would like to state my opinion concerning the proposed settlement. As a software developer, the quality of my own work depends on the quality of intermediate software like operating systems platforms or databases. Also, the level of stress that I have to face within my daily work with computers and the bearability of the job I do are majorly influenced by the actions of global players like Microsoft or Sun Microsystems.

Therefore I speak as a person directly concerned by Microsoft's policies and strategies and I cannot resist but to tell you that the business part of my life would be much more bearable if Microsoft would stop their ongoing seeding of discord.

Lately I bought a notebook and after a complete market survey, I found out that there was only one Notebook-vendor who could offer me notebooks without a preinstalled Windows operating system. If you purchase a Dell, Sony, Toshiba, Samsung or other notebook, then you can choose to take this graphics card or the other, you can configure every aspect. However you are always forced to purchase a Windows OS along with it. This is so up to the very day. If you just make the test, walk into a PC store, choose a particular notebook, and ask if you could purchase this laptop without a preinstalled windows, then you will always hear that this is not possible.

A fair competition between software vendors will only be made possible again, if some institution like the DOJ controls Microsofts behaviour. — Another aspect is that within a free-market economy, the best product should win the customers approval. Microsoft however is using its predominant position in todays market to force all software vendors into using their proprietary windows protocols.

In the earlier days I used to program windows software and my work was hard. Nowadays I am only using Java software coming from Sun Microsystems. Since that time, my work is much easier. My Point is, that although Java technology is superior to anything Microsoft has to offer, it is not going to spread among the people and its use it not going to increase because Microsoft again is using it monopoly to suppress Java technology.

If microsoft was acting in a fair way, they would reckon that Sun Microsystems is offering a product that is open and top-nodge an would try to catch up. Microsoft could even adopt Java technology because it is free. Nonetheless Microsoft prefers to use its monopoly to boycott this outstanding

technology and therefore suppress the improvement of software products directly.

By any means necessary, microsofts superciliousness has to be abolished. Laws must have a substance in reality and may not only look good on a piece of paper. It is necessary to apply strict regulations to Microsofts business mien.

Whatever judgement you decide on, it must be so made that it guarantees that Microsoft cannot go on acting as they do now in the future. To my mind the measures proposed so far are not sufficient. Microsoft not only deserves a higher punishment—it will be necessary to ensure a change in behaviour. Microsoft has had a chance to show that they are willing to cooperate but shows no sign of this. For example, Applte has integrated Suns Java platform within its newest operating system called Mac OS. Linux distributions come with a preinstalled Java platform. However, Microsoft is not integrating a modern Java-platform into its brandnew windows XP.

At the same time Microsoft is trying to become the only holder of people's electronic identities by setting up a proprietary platform that holds peoples secure identities. This project is called Project Hailstorm and Microsoft is using its monopoly once more to push this technology forward, not only ruining better proposals but also leading into an era where your complete identity as a person is hosted by one private company!!!

best regards
Sascha Coenen

MTC-00011089

From: Ernie Bello
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 9:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ernie Bello
610 Park Ave Apt. B10
Rochester, NY 14607
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will

be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ernie Bello

MTC-00011090

From: David Henry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:15am
Subject: Microsoft case comments
U.S. Department of Justice
Gentlemen/Ladies:
Refer: Microsoft case.

I understand the DOJ is taking comments about the Microsoft Case. Microsoft was clearly a case of monopolistic behavior. The company should have been split into four separate operating units.

1. Operating Systems.
2. Internet related software.
3. All other software.
4. All other business activities.

Why this wasn't done is a mystery to me.
David Henry
1620 S. 118th E. Ave.
Tulsa, OK 74128-5636

MTC-00011091

From: Frederick R. Brock
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern:

I feel that the proposed remedy fall's short of curtailing microsoft's monolpoly. I am a developer and devlope primarily java based enterprise systems, this means my inability to recieve windows OS specificate API (application programmers interface) information does not effect my ability to deliver a solution to my clients, however, from a price perspective I just spent 200.00 (199.99) on my UPGRADE to windows XP and just a quarter before I spent another 200.00 dollars on my UPGRADE to windows 2000. I can't afford MS Office which is near 1000.00 for a UPGRADE with the full version over 1000.00+ they can charge this because they are a monopoly!!!!. I have been around computers my entire life and watched as DOS evolved into windows and MS grew to become a monopoly. I used to be able to buy a Office suite of my choice from 5 or 6 vendors for about 79.00 dollars, MS drove all of them under and now If I want to be compatible with the rest of the world I have to pay MS 1000.00+ for a sub-quality office product. I can't afford to do this as a small business, I wish their was an alternative. But since you will not separate them or at least cap the price increases that they pass on to the consumer for MINOR updates to their product, no other vendor will have a chance.

In addition, when I installed my new XP upgrade it ruined 6 months of work, some of which I cannot re-create, I can't get my money back so I guess I am stuck. This is a big problem!!!!. Their software now answers questions and chooses options for you, as a result it ate my HD to crap with out giving me, the owner of the computer, a chance to intervene, thier should be a law against this. I lost time and money. Frederick R. Brock
Brock Consulting Inc.

MTC-00011092

From: Raymond
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:29am
 Subject: Comment on about the MS settlement

Hello:

I work with schools and community centers in the LA area. Many schools and community centers would like to use Linux as there main educational Operating System. After watching the video of Dan Kegel at Linux Public Broadcasting Network I also conclude that Microsoft must not create barriers to prevent MS applications from running on Linux via the WINE project. If the DOJ would enforce this one condition the US software market would likely return to a competitive market again. Most importantly disadvantaged ethnic groups and poor schools would have the technological skills they need to compete in the job market. Please watch the video at www.lpbn.org to find out what the really bright tech people of this country are saying. The link is www.lpbn.org.

Sincerely,
 Raymond Stedng

MTC-00011093

From: Brian Densmore
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 10:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice and honorable judiciary, A peer of mine sent this letter to you. I have previously sent in a letter. But this perhaps goes a little bit further in explaining my thoughts on the matter.

Some of my Information Technology background:

- B.S. Computer Science
- 8 years professional programming employment
- 20 years computer experience
- 10 years professional computer/computerized hardware experience
- 30 years electronic experience (started experimenting age 10)

In other words I have extensive knowledge of things electronic (of which digital computers are but one branch of) from both a hardware and software level.

I believe the Microsoft Settlement has been a capitulation by the current administration and the Department of Justice to the big money donations of the Microsoft lobbying and campaign contributions. The US won this case! Why has the justice department settled for this woefully inadequate solution to Microsoft's conviction as a monopolist? This is the penalty phase of this case, and yet there appears to be no penalty for Microsoft, and in fact if implemented as written, could actually increase Microsoft's Monopoly. Exactly! Microsoft has already been found guilty. While I can understand the DOJ backing off the separation of Microsoft, that doesn't mean they don't need to be reined in and made to behave like a good Monopolist. It has been apparent for some time Microsoft has flaunted the law in many aspects. They have taken other peoples copyrighted and or patented software and changed the copyright or patent information and sold it as their own (just one example: STAC software's stacker

compression software). This kind of lack of morals needs punishment. They just keep doing this over and over, and getting way with this! this is a travesty and a mockery of the American legal system. Don't let Microsoft manipulate the law to fit them; manipulate Microsoft to fit the law.

For true justice to be served, the courts must decide the punishment and not the politically (and monetarily) motivated DOJ. For this reason, the settlement as currently written must be REJECTED!

I would like to point out several flaws in the settlement and recommend some alternatives that would seem to make more sense. I refer to the settlement found at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm>

III.A Microsoft shall not retaliate against an OEM... Not only should Microsoft not be able to punish the OEM, but OEM pricing should be disallowed for Microsoft. The OEM vendors should be required to pay full retail price for the operating system and office products, and pass this on to the consumer. In other words, strike paragraphs

III.B.2 and III.B.3 from the settlement. Furthermore, the OEM should be required to list this cost as part of total cost of the machine, and offer all machines they sell with either alternative operating systems, or no operating system at all installed. This would provide clear disclosure to consumers of the "Microsoft tax" they are paying with each new computer system. Allowing users to remove items from a purchased machine is inadequate, as they have already paid the "tax" and Microsoft goes unpenalized.

III.D ...Microsoft shall disclose to ISVs, IHVs, IAPs, ICPs, and OEMs, ...the APIs and related Documentation... While this is a step in the right direction, Microsoft should be compelled to make public, not simply to certain companies but to the public, all operating system APIs, all communication APIs, and every single file format, current and future, created or used by any of their products. The interfaces and file formats should not be allowed to be considered "intellectual property" that would allow Microsoft to restrict access by imposing "royalties or other payment of monetary consideration" simply to interface with their products. This will promote true competition by allowing other companies and the open source community to write programs that can be fully compatible with, and have equivalent functionality to the Microsoft monopoly products. APIs (Application Programming Interfaces) are exactly that. They are an interface; a way of communicating between two closed systems. If Microsoft hides the APIs, then only Microsoft can communicate with that system. Microsoft does disclose a number of APIs, but not the ones they use "internally"; which allows them to "integrate" certain things (like Explorer) into the OS. No one else can use these APIs without reverse engineering them, because they are hidden from the public.

II.J—No provision of this Final Judgment shall:

1. Require Microsoft to document, disclose or license to third parties...
2. Prevent Microsoft from conditioning any license... This paragraph reads like a major

legal loophole for Microsoft that will allow them to get away with keeping large parts of the interface to their systems a secret by saying that the disclosure would "compromise the security" of that system. The APIs and file formats I mentioned above should be excluded from this paragraph.

Section V. Termination

B. In any enforcement proceeding in which the Court has found that Microsoft has engaged in a pattern of willful and systematic violations, the Plaintiffs may apply to the Court for a one-time extension of this Final Judgment of up to two years, together with such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

So if I have interpreted this paragraph correctly, if Microsoft fails to comply with this settlement in the first five years, their punishment is to spend two more years not complying!? How is this an incentive for Microsoft to comply with the settlement? This section completely removes what few teeth this settlement ever had. This section should be completely rewritten such that if Microsoft fails to comply with the settlement, any and all intellectual property not in compliance will be forfeited to the public domain. That would be an incentive for compliance!

In summary, the Microsoft punishment for being a convicted monopolist should include the opening and documenting of all Application Programming Interfaces for their products, the documented specification of all file formats for documents created by their products should be public domain, and the complete prohibition of the discounts and "bundling" Microsoft currently engages in with hardware vendors. Additionally, the legal loopholes should be removed, and the penalty for non-compliance should be severe.

A settlement that truly encourages competition is very much in the national interest and national security. A study released a year ago by the highly respected Center for Strategic and International Studies, pointed out that the use of Microsoft software actually poses a national security risk. We can not allow any one company to maintain a strangle hold on something as important to this nation as the information technology infrastructure of this country. It is very important for the future of this nation that a careful and deliberate penalty that restores true competition to the software marketplace be implemented.

Thanks you for your time,

Jim Herrmann
 Kansas City, Kansas

KC Linux Users Group—to unsubscribe send mail to majordomo@kclug.org Enter without the quotes in body of message "unsubscribe kclug"

Thank you,
 Brian Densmore
 Associate
<mailto:densmore@ctbsonline.com>
 CompuTech Business Solutions, Inc.
<http://www.ctbsonline.com/>
 (816) 880-0988 x215

MTC-00011094

From: Paul Farwell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 10:34am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want to voice my concerns about the proposed December 7th settlement of Microsoft antitrust case. These views are my own and not those of my current or previous employers.

As an experienced software developer, I see effects of Microsoft's monopoly on the software industry that are probably invisible to the average software user. It's been my responsibility to investigate and recommend software tools to my employer. In many cases, there is a reluctance to consider anything other than a solution using Microsoft tools and technology. The reason is not necessarily because Microsoft solutions (like Visual C++ or Visual Basic) are considered better than the alternatives. It's the concern that alternative solutions have no built-in support for deploying applications on the Windows operating system, which a large majority of our customers use. Java technology is a really good case in point. For years, Java has had the potential to provide users with complete and powerful applications on their web browsers in a browser-independent and OS-independent way. It is a much better tool for writing sophisticated web applications than HTML, which has become the de facto standard for web user interfaces. Most users don't realize how primitive most web applications are because they don't know what the alternatives are. While it is true that HTML is an open standard, one not controlled by Microsoft, it is also very limited. HTML is good at presenting text and pictures, but is a poor technology for developing a good web application, like a on-line scheduling tool. It amazes me that even today most web applications are displayed in HTML (and JavaScript). Why is that? Java applets would be the primary tool used in web applications if Internet Explorer had not won the "browser wars". IE's support for applets is poor because it offers out-dated (or nonexistent) Java support. Microsoft has attempted to introduce their own active content solution, ActiveX, but this solution limits the software developer to Microsoft technology on both the front-end (the browser) and the back-end (the middleware services on the network host). It works only if the software developer takes the 'Microsoft everywhere' approach.

It is very frustrating to see software vendors avoid Java technology, not because of the merits or demerits of the technology itself, but because of the perception that Microsoft won't support it. Ordinary consumers of software may not fully appreciate this, but it does have a powerful effect on the kinds of products we can deliver to them.

As a remedy, it makes sense to me that Microsoft supply a complete and up-to-date version of Java with every copy of the Windows operating system. This would remove the burden from the software vendor of struggling to get good Java support on an end-user's computer. That way, Java technology could be judged on its merits, not on whether Microsoft supports it.

Paul Farwell
Software Engineer

MTC-00011095

From: richard brosnahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:41am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice

I was disappointed in the proposed settlement the Department of Justice offered for its case against Microsoft. Where the case found them guilty of using their monopoly power to crush and stifle competition, the settlement does little to punish them, and provides nothing to deter them from doing it again.

It has been determined that they used illegal tactics to become what they are. Stifled competition means innovation is stifled as well. I urge you not to accept the weak settlement proposal. It is in the public interest that a stronger penalty be applied, as well as stronger remedies to prevent Microsoft from continuing their illegal practices.

Best regards,
Richard Brosnahan
Senior Software Engineer
Xperts, Inc
email: rbrosnahan@xperts.com
web: <http://www.xperts.com/>
CC:Richard Brosnahan

MTC-00011096

From: Stephen.Lochren@Sun.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:47am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

After reviewing the Prohibited conduct section it appears that Microsoft is left to review its practices and conduct business in a fair and unbiased manner and given the facts to date this has not been the case. I would recommend that this settlement not be granted in its present form and sent back to the courts.

Steve Lochren

MTC-00011097

From: Liz Lindsey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:48am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,
I am writing to let you know I support the Bush Administration and Microsoft in their desire to settle this lawsuit. Not only do I believe that Microsoft has done nothing to harm me as a consumer, but I believe my life has been greatly improved because of all the technology brought to the market because of Microsoft. The advent of the home computer has transformed my life and 'raised the level of all boats'. To prove there's no monopoly in my home, we own a Macintosh, and we also run Unix on our server, though we use Microsoft on our PCs. I have never been forced to use Bill Gates products, and the ones I do use, are used through choice. Explorer is without a doubt a better product than Navigator. There is a choice, and 90% of users agree. The 10% who use Netscape are proof that the government had a specious argument for 'monopoly'. Stop wasting my taxpayer dollars on this trial. Drop this case! Free up Department of Justice resources to

pursue antitrust violations that currently truly harm the public.

Elizabeth Lindsey
2125 Colorwood Ct.
Fuquay Varina, NC 27526
919-557-4966

MTC-00011098

From: Marvin Gardner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:38am
Subject: Fw: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir:

I would like to submit some argument as an amicus curiae. The Attorney General gave me your e-mail address, for which I am very thankful. I am aware that this amounts to a large amount of reading, but until today I had no idea of how to contact you. I strongly request that you take the time, especially to read the information posted at the first URL in the enclosed message. I lived and worked in Silicon Valley (San Jose, California) from 1973-1995 working in the semiconductor industry. As such, I am pretty well acquainted with the history of Microsoft and Bill Gates, which the huge majority of people in this nation are totally unaware of. Secondly, I strongly suggest that my 5-point "settlement" proposal contained in the enclosed letter is (in all likelihood) the only one that will do true justice to the people of this nation.

Thank you for your consideration.
Marvin Gardner
Boise, Idaho

From: Marvin Gardner
To: Connecticut AG; Florida AG; Iowa AG;
Kansas AG; Massachusetts AG;
Minnesota AG; Utah AG

Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2002 9:34 AM
Subject: Microsoft lawsuit

Bill Gates, beyond question, is an incorrigible (non-lethal) sociopath at core. (If you would like a quick biographical (personal and business) proof of that statement, you can find it on a page I authored and posted a couple of years ago: <http://sonsofliberty.org/wrecking-crew/bill-gates.html> In a nutshell, Gates obtained his de facto control of both, the home computer and internet software fields by the skillful (and totally unprincipled) "use" of legal stalling. By financially outlasting his opponents through an endless series of challenges and appeals until his opponents dropped out. Only one company—Apple Computer (which was financially as large as Microsoft at the time of the law suit)—has been able to financially "stay the course" with Microsoft, and Apple won! Last summer, when the Appeals Court threw out Judge Jackson's penalty (but verified the verdict) and the U.S. Attorney General publicly announced it would "settle" with Microsoft out of court, I contacted U.S. Senator Larry Craig's local (Boise, Idaho) office, sat down with one of his employees and "educated" that employee on what Microsoft had done throughout its history in order to control the software business, and set down the steps (conditions) that are necessary in any "settlement" that would bring justice to the people of America. And I urged that employee (with whom I have a friendship) to urge the DC office to have Sen.

Craig pass on to AG John Ashcroft. (Craig and Ashcroft have had an especially close personal relationship, through their "off duty" participation in the "Singing Senators" quartet.) I have no idea as to whether or not the Senator did pass the information on to Ashcroft. I only know that, just a few weeks later, the DOJ announced it's (total cave-in) to Microsoft. I also know that, sometime during the first 10 months of last year (the FEC printout I received last November does not give the dates of donations, just the "span of time" during which they were given), the Microsoft PAC gave \$6,000 to Senator Craig. And considering the fact that, in all the years Craig has been a Senator and Microsoft has been donating to Congressmen, it had given a grand total of only \$2,000 total to Craig, I wonder. Anyway...

There are 5 points that any settlement with Microsoft will have to include in order for the American people (and software businesses) to at last have justice:

1. All Microsoft software must be "open architecture" (a technical term that the software industry understands).
 2. Microsoft must publish and distribute free of any and all charges the source code of any and all software it releases.
 3. There must be total unbundling of all Microsoft task-specific software.
 4. All future Microsoft software releases must be 100% "backwards compatible" with all earlier Microsoft editions of similar programs.
 5. All future Microsoft release must contain no "blocking" of competitors' software. I feel certain that some of you might not understand the importance of some (if not all) of those 5 points, so I will have an explanation of the "why" of each of them posted on my personal web site by tomorrow (January 11). It will be accessible at www.bigskytel.com/marvingardner/MS—justice.html
- Yours truly,
Marvin Gardner

MTC-00011099

From: Cedryden@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:50am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In my opinion the entire pursuit of MSFT is unwarranted and the DOJ is overstepping the boundary of what the antitrust laws were intended for. The entire endeavor was pushed by a bunch of crybabies who couldn't compete in the market place and hence enlisted big brother in their fight. MSFT's bundling is a non-problem for me...I just don't use those features I don't want.

Charles Dryden
232 Rebecca Dr #447
Alamo, Tx. 78516
956-783-7410

MTC-00011100

From: Bradley.Wellington@hbo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My name is Brad Wellington and I am professional software developer currently living in New York. I am very concerned about the Microsoft trial because I believe

that the remedy will have long term effects that will be felt for years. I am particularly concerned about Microsoft's bundling of middleware into their operating system. The proposed settlement doesn't address this behavior, which I find quite disturbing. There is absolutely nothing in the settlement that would prevent them from "Netscape"-ing another product. I am fairly certain that Microsoft's long term goal is to build almost all software worldwide and knock everyone else out of every market, and they plan to use windows to do it. Look at Windows XP. They are trying to stop Kodak from selling digital imaging software, they are trying to eliminate AOL instant messenger by embedding Windows Messenger into XP. It is outrageous to me that they have completely ignored the court's verdict of guilty. They know it is too late for Netscape, they have been pretty much destroyed however XP is trying to replace even more products. It is in your power to keep this from happening again and I implore you to do so. Thank you.

Brad Wellington
Senior Software Engineer

MTC-00011101

From: Jjpick@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 10:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please allow things to move forward. The Settlement is tough but fair. Further litigation is a waste of resources.

Thank you,
Joanne Pickrel

MTC-00011102

From: Karthik Raman
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 10:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Karthik Raman
1234 Alphabet Lane
Denton, TX 76205
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:

I went to a website that wanted me to send an email with some crap about how the DOJ wasted money on the MS trial. However, I feel that is far from the truth. MS is a horrible monopoly, and I wish it had been broken up. Thus, I hope NOT for the trial to be dropped, but I wish the DOJ could be more aggressive in their strategy to bring down MS.

Sincerely,
Karthik Raman—Senior at the Texas
Academy of Mathematics and Science

MTC-00011103

From: Logan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:37am

I submitted comments earlier concerning this case. I need to add one more. What are you smoking? Give Microsoft the opportunity to close out one of the few remaining competitive markets existing in the computer industry? Make them "pay" 1.1 billion (less than one month's income) in "free" software for one year? Free is the correct term. You

propose that they give away "refurbished" machines that have already been amortized and written off and software that they create internally? They don't even have to pay for packaging! Why, come to think of it, they don't even have to pay the taxes on the sales because technically it's a donation.

Then, when the year is up and it's time to upgrade? Hmm, I wonder who's going to end up paying for Johnny to get his new version of Office... Could it be... oh... ME? Are my taxes going to help Microsoft expand it's control over the market? Wow, what a way to solve the problems of the needy. I wonder how much Microsoft stands to make on this deal. Sounds like it could be in the billions of dollars in continued revenue over the next ten years or so. Billions of dollars of MY TAX MONEY.

I thought we elected intelligent people to work in our government. Oh, wait I'm mixing my adjectives. I meant GREEDY when I wrote intelligent. Sorry, my mistake.

Amazing. Simply amazing. We'll as long as you've got it, why don't you share whatever you're smoking so we can all bear this royal bending over a little more gracefully. I'm sure with the lobby money you're getting from Microsoft to write this case off you can afford to buy a little extra for us little people.

Thank
You,
Logan
Creative Director, USinns.com

MTC-00011104

From: Lon Baker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

As a concerned citizen I would like to voice my opinion on this matter. Microsoft has been found guilty of using their monopoly power to gain market share and effectively reduce or eliminate competition in numerous areas. The current proposed remedy of requiring them to "donate" products, services and/or money to the educational institutions in the United States is unacceptable. This will basically allow them to capture the one final market that they are not the dominant force in, effectively driving Apple, SGI, Sun and others out of that market. The penalty for using and abusing a monopoly should be harsh and impose a true restriction on the companies abilities to use this power again. Since the break up option is not an option and a 1 billion dollar "donation" to education only expands their market share and power to influence, some other remedy needs to be found that truly punishes this company for their past actions.

The bottom line is they broke the law, stifled competition, eliminated innovation and leveraged this power to gain wealth, power and mass market control. This needs to be dealt with in a manner that prevents further abuse and sends a clear message that corporations will be held accountable to the laws of the United States of America.

In this time Americans expect and demand that our government acts in the best interests of the citizens and not some corporation that still refuses to admit it did anything wrong.

Please do NOT accept the current remedy being proposed and go back to the drawing board and find something that will stop this from becoming another example the citizens of America use when explaining how corporations get special treatment.

Lon Baker

MTC-00011105

From: richard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:21am
Subject: Stop the harrasment

When is the government going to stop the harrasment? The government made a mistake going after IBM years ago and I think the government is making another big mistake. I am a consumer and I don't think Microsoft has done anything wrong. I don't see the anticompetitive practices, Microsoft's products are cheap. Yes, Microsoft is huge and is the big bully on the block, but, how can you say that there is no competition in the software industry when everything around us is thriving. Microsoft has set the standard and it is difficult for other companies to accept. There would be chaos if there were no standard Windows operating system like Microsoft's. I see no problem with Microsoft's practices so, and let's more on. Richard L. Bernal

MTC-00011106

From: Chad McCaslin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:21am
Subject: final settlement on Microsoft

The final judgement obviously falls short of having Microsoft be responsible for the problems they cause in forcing consumers to use microsoft products. Just take a look at the latest operating system from Microsoft and you will see that they are now attacking the AOL Instant Messaging Service. I personally installed XP Professional Windows operating system from Microsoft. It automatically loads Windows Messenger into the OS, but that is not the bad part. The problem is that the Windows Messaging client cannot be de-installed. I tried to remove it from the task bar. On re-boot, microsoft placed it back into the task bar. I tried to remove the program files directory and received registry errors. I tried to remove all references to the Windows Messenger from the registry and was happy for a short with the product not running on my system until the next windows upgrade when all of a sudden the product was back. I have not configured it nor do I use it (I use AOL IM instead) but it keeps telling me I need to set the NET stuff and start using it. (this is known as badgering) Somehow Microsoft needs to get that this is wrong and to stop doing it. The current penalty for this type of issue is not even noticable for Microsoft. Obviously, Microsoft believes they can keep it in the judicial system until the problem is a faint memory and the companies that they destroy along the way are just a memory. We are a nation that is suppose to punish those who do wrong even if it was a long time ago. How are we as a nation to promote free enterprises to startup when the monopoly (microsoft) will uncut them before they start. People have a right to use the software they want

and to not have big brother force us to use their software. Internet Explorer was one example, Now that that problem is basically behind Microsoft, they are attacking the next product. How do we stop this? The best way is to make it not profitable to cause this type of pain. Even if it is long ago, make sure that the impacts to Microsofts ability to cause similar future problems are extremely hampered. If that causes the price for microsoft products to increase, then maybe other vendors will have a chance to make a difference. When criminals cause the same problem over and over, many states take on the principal of three strike and your out. Well, Microsoft has been doing this for alot more than three strikes. When will we make a stand and say that is enough?

Chad McCaslin
Raytheon
972-205-5753
Chad_A_McCaslin@raytheon.com

MTC-00011107

From: Ted Marquis Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:22am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 12, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing in support of the settlement in the Microsoft antitrust suit. I would like to see this case concluded as soon as possible. As a small business owner, I am concerned by the fact this case was brought against Microsoft at all. Microsoft has been an innovative, competitive company. Companies, especially those engaged in high-tech endeavors, must remain competitive to remain in business. I do not agree with punishing Microsoft for its ability to remain competitive.

I do, however, believe the case should be settled as rapidly as possible. To achieve this end, Microsoft has made a variety of concessions that go above and beyond the scope of the lawsuit. I do not necessarily agree with the concessions made, as they appear to be overly restrictive. For example, the creation of a technical oversight committee, which will monitor Microsoft's business practices, seems overly intrusive to Microsoft. Despite my belief that Microsoft is doing more than should be required, I support its decision to make such concessions so this case will settle. I appreciate your review of my comments, and hope to see this case settle as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,
Ted Marquis
President/CEO

MTC-00011108

From: Daniel L. Cole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can't tell you how pleased I am with the rejection of Microsoft's settlement proposal. Microsoft has demonstrated over the years that it seems to believe that it is a nation unto

itself, with its own rules, regardless of what others experience.

What particularly strikes me is the arrogance of their proposal. I would call it a great demonstration of a Wolf in Sheep's Clothing. Thank you for your astute and wise decision. Microsoft's arrogance will continue, until it realizes that there are other people and companies that have as much rights as they.

I commend your decision.

Thank you,
David L. Cole
14 Abbott St.
Greenfield, MA 01301

MTC-00011110

From: David Graham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear USDOJ,

I would only comment on one part of the settlement. Microsofts proposal to donate computer equipment and software to needy schools. Although I applaud the concept, I think it does not server as a punishment to the monopoly. Microsoft does not yet dominate the education market. This is simply an oportunity for them to try to gain dominance in the market.

I strongly recommend rejecting any part of the settlement that might increase Microsofts market share in the education market.

Dave Graham
520 N. Sherwood St. #31
Fort Collins, CO 80521
(970) 484-4577
dgraham@i3.com, dgraham@riverrock.org

MTC-00011111

From: eh8@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case has taken a protracted period of time. A short summary of the situation indicates that not much has been accomplished in regard to the basic issue of concern. The public interest would be best served by moving away from the concept of anti-trust and more to the point of providing competition to Microsoft. Let s see the competitors take more of a role of competition and less weining about Microsoft s success. T

MTC-00011112

From: LaffingKat@free-market.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement seems fair and I think the public is more than ready for this lengthy expensive ordeal to be over. As a neighbor of Microsoft I would love to see this resolved so that residents of this area have one less source of economic insecurity.

MTC-00011113

From: cutterb@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is fair to all concerned. I hope the deal with the others involved will be settled in the same way.

Anything less will not help America.

MTC-00011114

From: shdwflcn@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I firmly believe that this farse of a case has gone on long enough. While everyone and his dog has been trying to railroad Microsoft other companies have more blatantly defied the most basic of monopoly laws to move against this company. In the end what has that gained the consumer? Nothing but scandal. It was clear in the beginning and is still clear to me now that although what Microsoft DID do (which wasn't nearly as much as what is being done by OTHER firms in the same industry) was wrong this was nothing more than jealousy and hatred of a man who did us all a huge favor for a relatively little price. Without Microsoft the computer revolution would have stuck to a few hackers doing a few things until Apple got their footing. What do I think of the settlement? Good enough if not overly strict. Let Microsoft go.

MTC-00011115

From: dila813@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please Approve the Microsoft Settlement it provides more than enough remedy to the charges presented in the case. It is not in the public s interest for this trial to drag on any longer than it already has. Lets settle and get on with the remedy to correct any wrong that has occurred and we can put this behind us.

Respectfully
Mr. Joe Public

MTC-00011116

From: cgbcott1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop the litigation against Microsoft I think the waste of gov t money has gone on long enough!!

Thank you
CB

MTC-00011117

From: BariGood@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs It is time to finalize the settlement of the Microsoft case. It has dragged on beyond any reasonable period. It is unfair of the government to serve as henchmen for Microsofts competitors any longer. You have reached an amiable settlement. It is time to close the case.

Marjorie Larsen

MTC-00011118

From: evdon2@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Govt. should have better things to do with the taxpayers dollars than to hound corporations just because they have the know how to make a success of their

venture. So please do something constructive instead of destructive in the spending of our money.If you want to go after someone go after the people that provide the American dream only to those who do not have the gumtion to do anything on their own AKA illegals immigrants from the so called underprivilged countrys any ambition they have when they get here is soon replaced with every handout the U.S. Govt. can muster small business loans food stamps welfare & no limit to the amount of children they can have which is no burden to them because you provide evrything necessary Xtras for every child born. I was talking to the Sheriff Dept. here about the kids born to most of these families and they call it their job SECURITY that s some tribute.

MTC-00011119

From: jauregui1@prodigy.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel that this whole law suit was not only unfair and unwarranted but also an unnecessary and frivolous waste of taxpayers money. I think that was the result of a lot of envy and jealousy from bitter underachievers. Bill Gates has done much more in compromising and trying to make up for something that wasnt a wrong in the first place than most people would do. I think he should be praised and commented for what he and his genius have given individuals businesses the U.S.A. and the world instead of our letting envious bitter petty and little-minded idiots punish him for his success and achievements. I guarantee you that if any one of them had created what he has they would feel entirely different. The whole world owes him gratitude and praise not this stupid backstabbing.

MTC-00011120

From: allen.severance@secure
applications.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The whole matter had it s origin in the envy of Microsoft competitor s. Microsoft did not do anything illegal. The lame justice department then headed up my Janet Reno lacked the foresight to see this. Instead of demonizing Bill Gates we need to admire what he did for this country. Microsoft should not only be released from any anti-trust suit they should be apologized to. Thank you.

MTC-00011121

From: evzonegeorge@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets get on with it. This legal draging of legal manuvners must come to a halt.

MTC-00011122

From: jimj@value.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is time to put this Microsoft case behind us. It is so obvious to me that Microsofts competitors are pushing to keep it

going. AOL should be put under the microscope . . . Hummmm. What would we find there . . .? If it wernt for Microsoft I wouldnt be typing this right now. Microsoft has hepled far more people in the learning of computers than any other company. Let s save a little of the TAX Payers TAX money and close this case. The Government has already spent far to much on this case. Thank You

MTC-00011123

From: dovn@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop punishing success. Microsoft made the desktop computer possible. America should honor innovation and customer service not cave in ti Microsoft s whining competitors. The proposed settlement is fair to all parties concerned including the American public.

MTC-00011125

From: kwkid@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While I personally don t believe Microsoft should ever have been brought to judgement I firmly believe that it is time to put this behind us. Continued litigation serves no purpose except to line the attorneys pockets with more of my hard earned money. I would much prefer to use that money buying more software from Microsoft Corp.

Sincerely

Dieter Sellers Loyal Microsoft User

MTC-00011126

From: bob—c3@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

THEY ARE CROOKS AND SHOULD BE IN JAIL BUT AS USUAL THE LEGAL SYSTEM ONLY WORKS FORTHE BIG GUYS. IT'S NOT FUNNY ANYMORE.BUT YOU STILL DON'T GET IT.YOU TOOK A DIVE.THHHATS ALL FOLKS!!

MTC-00011127

From: budspence1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
end the charges against Microsoft.

MTC-00011128

From: billtanner@attglobal.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe STONGLY that no company should blatantly violate our nation s anti-trust laws. I believe more strongly it is time to resolve the blackhole of uncertainty surrounding the Microsoft case. There will NEVER be a settlement or verdict that is without strong controversy. America and Americans need your wisdom experience and good judgement during this difficult time. We need to remember that innovation made and keeps America great. Judge Kotelly this is a TOUGH decision for you. But this is a reasonable settlement. Americans

everywhere will be positively impacted by resolving this case as expeditiously as possible. Thank you for reviewing these comments. I have included my name and number if you would like to contact me. PS FULL DISCLOSURE: I own 176 shares of Microsoft. I also own 400 shares of Oracle which is Microsoft's biggest corporate detractor.

MTC-00011129

From: rositze@zianet.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The current settlement is enough. It is time to stop wasting time and money on a suit that should probably never have been filed at least on the basis it rests and move forward. Let the consumers determine what products we want and the market will in the long run even itself out.

MTC-00011130

From: emo101@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the settlement with Microsoft is in the best interest of everyone and good for the economy
E.R.

MTC-00011131

From: kmm2000@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with the settlement. Let this be the end of it so Bill Gates and Microsoft can move on and get back to business doing what they do best.

MTC-00011132

From: Hipmarjory@WebTV.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe Microsoft is being punished for being creative and far-seeing so lesser companies can cash in on their expertise. Reward Microsoft for being inventive don't punish them.

MTC-00011133

From: bobfinnie1@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to let Microsoft arguably one of America's all-time greatest engines of enterprise get back to business. Let not our government throw any more monkey wrenches into our best companies. Let freedom in enterprise ring!

MTC-00011134

From: qqqq@qqq.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
aaaaaaaa

MTC-00011135

From: cjscaparo@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In my opinion this case has gone on way too long and is starting to burden the American tax payer so let's get the gov. out of it and get it over in my opinion the gov. is bogging this down. Give them their settlement and get it over. It's just the thing that might start turning the economy around.

MTC-00011136

From: chas8422@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although I don't believe Microsoft should have been brought to trial in the first place I believe the settlement agreement is fair and equitable and should be accepted ASAP.

MTC-00011137

From: ischade@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While it is my opinion that the entire basis of the suit was without cause the process has brought us all to this point and it is from here that we must proceed. It is imperative that the settlement be made final and that all parties are made to abide by the terms thereof. The use of the court system to stymie one's competitors is reprehensible. The production of competitive goods is the proper response. I ask that the settlement be enforced and that all attempts to subvert the course of this final justice be denied. In the vernacular of the day Microsoft's competitors can put up or shut up and quit whining like children at a toy store. Thank you.

MTC-00011138

From: eredhawk@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I may be a user at the end of the intellectual chain but if it were not for Microsoft I may not even be connected to the chain. Just because someone wants what others have is no reason to take that which one has accomplished and give it to the who has not earned it. Get on with it! Thank you for all your hard work on this issue.

Respectfully

Rev. Ernest D. Matties thg.

MTC-00011139

From: eragsac@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Justice Department's frivolous anti-trust suit and the competitors' envious vendetta against Microsoft is pro-longed and frivolous. Microsoft is an innovative firm that should be commended for its success in research and development and marketing. It is an example of American free enterprise all around the world and to condemn its achievements only diminishes what America stands for. It is the choice of the consumers to buy and use the MS software and government should stay out of its production. Stop wasting taxpayer money and spend it on more serious issues in California and the nation. The Department of Justice and the California State Attorney

General should not continue to jeopardize the economy and future of technology.

MTC-00011140

From: yourpalgayle@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am delighted my government finally behaved in a way commensurate with business opportunities and good business sense in settling the claim with Microsoft. I feel this giant of a company has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt how important they are to the well being of America and a prosperous American future. Thank you.

MTC-00011142

From: lmcquay@gbmc.org@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with this settlement arrangement.—
Laurene McQuay Information Technology Consultant

GBMC www.gbmc.org

MTC-00011143

From: cgcworksinc@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For the time been although not yet clearly and/or fully satisfied to the masses specially Microsoft competitors the mere fact that our legal system team is involved the media exposure industry people and those who care to know and have become aware of such litigation court preceding and final agreement this primary settlement should be carry out. Should Microsoft ever fail to maintain its agreement then the Court shall have every excuse to execute a much tougher ruling and perhaps the break up of Microsoft.

By the fact that all the attorneys general of all the states (The Government representatives) have all agreed on this deal and in order not to reduce the great technology leadership of Microsoft not only in the United States of America but the world their market share and exposure its competitors must not only think of themselves and their bottom lines (Dollars) but how conjunctively can create a better fairer and more advantageous platform for all to work in and therefore continue providing the local and foreign markets with their great selection of products while at the same time maintaining Microsoft under a microscope so that the big M does not violate competitive laws and/or agreements.

MTC-00011144

From: salto30@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:35am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop the assault on Microsoft and the freedom to innovate. To whom it may concern As an employee of Microsoft I can ASSURE you that technology is in its INFANCY. This is not the time or era to try and legislate innovation. The world and the technology industries are many many years from true infrastructures on which to build the future. If we don't give key players

like Microsoft room to innovate the future will be a long time coming. Your behavior and actions affect all companies who desire to serve customer demand and enhance our world. Get off Microsoft's back and out of legislating the technology industries. Come back in 50 years when we have true solid technologies that may require government regulation. Now is NOT the time for this. Thank you for listening.

MTC-00011145

From: Mike Morris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been involved in the computer industry in one way or the other for nearly thirty years and would like to comment on the proposed DOJ-Microsoft anti-trust settlement.

The whole purpose of anti-trust laws is to ensure competition and innovation so that like natural selection inferior products will die out and superior ones will thrive. I have observed with disbelief over the past ten years or so how the most inferior operating system (OS) that I have ever dealt with as a software developer has gained such a market share. When I tell friends that on most OS's computers do not "crash" or "lock-up" they do not believe me because they have not been exposed to alternative OS's (UNIX, LINUX, etc.) Granted that most of Windows initial success was due to its ease of use as opposed to other OS's this is certainly no longer the case and I fear that consumers will never get the chance to find something better if the proposed settlement is allowed to go forward. It is absolutely imperative that Microsoft allow all third party developers access to the Windows source code in order to create cross-platform alternatives to their software products and to allow direct competition with their own software products (Office, etc.) Microsoft should also be compelled to continue to support the JAVA platform since there is so much JAVA content currently on the internet. Failure to do so unfairly denies consumers the use of that content and is an attempt by Microsoft to stymie the JAVA juggernaut which is in direct opposition and competition to their own .NET platform.

Finally I would like to comment that I feel the only reason this settlement proposal came about in the first place was due to "economic expedience." Following the September 11 attacks I think the DOJ felt it in the best short-term interest of the country to soften their position and cave in to Microsoft who from all accounts had been intransigent in previous settlement negotiations. Opposed to popular opinion, the computer industry will not collapse if Microsoft justly loses market share to its competitors. Please do the right thing and protect the millions of consumers who currently have no idea that there is something better out there.

Michael F. Morris
Professional Software Developer

MTC-00011146

From: Jaideep Mirchandani
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 11:45am

Subject: Case

Dear Officials,

I would like to register my deep opposition to the proposed settlement. Microsoft is a monopoly by any reasonable standards. The settlement does nothing to take away this status from Microsoft.

Jaideep Mirchandani

MTC-00011147

From: Peter Hodgson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 6:40am
Subject: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm>

Having read the relevant documents, I am persuaded that the U. S. Government has caved in to special interests. This is particularly distressing, since it coincided with the recent change in federal administration.

Puteracy is a new medium. America is playing a world wide role in defining its parameters. It would be a disgrace if we were to stifle competition at this early stage.

Microsoft must not be allowed to bully the American people, or the world.

Yours truly,
Peter Hodgson
[Emeritus Professor]
CC: hodgson@humnet.ucla.edu@inetgw

MTC-00011148

From: Clive Taylor
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 11:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Clive Taylor
431 Pebblebrook Dr.
El Lago, TX 77586-6012
January 14, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Respectfully,

Clive R. Taylor

MTC-00011149

From: Cecily Wood
To: Microsoft
ATR.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw
Date: 1/14/02 12:11pm
Subject: Microsoft's predatory ways

I wrote earlier protesting the school aspects of the settlement, which have now been nixed, thank goodness. However that message was based upon public concern. Now, however, my own ox has been gored, as it were, and I am speaking as a victim of Microsoft's monopoly. I have just been informed that as a ComCast cable user being transitioned to @comcast.net from @home (after all the Excite-ment), I HAVE to use Microsoft IE (which is not so bad but removes all choice) and OE for mail. This makes me madder than I have been in a long time. Why should I HAVE to use the most bug ridden major vector for viruses as my only access for email?

I have a Macintosh computer. I made a choice not to be bound by Microsoft, and yet now I am being FORCED to use their browser and their virus menaced email product. Use of Outlook Express means not only that my computer is vulnerable to Mac viruses it was not before, but that I can become a Typhoid Mary, infecting other machines with PC viruses that won't effect my machine, but which get passed along to people I send messages to. I have checked with Netscape and they say yes indeed, Microsoft's use in servers by ComCast leaves me no option because it is requiring a proprietary "handshake" protocol which is not open source—for both the browser and the mail portions. I can't use Netscape, nor Eudora, nor Opera or any other alternative.

ComCast/AT&T is now one of the largest cable ISPs, so that entire large market is being brought under Microsoft's exclusive domination, with absolutely NO choice, no matter whether users are capable of downloading and installing alternative software—something vastly easier on a Mac than a Windows machine.

This is, of course one of the original reasons suit was brought against Microsoft. It seems to me that if they were negotiating in good faith, this proprietary handshake would have been altered to accept internet standards by now. This only further serves to point out that they have no intention of altering the business methods that made them a monopoly, that the current settlement is a mere slap on the wrist, and that they must be monitored extremely closely for compliance, once the settlement is set.

Sincerely, Cecily Wood (cecinalph@home
in transition to
cecinalph@comcast.net)
CC: Cecily Wood, Cecily Wood

MTC-00011150

From: fleur
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:15pm
Subject: Microsoft security

We are regularly assured that our internet security is sound, but we are equally regularly warned that our pc's are subjected to newer threats of invasion from unwanted

sources which, we are told, are even dangerous. The need for regular assurances of security is itself indicative that the opposite might equally be true.

Is Microsoft scaring us into being its minions. Let's have more competition after the spirit of true capitalistic principles. Hey?

MTC-00011151

From: David Chancogne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it may concern,
I share the view of the Senate Judiciary Committee's bipartisan leadership that while I would have welcomed a settlement that addressed the numerous Sherman Act violations that were found by the District Court and upheld unanimously by the DC Circuit Court, the DOJ settlement falls far short of that goal. I'm concerned that the settlement will do little to change Microsoft's behavior or restore competition.

This is bolstered by the decision of the nine state plaintiffs to press on with their case to pursue a far more effective resolution. In particular, the proposed final judgment:

- * Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected;

- * Fails to remedy the injury done to the JavaTM technology community;

- * Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market;

- * Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system;

- * Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism.

Sincerely,
David Chancogne

MTC-00011152

From: nancy hammond
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:21pm
Subject: Microsoft
January 14, 2002

To Whom It May Concern:
Please continue forth with the proposed Microsoft settlement agreement as it is fair to all consumers and properly punishes Microsoft for any wrong doing they may have unknowingly caused.

Sincerely,
N Hammond
25959 SE 39th Pl
Issaquah WA 98029

MTC-00011153

From: John Anger
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Any settlement which allows Microsoft to pay through the free use of its products is not a penalty at all. It is a reward. Software does not have a cost like a physical product and the more copies that are in use allow Microsoft to continue its monopolistic dominance in many many markets. Penalties should be paid with CASH. It is the only

stick which will get Microsoft's attention. Don't let them dupe you into anything else.

These are my views only and do not represent my employer.

John Anger
Alterna Technologies Group
Suite 200, 5970 Center St. SE
Calgary, AB T2H-0C1
Work: +1.403.692.2203
E-mail: janger@alterna.com

MTC-00011154

From: Glenn Brown
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:31pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Hello:
One of the central issues promoted by Microsoft (MS) in this case has been to protect their ability to innovate. In my opinion, that issue is a carefully constructed red herring. The critical issue of importance to our competitive system is protection of "everyone's ability to innovate and compete". "Everyone" in this current court case includes not only MS, but also their competitors, past, present and future. I believe that the issue of protecting everyone's ability to innovate has been under appreciated, at least in part, because the major voices in the trial and associated hearings have been MS and their surviving competitors. The past MS competitors that have been driven into extinction by the anticompetitive behavior of MS are largely unheard from. When they are heard from their words obviously carry less weight than they would if they came from a source with more business and financial resources. Many of the current competitors have to be careful to speak misleadingly softly so as to not aggravate MS. After all, they often are, to a major extent, dependent on ongoing business relations with MS. Finally, the ranks of future competitors are, and will continue to be, diminished by the awesome and legally-proven ability of MS to crush competition by means both fair and foul.

I believe that the eventual settlement should focus to a minor extent on protecting the ability of MS to innovate. MS obviously has the resources to look out for itself, even without its near total monopoly in desktop operating systems. Instead, the settlement should focus on protecting the ability of its competitors to innovate, and hence to compete.

Remember, if the US government hadn't protected the ability of MS to innovate and compete through its restraint of IBM, MS would certainly not be such a powerful anticompetitive force today. What other successful companies and innovative products might there be in the information technology world today if MS had been similarly restrained over the past 15 or so years? Although we can't redo the past, we can work to protect innovation for all in the future. What ever remedies are instituted to protect innovation, if they depend in any respect on the good nature and good will of the "biggest bully on the block" who has repeatedly broken federal law in crushing innovation by competitors, then those remedies are doomed to failure.

If the US refuses to break up MS into 2 or more independent pieces, then the eventual

remedies should be designed to coming as close as possible to such an outcome in both law and spirit. Such a settlement would come much closer to being self-governing than the current proposed settlement.

Respectfully, Glenn E Brown
14 January 2002

MTC-00011155

From: Eric.Devlin@choicepoint.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hey,
When Microsoft released J++, I knew that it did not conform to the Java standard and would only trick unwary developers and managers by using Microsoft's extensions. As soon as you start using a nonstandard solution, you are completely dependent on that provider. As much as Microsoft has added to the whole of computing and that addition is generally good, do not allow that addition to become the only voice that is heard as a result of its previous success. I think that the Microsoft should be broken into separate business units and restrained from engaging in unfair business practices.

Eric Devlin
Senior Software Engineer
KnowX
404 541 0251
eric.devlin@choicepoint.net

MTC-00011156

From: Robert E. Timlin, Jr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/14/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am writing as a concerned consumer to comment on, and indeed protest the proposed settlement - the Revised Proposed Final Judgment—between the United States Department of Justice (along with the nine states party to the agreement) and Microsoft Corporation. Upon review, the terms of the settlement appear wholly ineffective. There is a complete lack of punishment for Microsoft's illegal conduct, and thus no effective deterrent against similar anticompetitive behavior in the future. Also, the agreement takes no substantive corrective action to repair the harm done to the marketplace by said conduct. The preventative measures spelled out in the proposed settlement are also woefully inadequate. Specifically, it permits Microsoft to continue to control OEMs through a codified system of rewards, provides a glaring loophole to allow the company to avoid disclosing Middleware APIs, explicitly allows anticompetitive agreements, and perhaps worst of all completely fails to address Microsoft's use of its Office product to coerce Apple Computer, which the Appellate Court specifically ruled was a violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act. Furthermore, the Enforcement provisions of the agreement can best be described as "toothless", offering no means to address willful violations by Microsoft other than going back to court, and even then the terms

significantly handicap the Plaintiff's ability to prosecute said violations. Enforcement seems to depend entirely on Microsoft dealing in good faith, something which the trial record alone shows is a dubious proposition at best. This Revised Proposed Final Judgment thus completely fails to provide effective relief by the very criteria set forth in Section IV.B of the associated Competitive Impact Statement. In short, the settlement serves neither justice nor the public interest, leaving consumers completely at the mercy of an abusive monopolist. I urge the court to reject the agreement out of hand.

First, let's consider the total lack of punitive and corrective measures in the proposed settlement. Under this agreement, Microsoft suffers absolutely no consequences for its illegal conduct. There are no fines, no compensation to those directly harmed, nothing. The few mild restrictions that are placed on them can hardly be considered punitive, as most amount to nothing more than instructions to obey existing law. And since no steps are taken to undo the competitive harm inflicted on the market by Microsoft, the settlement thus allows the company to keep the fruits of its anticompetitive behavior: a near-monopoly on the Web Browser market. Netscape Communications was effectively destroyed by Microsoft's actions, and ceased to be competitive in the Browser market once it was acquired by AOL-Time Warner. The most recent figures I could find (July 2001) show that Internet Explorer holds an 87% market share. And Microsoft is even now moving to exploit this dominant position, reducing support for open standards in the latest versions for Windows, as well as silently disabling competitor's products that work with the Browser (e.g. RealPlayer and QuickTime, among others). Basically, Microsoft accomplished precisely what they set out to do with their illegal conduct, and this agreement does nothing to redress that. It is not unlike a bank robber being caught, tried, and convicted, then allowed to go free and keep the money he stole! The proposed agreement thus fails completely to act as any sort of deterrent to future anticompetitive behavior. If anything, it even encourages such actions by demonstrating that illegal conduct can be used to achieve business goals without fear of punishment or reversal. That, in a word, is wrong.

I submit therefore that the actual penalty that is to be imposed on Microsoft should include forced divestiture of the Internet Explorer Web Browser, along with a prohibition on purchasing or developing anything to replace it. This simultaneously punishes Microsoft, denies them the benefits of their anticompetitive actions, and levels the playing field for all Browser vendors, restoring competition (thus preventing the Internet from becoming merely an extension of the Windows monopoly). Divestiture would also act as a serious deterrent to future illegal conduct, thus addressing some of the gravest shortcomings of the proposed settlement.

Next, I would like to look at some of the key preventative measures that the proposed settlement spells out, highlighting several

glaring flaws that render them ineffectual, or worse. These flaws take the form of obvious loopholes, outright omissions, or even explicit sanctioning of actions that have the same impact as the anticompetitive behavior that the agreement is supposed to stop! Consider first Section III.A, which prohibits retaliation against OEMs for a number of activities. A good provision, but it is made pointless by its final paragraph which permits Microsoft to grant Consideration to OEMs based on their level of commitment to Microsoft's products or services. Instead of punishing those that do not bow to their wishes, the agreement expressly allows the company to reward those who do. The net effect is the same.

Similarly, Section III.B mandates uniform licensing terms, thus preventing Microsoft from using discriminatory licensing to enforce its will. But III.B.3 completely undermines that by permitting discounts, programs, and market development allowances, the only requirement being that they be offered uniformly. This merely codifies a system of rewards for OEMs who toe the Microsoft line. Given the realities of the Personal Computer industry (razor-thin margins, falling sales, layoffs), every OEM is therefore highly motivated to take advantage of whatever discounts or Considerations that are made available. Few, if any, would willingly make the choice to incur higher costs by foregoing these benefits to go with products from Microsoft's competitors. The same goal is achieved as with discriminatory licensing.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that it simply defies common sense to explicitly permit market development allowances for an established monopoly. Any product that Microsoft chooses to bundle with a Windows Operating System Product automatically has access to more than 90% of the market. This is an enormous inherent advantage. The only purpose of any market development allowances would be to absolutely foreclose the possibility of competition. Permitting them in an agreement to settle an antitrust matter is absurd in the extreme. Sections III.A and III.B thus start out as excellent measures, but the exceptions spelled out render them not only ineffective, but actually worse than doing nothing at all. Their end result would be Court-sanctioned anticompetitive practices. These provisions merely substitute positive reinforcement for punishment. It's the difference between giving your dog a biscuit and hitting him with a rolled-up newspaper; both methods serve to control his behavior. I believe that the Competitive Impact Statement's assertion that uniformly offered incentives will not discourage OEMs from favoring, promoting, or shipping products from Microsoft's competitors is incredibly naive and demonstrates a profound lack of understanding of the Personal Computer industry. For these two measures to yield effective relief, I submit that the final paragraph of Section III.A and all of Section III.B.3 should either be removed entirely, or be re-written to expressly forbid what they allow in their present form. Further, I suggest that Microsoft be compelled to provide versions of Windows Operating System

Products without bundled Microsoft Middleware. (The Competitive Impact Statement does note that this was considered but not pursued, but I urge it be re-examined.) These Windows versions would be available at a discount commensurate with the subsequent cost for OEMs to then include the Middleware of their choosing, be it from Microsoft or a third party. There would therefore be no cost penalty incurred by OEMs for selecting Non-Microsoft Middleware, and hence no built-in rewards for using Microsoft Middleware. The unfair advantage of the Windows monopoly would thus be greatly reduced.

Other provisions of the proposed settlement that cause me concern are Sections III.D and III.E, which mandate the disclosure of the APIs used by Microsoft Middleware and Communications Protocols used by Windows Operating System Products. By themselves, these seem like excellent ideas which would give third party developers the same access to core features of Windows that Microsoft's own programmer's enjoy, thereby further leveling the playing field. (The only obvious shortcoming is the 9-12 month time frame specified; that is a long time in the Personal Computer industry, at least for companies without monopoly power, so for maximum efficacy the disclosures should be required to happen much sooner.) However, Section III.J.1 provides an inviting loophole to circumvent these measures. III.J.1 states that Microsoft is not required to disclose APIs, Documentation, or Communications Protocols if doing so 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.

On the surface, this seems reasonable. But one need only look at Microsoft's antitrust history to see how this represents a blueprint for defeating the provisions of Sections III.D and III.E. Microsoft blatantly violated the spirit of the last Consent Decree with the DOJ by artificially integrating the Internet Explorer Web Browser with the Windows Operating System. This act of technical artifice exploited a serious loophole in the wording of the Consent Decree, rendering it ineffective and meaningless. Microsoft makes no apologies for this action and in fact maintains they did nothing wrong. Thus there is every reason to believe they would make use of such tactics again if afforded the opportunity (particularly given how successful they were). Section III.J.1 of the proposed settlement gives them that opportunity. By taking essential Middleware APIs and key Communications Protocols and artificially grafting in even basic anti-piracy, anti-virus, etc. features, Microsoft could then refuse to divulge said APIs and Protocols under III.J.1, claiming it would compromise security. Third party developers would thus continue to be denied critical information they need to effectively compete, and Sections III.D and III.E of the proposed agreement would be completely circumvented.

To reiterate, the Section III.J.1 loophole is simply an obvious application of the same

technique that Microsoft used with great success to defeat the previous Consent Decree. III.J.1 seems designed specifically to permit such an exploit. While the Competitive Impact Statement maintains that III.J.1 cannot be used to withhold inherent functionality, there is nothing in the Revised Proposed Final Judgment itself that would prohibit Microsoft from doing so. I submit that in order for the provisions of Sections III.D and III.E to be effective, Section III.J.1 should be removed entirely, or at minimum extensively modified (for example, including the above referenced language from the Competitive Impact Statement) to specifically guard against the integration trick. Otherwise, history would probably repeat itself.

Still another problematic provision of the settlement is Section III.G.1. Again, it starts out very good, prohibiting Microsoft from striking deals with IAPs, ICPs, ISVs, IHVs, or OEMs requiring exclusive or fixed-percentage distribution, promotion, use, or support of Microsoft Platform Software. But as with so many of the other restrictions, an exception is included that permits anticompetitive behavior to continue unabated. Microsoft is still allowed to make agreements to require use, distribution, etc. of its software in a fixed percentage if it is "commercially practicable" for the IAP, ICP, etc. in question to use, distribute, etc. competing software in an equal or greater amount. The Competitive Impact Statement does a reasonable job of explaining how this limited exception cannot be used to exclusionary ends, but the argument breaks down completely if there is more than one competitor to Microsoft. For example, in the streaming media market, there are three major competing formats: QuickTime, RealPlayer, and Windows Media. Consider an extremely popular news Web site (an ICP) that might provide content in the QuickTime and RealPlayer formats. Under Section III.G.1 Microsoft could make an agreement with this ICP to provide content only in Windows Media and QuickTime. The terms of III.G.1 would be completely satisfied, as a competitor's product would still be used in equal proportion to Microsoft's, and yet such a deal is clearly exclusionary, removing RealPlayer from competition. As written, Section III.G.1 explicitly allows anticompetitive behavior, giving Microsoft the power to decide which competitors would be eliminated and which would be permitted to survive. Even worse, Microsoft could structure deals with multiple IAPs, ICPs, etc. to fragment a market, choosing a different competitor to keep at each entity, but keeping its own products in universal use, distribution, etc. Network effects would guarantee the Microsoft offerings dominance and potentially extinguish all of the competitors. Obviously, for Section III.G.1 to have any real meaning, the exception must be removed. There are far too many ways Microsoft can exploit the permitted agreements to anticompetitive ends. A monopoly should not be allowed to use its monopoly profits and power to simply buy widespread acceptance of its products or services.

Perhaps the most egregious failing of the Revised Proposed Final Judgment is that it

completely ignores a specific violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act as upheld by the Appellate Court: Microsoft's use of their Office product as a "club" to force Apple Computer to adopt Internet Explorer as the preferred Web Browser (see Section II.B.4 of the Appellate Court ruling). In fact, given the definitions in Section VI of the agreement, not a single provision of the entire settlement applies to Microsoft's dealings with Apple. Apple Computer is not an IAP, ICP, ISV, IHV, or OEM as defined therein. It might be argued that Apple qualifies as an ISV, since the company does produce software, but to quote the Appellate Court in Section II.B.4 of their ruling, "Apple is vertically integrated: it makes both software (including an operating system, Mac OS), and hardware (the Macintosh line of computers)." The Court addressed Apple Computer completely separate from ISVs (as well as OEMs and the rest), thus it is reasonable to assume that in the Court's eyes Apple is not considered an ISV. Which means this proposed settlement leaves Apple Computer wide open to further abuses at the hands of Microsoft, especially where the Office product is concerned. This alone renders the agreement inadequate, without even considering the myriad other problems, as it fails completely to "avoid a recurrence of the violation" (to quote Section IV.B of the Competitive Impact Statement).

Microsoft Office is essentially a monopoly product in the office productivity space. It holds well over 90% market share, and as such is an essential software product on both Macintosh and Windows platforms. Indeed, it is a critical product for the continued survival of Apple's Macintosh line of computers. Even today with Apple's improved financial condition, Microsoft could effectively kill the company by cancelling Office for Macintosh. Office represents a gun pointed at Apple's head, and in fact Microsoft has used this threat not just once, but twice. (The first time the ultimatum was for Apple to license certain interface elements or face cancellation of the Word and Excel software packages, the precursors of Office. Apple was forced to agree to terms that paved the way for Windows to duplicate many elements of the Macintosh User Interface, without Microsoft having to pay royalties.) But even though this coercion has now been explicitly ruled to be illegal, the proposed settlement ignores that fact and leaves Microsoft free to use the tactic again. It would therefore be impossible for the Macintosh platform to compete as vigorously as it might against Windows because Microsoft can destroy it at will if they decide that Apple is becoming too much of a problem. The situation is even worse now that Internet Explorer has a virtual lock on the Web Browser market, because Microsoft can now threaten to cancel Explorer for Macintosh to extract concessions from Apple. The result would be nearly the same as with Office: the extermination of the Macintosh platform. Explorer is rapidly becoming a knife at Apple's throat to go with the Office gun pointed in its face. I submit therefore that appropriate relief in this matter is to remove these weapons from Microsoft's hands. (If someone commits a crime with a gun, the first thing you do is take away the

gun.) Divestiture of the Office product line would accomplish this, but may or may not be practical.

(As stated previously, I believe that Internet Explorer should be divested; this is more feasible considering Microsoft generates no revenue from the product, whereas Office produces a large portion of the company's income.) In lieu of divestiture, a series of restrictions must be placed on Microsoft to ensure they do not abuse the Office product. First, they should be required to produce competitive and compatible versions of Office for Macintosh as long as Apple continues producing computers. The "competitive and compatible" stipulation is necessary to preclude Microsoft from creating deliberately inferior or crippled versions of the product, and to ensure interoperability with the Windows version. (This is hardly onerous, considering that Office for Macintosh is a profitable product; this simply prevents its use as a tool of coercion against Apple.) Second, Microsoft should be required to commission under reasonable licensing terms a competitive and compatible port of the Office product to the Linux Operating System. This would remove one of the highest barriers that Microsoft has erected to keep Linux from competing with Windows, as lack of a native version of Office effectively denies Linux access to vast portions of the Personal Computer market. (Again, this does not represent a burden to the company, as Microsoft would not have to do the work, and stands to reap considerable profits from each copy of Office for Linux that would be sold.) Third, similar to the terms of Section III.D of the proposed settlement, Microsoft should be required to disclose and document all of the APIs used by the Office software to interoperate with a Windows Operating System Product. This would help promote competition in the office productivity space by leveling the playing field for all developers. Finally, to that same end, and perhaps most importantly, Microsoft should be required to disclose and document all file formats used by the Office software, making them freely available for anyone to use in their own products. This alone would go far in removing barriers to competition, as file compatibility is one of the primary factors which prevents users from exploring alternatives to Office. Even without divestiture, these four measures would effectively end the use of Office both as a weapon of coercion against Apple and as a tool of monopoly maintenance, as well as encouraging competition in the office productivity market.

Next, let's examine the provisions for enforcement in Section IV. As with the rest of the Revised Proposed Final Judgment, there are some good points, but serious flaws and omissions overshadow them. Foremost among these are the lack of immediate enforcement authority and prescribed penalties for willful violations. If Microsoft chooses to engage in anticompetitive conduct prohibited by this settlement, the only remedies available are voluntary resolution through the Internal Compliance Officer or through court action as described in the Competitive Impact Statement. Neither offers an effective deterrent to violations.

First, consider the nature of the Internal Compliance Officer; he or she is to be a Microsoft employee. The factual record of this case clearly shows that many of Microsoft's anticompetitive policies originated with senior management, among them Bill Gates himself. If further such practices were mandated from the top, is it reasonable to believe that a simple employee who is afforded no protection whatsoever from retribution by this agreement would dare oppose them? Furthermore, even if the Compliance Officer chose to make a stand against such illegal conduct and was not fired on the spot and replaced with someone more pliable, he or she is granted no real power to forcibly stop the conduct. The entire idea of voluntary resolution through a Compliance Officer seems predicated on the notion that Microsoft actually wants to comply and avoid further anticompetitive behavior. I believe the record shows this to be a naive and dangerous assumption.

Microsoft willfully and blatantly violated the spirit (if not the letter) of the first Consent Decree with the DOJ. The company has lied to its developers and customers, coerced competitors, and bullied its partners. During the trial in District Court, Microsoft repeatedly demonstrated contempt for the proceedings and indeed the very notion that the Law has any say whatsoever over its business practices. The company was even caught falsifying evidence in Federal Court! As the trial went badly, Microsoft turned to public relations firms to write fake letters of support in an attempt to create the illusion of broad grass-roots backing for the company's position, the idea being to manipulate public opinion to influence the outcome of the trial. At one point they even stooped to sending letters in the names of deceased individuals! And obviously the tactic has not been forgotten, for recently it was discovered that Microsoft had submitted falsified testimonial letters to the European Union commission currently investigating alleged anticompetitive abuses by the company. And Microsoft continues to misrepresent facts in the matter at hand, failing to disclose lobbying activity related to this proposed settlement in its APPA filing, when extensive lobbying by the company has been amply documented in the media! To this day Microsoft remains unrepentant and denies that its actions were wrong, despite the findings that were upheld by the Appellate Court. Given this record of dishonesty, disregard for the Law, and utter lack of remorse, it seems completely unreasonable to now simply trust that Microsoft will police itself, or even believe that it in fact has any desire to do so.

That leaves court action brought by the Plaintiffs to address willful violations of the settlement. This has proved ineffective in the past, as the case of the original Consent Decree between Microsoft and the DOJ shows. Even when threatened with the unprecedented fine of one million dollars per day, the company was not cowed (unsurprising since their monopoly generates billions of dollars in profits each quarter). Plus, the company escaped punishment for their violation of the Decree completely upon appeal. Thus the threat of court action, with

its attendant process of appeals and likelihood of only fines being imposed even if prosecution is successful, does not act as a deterrent against willful disregard of the provisions of the Revised Proposed Final Judgment. Appeals can drag the enforcement proceedings out long enough for anticompetitive acts to achieve their ends, and as before, any potential fine is likely to be insignificant compared to the sheer size of monopoly profits (not to mention Microsoft's staggering cash holdings, which presently amount to roughly \$36 billion and counting).

What is required to ensure voluntary compliance on Microsoft's part is an independent, external authority with the power to immediately act to remedy violations, triggering the imposition of prescribed penalties severe enough to make the company fear them. The Technical Committee as established by Section IV.B of the proposed settlement could be such a body, but the agreement fails to give it the necessary enforcement powers. The TC is limited to working through the Internal Compliance Officer or referring the matter to the Plaintiffs to pursue through the courts, both of which are likely to be of dubious value, as outlined above. Furthermore, Section IV.D.4.d makes even court action difficult by prohibiting the TC from either testifying or submitting evidence in any enforcement proceedings. This restriction seems wholly unreasonable as it only serves to further prevent expeditious enforcement. The Competitive Impact Statement notes that the TC can provide information to the Plaintiffs upon which to base an enforcement investigation, but why mandate such extra steps when the TC can directly verify non-compliance for the Court? This makes no sense, and would only serve to prolong the duration of any violations. At minimum, IV.D.4.d should be removed. (Note that this would not compromise confidentiality of materials obtained by the TC, as this is specified separately.) Ideally, since time is critical in addressing any anticompetitive behavior, the TC should be empowered to immediately invoke harsh penalties, either directly or via the Plaintiffs, to stop willful non-compliance. These penalties should be prescribed in advance and severe enough to nullify and reverse any advantage that might be gained by illegal conduct. This might include forced divestiture of products, or perhaps forced disclosure of the source code for the Windows Operating System. The point being that Microsoft would actually fear punishment, and find it in their best interests to comply rather than continue their anticompetitive ways.

Lastly, the final major problem with the Revised Proposed Final Judgment is found in Section V. The specified five-year duration of the agreement is far too short for conduct remedies (even the more far-reaching ones that I have suggested) to fully restore competitive conditions to the marketplace. While the Personal Computer industry is rapidly evolving, Microsoft is a thoroughly entrenched monopoly, and five years represents at best two major upgrade cycles. It is a short enough time that the company can simply "wait it out" (as they have managed to do thus far during the four-year

course of these antitrust proceedings) and still wield monopoly power when the restrictions expire. I submit that the conduct remedies should remain in force for a period of ten years. This would allow ample time for competition to flourish and make it nearly impossible for Microsoft to simply bide its time waiting for the Judgment's expiration. Also, the Plaintiffs should be entitled to seek multiple extensions to the term of enforcement so long as there is evidence of willful, systematic violations of the agreement (or associated illegal conduct), rather than the one-time extension stipulated in Section V.B. Again, this is to prevent Microsoft from simply "running out the clock" so it could continue with anticompetitive behavior unhindered.

In conclusion, I believe it to be abundantly clear that the Revised Proposed Final Judgment would be completely ineffective in restraining and redressing Microsoft's anticompetitive behavior. What good provisions there are have been rendered impotent by loopholes and exceptions. This agreement is a failure by the DOJ's own criteria as presented in Section IV.B of the Competitive Impact Statement: (1) it does not end the unlawful conduct (and in some cases officially sanctions alternate forms of it); (2) fails to prevent recurrence of violations (especially regarding the coercion of Apple Computer); and (3) does absolutely nothing to undo the anticompetitive consequences, in particular leaving Microsoft in control of the Web Browser market, control obtained through largely illegal means (as upheld by the Appellate Court). Furthermore, the enforcement provisions are weak at best, completely devoid of meaningful penalties for continued anticompetitive acts. Enforcement seems to hinge entirely on the good faith of a company that has repeatedly demonstrated untrustworthiness. Quite simply, under this proposed settlement Microsoft faces no punishment for its past crimes and no deterrent to future ones.

In order to provide effective relief to the marketplace, I urge consideration of the suggestions that I have submitted in this commentary.

I believe the additional measures and elimination of exceptions and loopholes in the proposed settlement fall well within the scope of the Appellate Court's ruling, and would more successfully undo the harm inflicted by Microsoft's actions, prevent further violations, and restore competition. Even though it is probable that additional, lengthy litigation would be required, the time and effort to ensure appropriate remedies is more than warranted. A quick but ineffective settlement such as the Revised Proposed Final Judgment accomplishes nothing and leaves one of our most important industries trapped beneath the heel of an abusive monopolist.

For the record, I would like to state that I am not employed in the Personal Computer sector and am in no way affiliated with Microsoft or any of its competitors. I have no axe to grind. I do follow the industry though, as computers have been a hobby of mine for nearly 20 years. I work in higher education and manage the computer systems for my department. These consist of a variety of

platforms including Windows, Macintosh, Linux, and Unix. Based on my personal experience, almost without exception I would never willingly choose to use any Microsoft product. Yet I am frequently forced to, directly or indirectly because of their monopoly power. As a consumer I am denied choice. This is the harm that is at the core of this case. Now that Microsoft stands convicted of the anticompetitive tactics it has employed for so long, there is the opportunity to pursue potent remedies to restore competition and choice to the marketplace, allowing innovation to flourish. If instead the Department of Justice chooses to proceed with this completely ineffective settlement, then nothing will change and the DOJ will have failed in its duty to the American people.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Timlin, Jr.

P.S. Please note that I have also faxed a copy of this document. This electronic version is provided for your convenience.

MTC-00011157

From: Brian Jones

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 12:40pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

<<Microsoft Letter 1-14-02.pdf>>

Management Concepts, Inc.

Business Computer Systems—Software Solutions

2229 s. Oneida Street Green Bay, WI 54324-8135 OFFICE: (920) 494-4949

PO Box 28135 Website: www.mcigb.com

FAX: (920) 497-4850

January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am concerned about the status of the settlement recently agreed to by Microsoft and the Justice Department. Your decision to settle the matter is admirable and it is unfortunate that certain adversaries of Microsoft are trying to cause problems for it. After all, the settlement gives Microsoft's opponents everything they could have ever hoped for (and some...) without actually breaking up the company. Everyone wins in this scenario.

Microsoft grew to its great size and magnitude because of the seamless operating system it developed and subsequent demand for its products. Yes, it grew to be a huge corporation, but if you recall, its inception was in a garage. It did nothing illegal to achieve its premiere status, as its competitors accuse.

I am most impressed by Microsoft's agreement to share its code for the Windows operating system with competitors. This is profound and demonstrates Microsoft's desire to move forward—even though it really did not have to disclose these secrets. It will also no longer retaliate against computer makers who ship software that competes with anything in its Windows operating system—another measure that will increase competition.

The settlement is fair and is a much better alternative to breaking Microsoft up. The

court should finalize it as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brin Lave

Brian Jones

Vice President

Cc: Representative Mark Green

MTC-00011158

From: Partezana, Chris

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 12:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To restore competition, forget about breakups and require Microsoft to license its source code for a set fee. And with numerous companies selling compatible versions, we might finally see a leaner and more stable Windows. Microsoft should be required to publish all the "hooks" into their OS at launch, patch, upgrade. There should be a penalty for each one discovered that have not been published. Setup a "bounty" system for people to find them. First one to find and post to a web site received a percentage of the fine for that specific hook.

MTC-00011159

From: Joe Cortale

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/14/02 12:53pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

I am a 20 year software executive who has had the opportunity to both partner with Microsoft and compete against Microsoft during my career. As such, I have spent time in Redmond, WA and gotten to know firsthand both the culture, and Machiavellian management philosophy that has been a legacy at Microsoft.

In recent days, I have come to know through an ex-colleague some of the details relating to the Proposed Settlement made by the Justice Department with Microsoft, and to say the least, I am displeased by them. This is why I am writing to you today.

Your Honor, how could the Justice Department grant Microsoft a government-mandated monopoly of the software industry and even worse—other technology markets? Clearly, this decision would seriously jeopardize all competitors—both now and in the future. This decision would clearly violate some basic principals of Capitalism, such as our right to choose, our right to fair competition, fair pricing, etc.

In closing, your Honor, I submit to you that like never before in our Country's history, Microsoft has unequivocally shown itself to be the proverbial 800 pound gorilla. Their illegal conduct and activities (bribing & threatening partners and competitors) have been proven time and time again. I would like to see Microsoft be brought to justice for the good of our country, our economy, and most of all—the good of our people. I like millions of other Americans are counting on you, and counting on justice to prevail.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cortale

Joseph Cortale

Senior Vice President of Sales

jcortale@eloquent.com

Eloquent

2000 Alameda de Las Pulgas

Suite 100

San Mateo CA 94403

Tel: (650) 294-6474

MTC-00011162

From: John Eriksen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 12:55pm

Subject: RE: Microsoft Settlement

I originally sent this mail item (below the line) to Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General, State of Connecticut <attorney.general@po.state.ct.us>. He mailed me back and suggested that I forward you a copy concerning MY concerns about the Microsoft settlement. Thanks in advance for your concern and attention. These are matters that are very important to all americans and have unfortunately gotten pushed from the public's primary attention by the events of Sept 11.

As a concerned american... and a very knowledgeable computer professional... Who uses Microsoft products...

I want to urge you to CONTINUE your efforts to rein in the behavior of Microsoft in any way possible.

It is hard to express in words how disappointed I am with the Bush administration and the Dept. of Justice's decision to settle this case short of its original goals. I want to further state that after having said these things.... that I am a conservative republican, who find governmental intrusion into the private sector offensive.. but in this particular case, it is not only justified, but damned important for the good of this country. Microsoft is not ANYONE'S friend. Their goal is become a global corporate entity with the same influence and power that an autonomous country has... And nothing short of pro-active intervention on the part of knowledgeable law enforcement is going to prevent:

(1) The illegal conduct of Microsoft and similar conduct in the future

(2) To spark competition in the information technology industry

(3) To deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains Microsoft is attempting to control the global network... one information protocol at a time. By nothing more intrusive than seemingly benign software 'upgrades'.. all the while... every other computer platform becomes less capable of communicating efficiently across networks DOMINATED my Microsoft software...

This 'incompatibility' is not an accident on their part.... This is a planned 'feature' of their software.. This being software not written to do productive work as its primary function, but to ensure an ever widening sphere of Microsoft dominated networks. Productive work being its secondary function.

This 'incompatibility by upgrade' must stop. Your efforts must continue until Microsoft realizes it is not going to be allowed to force its vision of the future on us any more than Osama Bin Ladin is.

You're legal efforts have my total ethical and political support.

MTC-00011163

From: Elbert Hannah

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/14/02 1:01pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In 1992 I was highly recruited by Microsoft to be on their NT Beta support team. I was very reluctant and agreed to interview at the urging of a close friend who worked there.

Throughout the interview process, I questioned whether Microsoft truly wanted someone like me, since my background was strictly Unix. And, I hated DOS, and I hated Windows, and I hated all of their products. They assured me they wanted me badly BECAUSE of my Unix background... This was during the time when Microsoft touted their new NT Operating System as Open and POSIX compliant—i.e., they were ready to play the Open Architecture card.

I accepted their 4th offer...

On Friday of my first week I attended an internal presentation on the NT POSIX subsystem. The project manager, Margaret (I don't remember her last name) opened the presentation with the following remarks: (and I am summarizing here):

Margaret: Before we get started here with the POSIX Subsystem, I want to make one thing perfectly clear—we have NO interest in this subsystem... The POSIX subsystem is just a check box so we can qualify to get government contracts. We don't care about it, we don't intend to support it, it's just a checkbox.

Then Margaret introduced the ENTIRE POSIX subsystem team, a guy named Matt!

Afterwards, I called and talked DIRECTLY with Larry Kroger about what I had heard. I recounted what I had heard and he made no counter argument. I asked him what I was to tell people asking questions about the POSIX subsystem on the support forums. Larry said, "Tell them we don't support it." I asked what I should tell these people about MS' future plans for the POSIX subsystem. Larry said, "Tell them we have none."

I resigned the following week—foregoing "in the door" stock options that have since exceeded \$3M in profit value.

Thought you'd be interested in MS' behind-closed-door "policy". And, if you have any doubts about the authenticity of my experience, check with MS' HR department about my employment at that time... Also, the "presentation" I described was video-taped, as were all of their presentations, so the meeting should be preserved in their libraries.

Elbert Hannah

MTC-00011164

From: Lance Speelman

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/14/02 12:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lance Speelman

543 S Magnolia Ct

Bloomington, IN 47403

January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust

Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Lance Speelman

MTC-00011165

From: Jane Olson

To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Date: 1/14/02 11:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Jane Olson

2025 Sage Lily Dr

Sidney, MT 59270-5730

January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Jane Olson

MTC-00011166

From: George Maynor

To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Date: 1/14/02 11:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

George Maynor

10201 River Drive

Descanso, Ca 91916

January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views. P.S. Perhaps your time could be better spent bringing the money changers down to their collective knees. Greenspan keeps lowering the interest rate to the money changers but real relief to the people in the form of lower interest rates on consumer loans is nowhere in sight. Don't you think it's about time to help the very people who elect you?

Sincerely,

George E. Maynor

MTC-00011167

From: SAGalant@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 12:09am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case against Microsoft I believe their last offer was a good one and feel that its the competition of Microsoft dragging this settlement on and on. I would like to see the gov. step in and make these nine states accept this offer.

Thank You

Sam A. Galante

MTC-00011168

From: George Tice

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 12:12am

Subject: Settlement

I feel that the Microsoft case should be settled NOW. It is good for the people and the economy and should be resolved without further delay. Thank you

George E. Tice

PO Box 2474

Sedona, AZ 86339

MTC-00011169

From: Ken Smith

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:13am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I understand consumers are being encouraged to voice their opinion about the DOJ settlement with Microsoft. I believe that it is critical for the country to get past this whole mess. The suit was driven by Microsoft competitors that have failed to compete on price, performance or features. All they have left is litigation. It's a sad and disgusting comment on our government that it should be fooled by such tactics.

Microsoft does more for this county in a week then Sun, Oracle or AOL do in a year.

MTC-00011170

From: William and Gwen Fisk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is in the interest of the American people and the world economy to settle the Microsoft antitrust suit.

Our economy needs for this issue to be put behind us. Our country needs the funds to continue the Anti-terrorism fight, not litigation costs. Microsoft needs to use their funds to continue researching and developing technology, not litigation costs.

If the other companies could offer the technology Microsoft has developed, you can bet they would have done so. It's sour grapes and let's move on.

Gwen Fisk
Small business owner

MTC-00011171

From: Karen and Harold Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:18am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT = DISASTER!!

DEAR JUDGE;

MY WIFE AND I ARE BOTH IN THE HIGH TECH INDUSTRY AND HAVE BEEN FOR OVER 10 YEARS. THE CURRENT PFJ IS SIMPLY A DISASTER. IT IS FULL OF LOOPHOLES THAT MS HAS ALREADY PROVEN IT IS AN EXPERT AT FINDING AND USING AGAINST ANY COMPANY THAT THREATENS ITS MONOPOLY.

WORKING WITH THEIR SOFTWARE IS AN ABSOLUTE NIGHTMARE—AND NOW THEY WANT EVERYONE EVERYWHERE TO BE PART OF .NET. WE DON'T KNOW MUCH ABOUT THE EXACT LAW IN THIS AREA—BUT IT JUST SEEMS TO US THAT WHAT MS IS DOING IS WRONG. AND CERTAINLY THE PFJ, WHICH I HAVE READ IN PARTS, ISN'T GOING TO LIMIT THEIR ABUSIVE TACTICS AT ALL.

IT'S IMPORTANT FOR OUR COUNTRY THAT PEOPLE LIKE YOU, WHO HAVE THE POWER TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT AND GOOD, DO SO. WE UNDERSTAND THAT IT WILL BE TOUGH TO STAND UP TO MICROSOFT AND THEIR BULLYING TACTICS. WE JUST PRAY THAT YOU WILL HAVE THE STRENGTH, THE COURAGE AND THE WISDOM TO DO THE RIGHT THING IN THIS VERY, VERY, VERY IMPORTANT CASE.

PRAYING FOR YOU.
KAREN AND HAROLD WILLIAMS
BRIGHTON, MASS.

MTC-00011172

From: BCamp1004@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:29am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I wish to state my views in regard to the recent Microsoft Settlement. I for one, (and I believe the majority of the general public) , am pleased that the Microsoft case has gone to settlement so we can put this behinds us all and move on. Enough taxpayers money has been spend on pursuing a company under the assumption that the consumers will benefit from government legal intervention, when in fact the consumers have only benefited from Microsoft's products and innovations.

Sincerely,
Bruce A. Campbell

MTC-00011173

From: GEORGE GRANDY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:30am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Dearest Judge;

there are five huge problems I see with the PFJ as it currently stands—and I hope that you will use the power of your good office to correct these egregious errors before this is made the law of our good land:

1. Communication Protocols: The Agreement states that Microsoft must now share information on how its middleware and server software work together with Windows. However, Microsoft does not have to disclose this information for middleware it does not distribute separate from windows, or for middleware it has not trademarked. This is a huge loophole, because if Microsoft wants to drive a competitor out of business, they just attach the specific type of software the competitor is involved with to their Windows platform. Once they do that, they do not have to share the coding information that allows the competitors software to work with Windows, thus driving the competitor out of business. Once the competitor is out of business, Microsoft can separate the software from the Windows package, sell it separately and derive huge margins. In addition, Microsoft does not have to disclose their information to companies that in ?their view? do not have a ?viable business?. This loophole will allow Microsoft to prevent new software start-ups from forming which, to say the least, is very bad for competition, and therefore, the consumer.

2. No Penalty For Undisputed Illegal Activity: Microsoft is not penalized for any past misdeeds. In other words, they are being allowed to retain all the profits gained from their illegal activities. Every court involved with this case has acknowledged that Microsoft broke the Anti-trust laws. Through this Agreement, the Justice Department is sending the message that this sort of anticompetitive behavior is acceptable. Every large potential monopolistic company is being told that they can get away with this sort of illegal behavior without fear of losing any of the gains made from such conduct. In other words, get away with as much as you can until the Justice Department brings an action. There is every incentive for future monopolists to engage in this type of conduct and no incentive not to.

3. Middleware: As part of the Agreement Microsoft is required to allow the PC manufacturers to hide Microsoft middleware programs and allow them to install icons or links to competing middleware programs. The only problem is that the PC manufacturers are not allowed to remove the code that could be used to reactivate Microsoft's middleware programs. In other words, two weeks into owning the machine, a consumer could be asked if they want to reconfigure their desktop, install all the Microsoft middleware and delete all the competitor's middleware.

4. The Three-Man Compliance Team. The Agreement requires a three-man compliance team to oversee Microsoft's compliance with the Agreement. Microsoft will appoint one person, the Justice Department another, and the third will be chosen by the two people already appointed. This new team will not be allowed to inform the public of their work, and cannot impose fines. Their sole remedy for infractions is informing the Justice Department of the infraction and then the Justice Department will have to commence litigation to stop the infraction. The Justice Department does not need a compliance group to tell them when Microsoft is doing something wrong, so in reality this group is just a smoke screen.

5. Market Share. All other businesses in the U.S. market that have a ninety percent market share are considered per-se monopolies and are regulated or have some sort of government oversight (i.e. utilities, local phone companies, cable companies etc.). This is done because it is in such a company's best interest (in the interest of their shareholders) to abuse their position. In other words, to gain maximum shareholder value, they are almost required to abuse their position. Why is Microsoft allowed a waiver to this general rule? Does Microsoft not try to gain optimum share value for their shareholders?

Judge: this agreement looks badly flawed—especially to anyone that has been in the industry for years and has seen MS again and again abuse its monopoly powers. I've been a CEO of a number of small software companies—and am one right now. The PFJ will put those of us depending on Java in a very precarious position strategically.

Help make this right. Our entire industry is counting on you.

George Grandy

MTC-00011174

From: todd neighbors
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:36am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Gentlemen and Ladies,

I feel that Microsoft has made our lives better through the innovations they have provided us. I do not understand why some lawyers want to tell us what is good for us. The technology has already changed and is moving in a different direction as more and more people get online. The people that are behind this suit are not individual consumers. The people that tend to benefit are the AOL's, Sun Micro, Nokia, AT&T of the world. They all have monopolies in their own business models. AOL now controls all

cable tv. They set the price and what's on. AT&T have not only the phone systems but also have the platform to deliver cable tv and the internet. If you look at the cost Microsoft charges for it's product it's cheaper than either AT&T or AOL's products on an annual basis. Who's providing the better value for the service provided. I don't feel that Microsoft has overcharged anybody and it's a disgrace to the public for these politicians who are suing the company for the betterment of their careers. How come no one sued AOL for the monopoly that they have over cable tv now that they have Time Warner. Look at what they tried to do to Disney a competitor. This is another frivolous lawsuit that only benefits the politicians and hurts the consumer and technology as a whole. Microsoft does not control an individual's ability to create a product for sale in the software market. They make it better. Without Windows, the computer box makers would have been broke years ago. How come no one has looked into the prices that the box makers charged for their products. I want Microsoft products because they work.

MTC-00011175

From: Robert Figone
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:36am

Our government should concentrate on protecting our companies and industries like other countries in the world do. Trying to destroy one of our own companies losses sight of the people that make up these companies. Individuals with families, raising their children that will become the future leaders, doctors, workers and patriots. Our laws should be used to build, not tear down efforts that create better conditions in our society. Encourage those who are willing to take the risk, make the extra effort to be successful not only for themselves but for their many employees as well. Reward effort, not whiners who are looking for a free ride or someone else to carry their fair load.

Government should not try to legislate success, only opportunity!

MTC-00011176

From: mel graham
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:38am
Subject: microsoft settlement ruling
108 Fairview Avenue
Elrama, PA 15038-
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania
Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
The Microsoft Anti Trust case settlement has been a long time coming. I am very glad to see that there is now a light at the end of the tunnel. However, I don't see how anyone can even debate the settlement's fairness. Microsoft is giving up a great deal to end this lawsuit, going so far as to give their competitors an unfair edge in the future. Sounds like the "reverse discrimination" rulings of the past.

I use Microsoft products both at work and at home. For years Microsoft has provided

American consumers like me with superior products, creating innovative and compatible technologies useful in so many areas. Their dedication to making their product user-friendly created the computer revolution.

Everyone had the same opportunity to "jump in" and profit. AND MANY DID!! Now, with the settlement Microsoft has pledged to share information, including the internal interfaces for its Windows operating system, with its competitors and make it easier for people to install non-Microsoft products in Windows. Doesn't sound like a just reward for a job well done!!!

The government has more important matters to deal with. It should not be intervening in the affairs of private companies. Please uphold the settlement and allow Microsoft to move on with their business.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Milford Graham

MTC-00011177

From: Johannes Ziegler
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 12:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Kollar-Kotally:

I want to express my dissatisfaction with the Proposed Final Judgement (PFJ) against Microsoft. As a management consultant to leading companies in the high-tech industry, including AOL (formerly Netscape), Intuit, and Hewlett-Packard, I have personally witnessed the damaging and anti-competitive behavior of Microsoft. In several cases Microsoft forced my clients to make product decisions that were not in the interest of the consumer, but that were necessary to avoid open retaliation by Microsoft— which is in line with what federal courts have found when they reviewed the Microsoft antitrust case over the last three years.

Unfortunately, I cannot see, how the PFJ will change this behavior in the future. On the contrary, by not severely penalizing Microsoft for past unethical and anticompetitive behavior and not really curbing the same behavior in the future, this seems like an encouragement for Microsoft to continue with their way of "business as usual".

So I urge you not to approve the PFJ but to request a judgement that adequately addresses both the past and the future of Microsoft's industry-damaging behavior.

Sincerely
Dr. Johannes Ziegler
President and CEO
Synesis Inc.
Phone: +1 650 813 9913
Fax: +1 650 852 9913
www.synesis.com
CC: 'microsoftcomments(a)doj.ca.gov'

MTC-00011178

From: Brian Grave
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:42am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Judge; the proposed deal with MS is a potential disaster for our industry for a bunch of reasons. but the most obvious one is the issue of "bolting."

The PFJ does not address the issue that fueled consumer criticism and which gave rise to this antitrust case in 1998: Microsoft's decision to bind Internet Explorer to the Windows operating system in order to crush its browser competitor Netscape. This settlement gives Microsoft sole discretion; to unilaterally determine that other products or services which do not have anything to do with operating a computer are nevertheless part of a Windows Operating System product; This creates a new exemption from parts of antitrust law for Microsoft and would leave Microsoft free in future versions to bolt financial services, cable television, or the Internet itself into Windows. This is clearly a problem— especially for companies like mine that compete with Microsoft (as well as partner).

I hope you'll help us level the playing field here...it is desperately needed.

Brian Graves
Boston Mass

MTC-00011179

From: Marcus Grumbles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am happy that the Department of Justice is ready to close its case against Microsoft. The three-year suit has affected the computer industry and cost consumers a great deal of money. I feel that Microsoft, like any other American business, has the right to conduct its affairs without government intervention.

The proposed settlement is more than fair to the plaintiffs in the suit and will correct any infractions of which Microsoft may be guilty. Microsoft will share its Windows operating system with other computer makers, allowing them to place their own software on it. Also, Microsoft will agree not to retaliate against companies that sell, use, or promote non-Microsoft vendors.

It is time to allow Microsoft and the rest of the IT industry to return to normal. I urge you to see that the proposed settlement becomes formal. The lawsuit has already been too costly on the industry and needs speedy resolution.

Sincerely,
Marcus Grumbles
6503 Bluesky Way
Austin, TX 78745
mgrumbles@austin.rr.com

MTC-00011180

From: ken chang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:51am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Judge;

My company works extensively with Java—it is in fact our lifeblood. what MS has tried to do with Java is beyond belief.

The Court of Appeals affirmed that Microsoft had unlawfully and intentionally

deceived Java developers and polluted; the Java standard in order to protect its monopoly and defeat competition.

Yet, the PFJ does not restrict Microsoft's ability to modify, alter or refuse to support computer industry standards, including Java, or to engage in campaigns to deceive developers of rival platforms, middleware or applications software. Indeed, Microsoft's decision not to distribute Java technologies with Windows XP, which hurts developers and consumers alike, will be the shape of things to come under the proposed deal unless the Court requires Microsoft to continue to distribute Java technologies.

You must do something to help Java based companies survive. C is a 20 year old language that— if not for the MS monopoly— would have died a natural death years ago (remember Cobal??).

Let competition reign!!

Dr. Ken Chang
SF, CA.

MTC-00011181

From: GOTHDOVE@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:55am
Subject: Time to stop the political attack upon Microsoft

It is long over do to let all this be done with. Most of my friends agree this was all done for political reasons. If the former US Attorney would have spent as much time on terrorist threats against the USA we might not have had the lose of life on 9/11/01. What a injustice has been done to all Americans. Stop letting a group from playing politics and not be concerned for the true welfare of all US citizens.

MTC-00011182

From: Bobbie Dee Flowers
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/15/02 12:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Bobbie Dee Flowers
418 West 17th Street, Apt #22A
New York, NY 10011-5826
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice: Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations,

consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bobbie Dee Flowers

MTC-00011183

From: sergio jimenez
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 12:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
sergio jimenez
527 2nd steet Brooklyn, ny 11215
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
sergio jimenez

MTC-00011184

From: ROBERT REMINGTON
To: Microsoft
ATR, rremington@webtv.net@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 1:05am
Subject: Arthur's Counting Troubles

The Microsoft Anti-Trust private and educational settlements were rejected on the grounds that the amount proposed was far too low! Who's counting for the government, Enron or Andersen's group?

Add a AOL Time Warner settlement recalculated over one year ago from their merger (estimated at about \$1 billion dollars from Gerald Levin's figures) and my claim reaches into the billions of dollars without any others factored into the settlement.

Should we use Arthur Andersen's Accenture Group or another respected Big 5 accounting firm in order to calculate the right

amount? Can we even trust their CEO after the Enron debacle?

My previous totals, including revenue from Disney, Gary Goldberg / SKG Dreamworks, NBC, Sears, IBM, Microsoft without access to television advertising logs for revenue streams and royalty calculations is over \$1 billion dollars. If the USDOJ gives me legal authority and a motivated accounting team, I'll direct the team to the proper TV commercial logs, advertising agency orders, computer manufacturing records & software license sales. Together we'll obtain a more accurate settlement figure, for a lasting peace!

Include me in on these discussions. Decisions on my future, and my money (in the billions of dollars) must be discussed with me, in person!

The sum owed to me is greater than the total 2002 appraised value of the NBC Burbank campus and technology! That's why I am not disappointed to see a full studio audience at the Tonight Show ahead of me! I don't need to be in the studio audience ...

I'll be just as pleased to own the campus and schedule additional productions at unused soundstages within NBC! I can hire additional staff and production workers for new shows, employ more Californians who are seeking work, and we can all have a great time in entertainment! Plus we'll contribute more corporate taxes for General Electric to consider, and help the governments as well!

The USDOJ cannot ignore my email, my legitimate legal rights and claims. After all, the IRS and other government agencies will receive their fair share of the settlements as well! Enclosed is a reminder from the end of 2001, over three weeks ago!

MTC-00011185

From: Julius T. Abadilla
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

Any settlement regarding this dispute will always displease someone or some other parties because of the magnitude of the situation. It is better to simply go ahead with the agreed upon settlement, i.e., give the poorest schools what was originally agreed upon, let the recipients benefit from this decision now, and move on.

Because of conflicting ideas in our vast population, there will always be some parties who will be 'hurt' no matter what the solution would be. When the new presiding judge proclaimed that she wants a fast track settlement to this problem, I rejoiced. I felt the air of leadership and determination to solve the mess once and for all. In a society like ours, we should always work with the quickest and best 'at that time' solution to out problems, otherwise, we will be paralysed with trying to find the 'perfect' solution which is almost always elusive. It is better to achieve finality now and move on rather than stall the whole process and let the whole economy suffer.

Let us avoid any more losses and missed opportunities due to these uncertainties and indecisions. This is the reason we have leaders and have appointed well-paid decision-makers so that they can come up with solutions within the confines of the law.

Let not the supposedly leaders challenge each others ruling and stall the process all together. Let us move on.

Thank you,

MTC-00011186

From: Tom Eubank
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am a customer of Microsoft. I have been a software developer for over thirty years and have used Microsoft products for over ten years. In my opinion, the Justice Department has been used as a pawn of Microsoft's competitors—to win in the courtroom market share that they could not win in the marketplace.

In 1991, I attended a developer's conference, hosted by Microsoft's competitors, at which the head of PC Development for IBM, and representatives of Borland, Novell, Word Perfect, and others, appealed to the attendees to unite against Microsoft. In different, but similar venues, Microsoft promoted the benefits of their future products—not so much in juxtaposition to the competition—but within the context of improvements over their own, then-current products. It is this difference vision that has enriched Microsoft—along with a significant segment of U.S. economy and the lives of many U.S. consumers.

For almost fifteen years, I worked for a company that actively discouraged the use of Microsoft products—primarily due to the presence of a Vice President of Microsoft's major competitor on its board. During that time, my employer wasted millions of dollars on projects that failed in large part due to ill-conceived and faulty software technologies and products that were chosen as a result of the anti-competitive behavior of Microsoft competitors.

I have personally encountered multiple products distributed by major Microsoft competitors that seemed to be designed to impair the reliability or performance of Microsoft Operating System products.

In summary, over the years, Microsoft has created and published a large number of high-quality products for sale to the general public, and has slowly increased market share as a result of the quality and functionality of those products. During the same period, it's competitors have sought to gain market share by stifling competition through their influence in the boardrooms of major corporations and in the courtrooms of the federal judiciary.

The COMPLAINT and the STIPULATION seem to be designed to benefit other large companies—some of which seek to restrain Microsoft from competing with their inferior products and others of which seek to further extend their dominant presence in other segments of the information marketplace. Articles 1. through 3. of the STIPULATION will enable Microsoft's competitors to degrade the user's experience of Microsoft products by embedding their products into the operating system. Rather than ensuring a competitive marketplace, the STIPULATION will impede it by requiring U.S. consumers to use inferior products.

The prosecution of this COMPLAINT has been a waste of U.S. funds for the benefit of a few large, under-performing companies; the enforcement of the STIPULATION would be a further disservice to the U.S. public.

Regards,
Thomas H. Eubank
Durham, North Carolina

MTC-00011187

From: TEDDYSEA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:43am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Thank God for Bill Gates and Microsoft. I don't think the Government should have interfered in this matter at all. Look at where we are as a result of Microsoft Windows. We now can use computers easily. What a boost the computer industry has been to the economy for the last 10 years and that is all thanks to the ease in which the average person can use a computer. If someone can make a better operating system, then let them and if its good the public will use it; but I don't need the Government running interference on this one.

I can think of many more ways the Government can protect me. Try the banking industry and their unreasonable fees for ATM use or the oil industry that controls the prices of a commodity that I have to use daily! A computer is an option—let the Government interfere and take action on the things in my life that are not optional!

I thought that we lived in a country that embraces capitalism and free enterprise and rewards people that are innovative—I guess not in the case of Bill Gates!

MTC-00011189

From: R. Douglas Barbieri
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the Microsoft was a paltry settlement which is a mockery of the antitrust act. You wasted millions of taxpayer dollars to basically accuse Microsoft of being a monopoly then give them a slap on the wrist. Having Microsoft donate computers pre-loaded with Windows to schools only give them an edge in a largely Mac-dominated arena. What should be required of Microsoft is that all of their operating system source code should be required to be turned into open-source under the GPL license, and that said source code, complete with internal comments and documentation, be released to the general public.

They should then be required to keep said source code up-to-date and published. They should also be forced to adhere to open standards for data formats instead of being allowed to create their own, closed source versions. Those data formats (Windows Media, Microsoft Word, etc) help them maintain their monopoly on the world. By requiring them to play with open standards, we are guaranteed to be able to view their data formats on any system using non-Microsoft software.

R. Doulas Barbieri
dougbarbier

MTC-00011190

From: ww6v@juno.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: DOJ

I believe the settlement proposed by the court is fair and want this case settled. I disagree with the nine state Attorneys General who want to continue this case should be denied the forum to do so. Please settle this case.

Charles Dorsten
936 Burlington Drive
Santa Maria, CA 93455

MTC-00011191

From: Gerard Verbrugge
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US government,

I look at this issue with a european background and personal view. I must say that the press and the competitors created a nice show of this trial but forgot all about what it is about. I myself am a happy user of Microsoft products and never felt the need to complain about anything, I do not feel that I pay too much or must use something that I do not want. There are many ways of competing, this competing through justice by the so called big companies is clearly a negative side of the industry.. Also big time lawyers that try to make a small win in this case (DOJ side) is pethatic.

I say Free Microsoft of all its charges and tell the competitors to get of their lazy butts and create products that compete instead of crying....

Kind regards,
Gerard Verbrugge,
the Netherlands

MTC-00011192

From: Walter Paul Bebirian
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:51am
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Since this and most other "antitrust" cases are compared to Standard Oil—I would recommend that the Standard Oil case be looked at from the perspective of what was done and just how we as a country are fairing because of that break-up—It seems that no one—not one of the states or the government is taking into consideration that since the beginning of this "case" that the economy is the real injured party every step of the way and because this is so, every citizen in this country is being negatively effected—My suggestion is that every single person whether they are in or out of Microsoft—does not really appreciate the negative effect of this "action against" Microsoft—For one brief second—let us imagine that there is no Microsoft and that there never was one—how much progress along any lines whether with computers—handhelds—or Internet— would we have made—and if you think that Netscape is innocent—I propose that the investigation truns right around and looks very deeply at the fact that Netscape was not only behind this whole case—but that Hearst Publications—a most powerful and controlling Private Business—has been behind Netscape from the beginning—So—let us take a quantum leap and figure that 20

years down the road—Microsoft is diminished to a small player in both the operating system category and the browser category— so what—how will that have benefited me—I use a Power Mac which runs on an Apple OS 9 system— (nothing to do with Microsoft) but let me tell you one thing—there is no comparison between the Netscape and Explorer Browsers—the Netscape is no where near as good— efficient—easy to use or fast as the Explorer—so let's be truthful—cut out all the double talk and admit that Microsoft is where it is at because it belongs there—and so I don't agree with the Micosroft Company having to pay any penalty or to be judged against because it is the thruth that there has been no investigation as to exactly why any on has complained about Microsoft and done anything but made a better OS—and if they haven't it is most probably the case because given the hardware they have to work with—they can't—so from that perspective— let's all sit down—make a better machine and then figure out how to make a better OS from the beginning of the next generation—

And my dear Department of Justice— friends—if you don't think that I know what I am talking about— that's just fine with me—since anyone who really has the capabilty of designing what I mentioned above will always be a thousand steps ahead of your thinking!

Walter Paul Bebirian
http://www.575488trillion.com

MTC-00011193

From: Jacob Dobrinen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Letter
911 N. 107th Street
Seattle, WA 98133-8804
January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing in full support of the recent settlement between the US Department of Justice and Microsoft. Litigation has gone on for far too long now, and I think the terms of the settlement are fair and in the best interest of the public and American economy.

A number of the terms of settlement will help give consumer's freedom to choose products. Microsoft had agreed to design future Windows versions so that computer makers, software developers, and consumers can more easily promote their own products from within Windows' operating systems. Also, I like the fact that Microsoft has agreed to form a three-person team to monitor compliance with the settlement. I think the settlement is fair and reasonable and should suit all parties.

Unfortunately, there are nine states in opposition. I urge your office to make the settlement a reality. Our country needs American companies such as Microsoft to be focusing on innovation, development, implementation and growth. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jacob Dobrinen

MTC-00011194

From: Blomberg David
To: 'microsoft.atr(ajusdoj.gov)'
Date: 1/15/02 2:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge

I am relieved that the proposed settlement was thrown out. Please do us all a favor and sned a message that the Antitrust and unethical activites of Microsoft will not be tolerated. I ask that this case continue and that Microsoft be made to pay for its crimes.

I will keep this short

Thank You for hearing me out

David Blomberg
System Engineer
Nihon Libertec Co. LTD
1-34-14 Hatagaya
Shibuya-ku Tokyo
Ph: (03)3481-8321
Fax:(03)3481-8371

MTC-00011195

From: wolfgang manowski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:08am
Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time to settle the microsoft anti-trusst suit. DOJ's proposal is just and in the interest of the electronics consumer. Lets settle so we all can get on with our lives.

Regards,
Wolfgang Manowski
25 Southridge Way
Daly City, CA 94014
4153335610
wolfm3

MTC-00011196

From: debby hein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:17am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please begin 2002 with a reasonable settlement of this case to benefit all parties concerned...particularly our economy. It's time to move forward and build a healthy economy through healthy corporate relationships.

Thank you,
Debby Hein

MTC-00011197

From: tntvideo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear People of the United States of America:

I felt that the word UNITED be part of what is NOW needed. Enough is enough, can't the states of this country come to the realization that with the economy in such bad shape that it is today we need unity! We also need a company such as the likes of Microsoft to be left alone! It will be a sure bet that the technology sectors will recover with this company leading the way!

Fed chairman Alan Greenspan has no data and no real answers to help this country to a new economic recovery! The proof has been that he has lowered rates last year 11 times and we still have heard of companies like Ford now getting ready to close down factories to which another 35,000 jobs will be

lost. These people that have and will lose there jobs have know class action law suits! Most don't even know what one really is, be it known that when given the choice to sign up to sue a company because it's for the good of the people, ??? this I question and deny my ever putting my name on the dotted line! The lawyer's will make all the money even if they win!

Stand up for what's right, but exactly what has been right in the antitrust case is that Microsoft has surely taken a beating for the most part but unjustly and certainly unfairly by a very bad if not the worst Judge in History to proclaim that Microsoft is a monopoly! Truly Microsoft has been one of best and greatest companies in true innovation of the last century! It has made HISTORY as being a giant in an industry started by others like IBM.

United States of America, we are at war now but with terrorist's for Sept 11, 2001 also has now made HISTORY! We can no longer sit back in this country and fight within ourselves as Microsoft is not the enemy!

I am proud of this country and for which we stand, but right now I'm sorry to say that the time to come together so that this country and our people, many who do not wish to lose there jobs and their sense of self respect need to see a heeling process begin again to this great nation!

At this time, I implore the states that have not settled in the Microsoft Anti-Trust Case to please do so and forget about the term CLASS ACTION in the legal sense. Just to use some ACTION with CLASS and settle so we as a Nation can count on YOU so we can Take care of business where it needs to really be taken care of. Please help our great country and leaders to do their jobs in regards to creating an economic growth for the good of ALL the PEOPLE of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Terrence V. Lipinski

MTC-00011198

From: Mauro Gandini
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with Microsoft
Mauro Gandini
The Outsourcing Company
Marketing e Comunicazione
Via S.A. Sauli, 19
20127 Milano ITALY

MTC-00011199

From: The Flanegans
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Judge,

Please reconsider the Microsoft Settlement. As a household that relies on incomes from small software companies and the competitiveness they create, we cannot afford to have the monopoly that is Microsoft drive this away.

Please reconsider.
Sincerely,
Christina Flanagan

MTC-00011200

From: Dan Flanagan / 4alarm films
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 3:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Judge,

As someone with over six years experience in high tech, I can tell you I have experienced the strong arm tactics of Microsoft more than once.

Unfortunately, the proposed settlement would not stop Microsoft from taking these same tactics in the future.

I ask you to judge the facts and not act simply to put this behind us. Do the right thing!

Sincerely,
/Dan Flanagan
Producer / Director
4alarmfilms

MTC-00011201

From: Richard Storey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Attorney General, et al:
I conceive the actions by the DOJ, under the Bush administration, to be a failure regarding the handling of the Microsoft case. Failure to break up this mega-corporation will continue the oppressive effects Microsoft has upon the software market and the PC industry. This may sound harsh, especially coming from a conservative such as myself. However, I am knowledgeable about software and PCs. Knowledgeable enough to know that DOJ took a weak case against MS, because they are guilty of much, much worse than they were found to be. It is evident to me, from the statements from the lawyers in the case, that DOJ is almost without a clue when it comes to PC operating systems and without a clue in assessing what impact MS's coercive tactics have had in the PC industry, as well as the software industry.

Microsoft is a mega-corporation that puts out grossly under-engineered products. They are, in many ways, dangerous to the PC industry, the consumer, and business. But the overwhelming majority of the users out there don't have a clue about this. Ignorance is their bliss. MS's strong-arm tactics, and anti-competitive monopoly has grossly distorted and brought to ruin much of the competition in the software industry. MS should be broken-up and anything short of that is merely a slap on the hand of a serious offender against freely competitive markets.

Some of us know, are aware of, why MS has risen to its place in the market. Sure, the right people, at the right time made it so, partly, but if it were not for IBM's size in the market and their stupidity MS would not have been successful at dominating the entire market. Also, since it was government contracts that, basically, allowed IBM to achieve its status in the market we have series of events made possible by government interference in the market. This is why it is a lie to say that MS is what it is because it is innovative (everyone knows it is not).

Get on with doing the right thing—pursue the break-up of Microsoft and do it soon. It will change everything in the computer and software markets for the better, and besides, considering their practices of coercion with their vendors and the PC OEMs they deserve it.

Sincerely,
Richard Storey
President
Primera Financial Group, LLC
22 West Bryan St., Ste. 234
Savannah, GA 31401
(912) 659-6256
(877) 639-1282 Fax

MTC-00011202

From: Claudio Vacalebri
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:01am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just to remind you (I already wrote some week ago) my disappointment on this story. I'm writing you mainly as a consumer, although I'm the CEO and CIO of a very small Internet company.

I'll try to list my perceptions and opinions (my english is very poor, so please excuse me for language mistakes).

1) This case wasted millions of \$\$, please stop this case and please focus on REAL ISSUES, the people that worked, during the past years on such case, could be used with more proficiency on more important cases.

2) Me and other people wasted our time trying to learn about this "vapor-lex" case, the time spent can be considered more millions \$\$ wasted, please STOP wasting our time!

2a) If I was an American citizen I could add : Please STOP wasting our money!

3) Microsoft always worked, as a company, with a very clear goal: facilitate the "digital-life" of us and the results are evident when you compare single pieces of technologies against MS competitors.

4) The quality of the code provided, during the past 25 years, was always improved as the main example of the honest commitment of the company

5) You are condemning a company that started from scratch and that was able to become the reference for all the world, with your actions you are convincing entrepreneurs to "stay small", that should be better for you but not for the global economy because in this way no evolution can happen.

My list is very long but I do not want to continue wasting my time on such ridiculous story. Just try to consider that this case is not a game or a way to spend your time but try to use your time to end it.

Best Regards and thanks in advance for doing nothing and wasting and confusing us.

Dr.claudio/
CEO & CIO
dotMMS srl
Email: claudiov@dotmms.it
Messenger: claudiov99@hotmail.com
Sito ufficiale: www.dotmms.it
Portale dimostrativo servizi di Streaming:
<http://dotmms.tv>
Sito Personale: <http://claudio.tv>

MTC-00011203

From: Karl Auerbach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am presently the North American Elected Director on the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

I am a member of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). I was recently named a Yuen Fellow of Law and Technology at the California Institute of Technology (CalTech) and Loyola Law of Los Angeles. I have started several companies over the years and have been closely associated with several other startups.

I have been a developer of software since the late 1960s and have been working on the Internet since its inception in the early 1970's. I have experienced first hand the damage that Microsoft has caused to the software industry and to the Internet.

One startup with which I was associated was very definitely "Microshafted" when Microsoft used its operating system monopoly to subsidise and to give away, without visible charge to the customer, a product that directly competed with our products. Later, when we tried to modify our products to be compatible with those from Microsoft, I heard (secondhand) that Microsoft played a shell game with enabling keys to their modules, thus forcing us to dance to their tune.

It is my belief that the proposed settlement will do nothing to prevent Microsoft from continuing to wreck havoc. As a Director of ICANN I am responsible to protect the "stability" of the Internet. Yet I see a great threat to the future of universal and impartial interconnectivity of the Internet arising out of Microsoft's leveraging of its dominance of user platforms to starve out any non-Microsoft technologies or implementations.

The proposed settlement is inadequate. It does nothing to redress the harm that Microsoft has caused. And it institutionalizes those abusive and predatory practices so that they will be repeatedly visited upon us and our children in the years to come.

The proposed settlement should be rejected in favor of a settlement that truly will remedy the past damages and prevent their recurrence in the future.

—karl—
Karl Auerbach
North American Elected Director, Board of Directors
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
(ICANN)

MTC-00011204

From: Joseph Kane
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:33am
Subject: microsoft settlement

As an ordinary citizen and member of the military I've sworn to uphold the constitution of the U.S.A. I'm disgusted and appalled by the continued harrassment of Microsoft and its shareholders by the United States Government.

Anyone with a basic understanding of economics knows that there is no such thing as a monopoly in a free market. To penalize the creative and successful is barbaric, un-American and comparable to an act of terror.

If liberty and justice are to prevail the US Government must immediately dismiss all anti-trust charges against Microsoft and any other corporation or individual.

Sincerely,
Joseph Kane

MTC-00011205

From: chrisharrison@citlink.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:12am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Justices,
 It seems to me the most significant factor regarding the decision to break up or apply punitive measures to Microsoft is being completely ignored. This key factor was and still is 'interoperability', which is the ability of computers running different operating systems to exchange files, data, and otherwise communicate freely. Microsoft manipulated features and issues that exploited or limited interoperability in order to squelch competition.

Furthermore, the proposed settlement offers no resolution of this core problem. There's little in the way of laws in place that protects a consumer's rights to interoperability in an OS (Operating System) or NOS (Network Operating System). Just as the development of automobiles necessitated speed limits and standardized safety equipment (turn signals, seatbelts, etc.), America need laws to protect consumers from a single company controlling or overmanipulating the evolution of such essential elements in its network and computing environments.

Recommendation: Penalty and/or restitution be added or replace self-monitoring agent; such that Microsoft be required to take a principal role (via it's proven legal and technical expertise) in enacting new laws that protect consumers' rights to an open OS environment, while providing guidelines for product development that complies with an open standard for OS and NOS interoperability. This role may be manifested by the development of a standards organization, or by a joint committee with congress to enact such laws.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,
 Christopher F. Harrison

MTC-00011207

From: wolf@puc.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:29am
 Subject: Microsoft remedy suggestion

No more OEM Software!! Have the consumer buy the OS and install it or have your friendly neighbourhood installer do it. That way, if there is a software problem with MS software, they have to field it and not the OEMs.

The OEM hardware will be according to PUBLISHED compatible specs, so MS can't weasel out and put the blame on hardware! MS has to publish file specs, so competing office products are on the same playing field.

Unbundle all non OS software from Windows and provide links to ALL relevant additions. Legislate software "Lemon Law" and make the producer responsible for damages.

Regards
 Wolfgang Schneider

MTC-00011209

From: sonofgomez709

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:59am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 From: "Microsoft"
 Subject: FINFlash Update: Time running out for DOJ comments
 To: <declan@wired.com>
 Date: Mon, 14 Jan 2002 17:26:12-0800

While Microsoft commends these public officials for involving citizens in a decision that will affect them so profoundly, your voice is more important now than ever before to ensure that the DoJ hears the full spectrum of opinion on this matter.

Gee, when Micro\$not got an email containing what Eric Cordian described as "the best defense of Microsoft's anti-trust position that I've seen," they had me charged with a felony and had their employees perjure themselves and hide evidence in order to have me convicted and imprisoned.

I would suggest that anyone sending any emails to Mico\$not consider the fact that it may result in their PerseProExecution by a CorporRapeTion and a GovernMint with bottomless pockets.

Besides, Micro\$not's high-priced lawyers already proved their inability to do anything more than piss away BadBillyG's money while waiting for HisDigiHoliness' new found Respect for throwing large amounts of money into the Corrupt Lobby System to take effect.

All anyone will do by providing Micro\$not with public support is open themselves up to Micro\$not's legal wrath and unconstitutional persecution while lowering the cost of Micro\$not's political bribes.

People wshould be particularly careful in light of the impending legislation doubling the sentences for computer crimes committed by people using the Linux Operating System. (Hey! You don't think I'd just make that up, do you?)

CJ Parker <sonofgomez709@yahoo.com>
<http://profiles.yahoo.com/sonofgomez709>
<http://members.w-link.net/sog/>

INDEX.HTM
<http://toto.diary-x.com>

MTC-00011210

From: Schlep Rock
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:03am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I am voicing my displeasure and loathing toward the Proposed Final Judgment. Microsoft, as we all know, continues to commit acts of misdeeds. The Proposed Final Judgment doesnt help the situation any better. In fact, the final settlement only worsens the existing situation. For all intents and purpose, the PFJ does not deny Microsoft its past violations and illegal acts. As one can see, every court, which has been involved with the case, has found Microsoft guilty of breaking the anti-trust laws. However, under the proposed final settlement, Microsoft, surprisingly enough, will be permitted to retain most if not all profits gained through their illicit activities.

Subsequently, the PFJ will not compensate parties injured or harmed through Microsofts egregious misdeeds. In addition, the PFJ will not take into account all Microsoft gains

made through its illegal maneuverings. With all due respect, the final settlement is basically acknowledging the acceptance of Microsofts anti-competitive behavior. What kind of message does this send out to the public? I can assure you that the message is clear and simple. The Proposed Final Judgment encourages big corporations to engage in monopolistic and predatory conduct, which in turn is detrimental to the technology industry at large.

With all due respect your honor, I am outraged at such a preposterous proposal that only helps Microsoft to remain intact and continue with its unethical practices. I submit to you my objection to this Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
 Bill Utlak
 Palos Verdes, CA

MTC-00011211

From: Ailei Jimenez
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:06am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

With all due respect, I abhorrently object to the Proposed Final Judgment in the Microsoft case. There are several apparent flaws with in the final proposal which will undoubtedly give Microsoft absolute power to abuse their existing monopoly position. Based on further review of the proposed settlement, there is one glaring oversight that cannot be overlooked. One such noticeable defect entails an ineffective and inept enforcement mechanism to implement so-called restrictions. As stated in the settlement, Microsoft will be closely monitored to comply with all restrictions encompassed with in the stated agreement. A three man compliance team will oversee and insure that Microsoft comply with the stated rules and regulations. Taking a closer look however, this three-man oversight team will be composed of the following: one appointee from the Justice Department, one appointee from Microsoft, and another appointee chosen by the two existing members. In turn, Microsoft will control half of the oversight team.

Also, in the likelihood of any enforcement proceeding, all findings by the oversight committee will not be allowed into court. The sole purpose of the committee is to inform the Justice Department of all infractions by Microsoft. Subsequently the Justice Depart will launch its own investigation into the matter and commence litigation to halt all infractions. When all is said and done, the oversight committee is just window dressing, who will not strictly oversee Microsofts business moves. In my opinion, the Proposed Final Judgment does not provide sufficient and appropriate restrictions or penalties against Microsoft.

What reassurance do we have against Microsofts illegal and illicit activities? I can assure you that the Proposed Final Judgment does not effectively nor sufficiently address the question. Therefore I submit to the court my objection to the Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
 Ailei Jimenez
 San Mateo, CA

MTC-00011212

From: Erlin Jimenez
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:09am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I am giving my personal objection to the so-called Proposed Final Judgment in regards to the Microsoft case. As history will prove, Microsoft continues to violate business practices. The Proposed Final Judgment in a sense, does not deny Microsoft its past violations and illegal acts. As one can see, every court, which has been involved with the case, has found Microsoft guilty of breaking the anti-trust laws. However, under the proposed final settlement, Microsoft, surprisingly enough, will be permitted to retain most if not all profits gained through their illicit activities. Subsequently, the PFJ will not compensate parties injured or harmed through Microsoft's egregious misdeeds. In addition, the PFJ will not take into account all Microsoft gains made through its illegal maneuverings. With all due respect, the final settlement is basically acknowledging the acceptance of Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior. What kind of message does this send out to the public? I can assure you that the message is clear and simple. The Proposed Final Judgment encourages big corporations to engage in monopolistic and predatory conduct, which in turn is detrimental to the technology industry at large. With all due respect your honor, I am outraged at such a preposterous proposal that only helps Microsoft to remain intact and continue with its unethical practices. Thus, I submit to you my objection to this Proposed Final Judgment.

Sincerely
 Erlin Ortiz
 Lodi, CA

MTC-00011213

From: Ernesto Funa
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:12am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I am submitting to you my personal objection to the Proposed Final Judgment in regards to the Microsoft case. As history will prove, Microsoft continues to violate business practices. The Proposed Final Judgment in a sense, does not deny Microsoft its past violations and illegal acts. As one can see, every court, which has been involved with the case, has found Microsoft guilty of breaking the anti-trust laws. However, under the proposed final settlement, Microsoft, surprisingly enough, will be permitted to retain most if not all profits gained through their illicit activities. Subsequently, the PFJ will not compensate parties injured or harmed through Microsoft's egregious misdeeds. In addition, the PFJ will not take into account all Microsoft gains made through its illegal maneuverings. With all due respect, the final settlement is basically acknowledging the acceptance of Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior. What kind of message does this send out to the public? I can assure you that the message is clear and simple. The Proposed Final Judgment encourages big corporations to engage in

monopolistic and predatory conduct, which in turn is detrimental to the technology industry at large. With all due respect your honor, I am outraged at such a preposterous proposal that only helps Microsoft to remain intact and continue with its unethical practices. I submit to you my objection to this Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
 Ernesto Funa
 Stockton, CA

MTC-00011214

From: Eliza Funa
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:16am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I am against the proposed final judgment. Over the past several years, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of all misdeeds. Nevertheless, the Proposed Final Judgment dismisses all previous court findings indicting Microsoft. The PFJ allows Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets. Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past are either broken up or carefully regulated. Unfortunately, Microsoft is given a pardon to this general rule of thumb. Also, admonishing Microsoft will not radically alter Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. With out a doubt, Microsoft will continue to abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless the court breaks up Microsoft into several parts, Microsoft will continue on with its illegal practices. In conclusion, I object the Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
 Liz Ageri
 San Francisco, CA

MTC-00011215

From: Ricky G
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:22am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 I object to the so-called proposed final judgment in the Microsoft case. In all past findings, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating the Anti-Trust laws. Yet the PFJ or the proposed final judgment throws out all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In other words, the proposed final settlement allows Microsoft to continue on with its predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment to the technology industry. I am certain you will receive thousands appeals entailing various flaws apparent in the proposed final settlement. However, my main focus involves

one glaring flaw in the proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology sectors. In the past most monopolies, such as AT&T, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However in this case, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb. In addition, a simple slap on the wrist by the Department of Justice will not suffice in drastically altering Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. As history has shown, Microsoft will unfortunately abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless something extraordinary is done, Microsoft will continue to implement illegal business practices. Thus, I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment does not solve the problems involved in the Microsoft case.

All the Best,
 Ricky Gamboa
 Foster City, CA

MTC-00011216

From: Anne
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:22am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 911 N. 107th Street
 Seattle, WA 98133-8804
 January 14, 2002
 Attorney General John Ashcroft
 U.S. Department of Justice
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
 I am writing in full support of the recent settlement between the U.S. Department of Justice and Microsoft. Litigation has gone on for far too long now, and I think the terms of the settlement are fair and in the best interest of the public and American economy. A number of the terms of settlement will help give consumer's freedom to choose products. Microsoft had agreed to design future Windows versions so that computer makers, software developers, and consumers can more easily promote their own products from within Windows' operating systems. Also, I like the fact that Microsoft has agreed to form a three-person team to monitor compliance with the settlement. I think the settlement is fair and reasonable and should suit all parties. Unfortunately, there are nine states in opposition. I urge your office to make the settlement a reality. Our country needs American companies such as Microsoft to be focusing on innovation, development, implementation and growth. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
 Anne Argue Dobrinen

MTC-00011217

From: Rich Gamboa
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:29am
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
 Your honor, I object to the Proposed Final Judgment entailed in the Microsoft case. After reading and analyzing the proposed settlement, I am appalled that Microsoft can

get away with such murder. Obviously here are several apparent flaws with in the proposal which will undoubtedly give Microsoft absolute power to abuse their existing power. Based on further review of the proposed settlement, there is one glaring oversight that cannot be overlooked. One such noticeable defect entails an ineffective and inept enforcement mechanism to implement so-called restrictions. As stated in the settlement, Microsoft will be closely monitored to comply with all restrictions encompassed with in the stated agreement. A three man compliance team will oversee and insure that Microsoft comply with the stated rules and regulations. Taking a closer look however, this three-man oversight team will be composed of the following: one appointee from the Justice Department, one appointee from Microsoft, and another appointee chosen by the two existing members. In turn, Microsoft will control half of the oversight team. Also, in the likelihood of any enforcement proceeding, all findings by the oversight committee will not be allowed into court. The sole purpose of the committee is to inform the Justice Department of all infractions by Microsoft. Subsequently the Justice Depart will launch its own investigation into the matter and commence litigation to halt all infractions. When all is said and done, the oversight committee is just window dressing, who will not strictly oversee Microsoft's business moves. In my opinion, the Proposed Final Judgment does not provide sufficient and appropriate restrictions or penalties against Microsoft. What reassurance do we have against Microsoft's illegal and illicit activities? I can assure you that the Proposed Final Judgment does not effectively nor sufficiently address the question. With all due respect, I submit to the court my objection to the Proposed Final Judgment.

Kind Regards,
Richard Flores
Santa Barbara, CA

MTC-00011218

From: Di M
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:34am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
Over the past several years, we have witnessed first hand the predatory methods Microsoft uses to squash its competitors. Therefore, I am filing my personal objection to the proposed final judgment on the Microsoft case. Supposedly, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating all rules of proper business ethics and practices. However with the PFJ (Proposed Final Judgment), the Department of Justice throws out, if not abandons all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In fact, the PFJ permits Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the

proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets. Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past, such as AT&T and Standard Oil, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb altogether. Also, simple slaps on the wrist or severe reprimands by the Department of Justice will not radically alter Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. As history has proven over and over again, Microsoft will undoubtedly abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless something extraordinary is done such as breaking up Microsoft's business into several parts or meting out severe punishment, Microsoft will persistently continue to implement illegal business practices. I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment does not solve anything but exacerbates the existing problem with Microsoft.

Respectfully,
Diana Mah
Lodi, CA

MTC-00011219

From: J J
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:42am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I am objecting to the Proposed Final Judgment. Microsoft continues to break anti-trust laws and discards proper business ethics. The Proposed Final Judgment does not punish Microsoft for it's past violations or illegal acts. Every court, which has been involved with the case, has found Microsoft guilty of misdeeds. However, under the proposed final settlement, Microsoft, surprisingly enough, will be permitted to retain most if not all profits gained through their illicit activities. Subsequently, the PFJ will not compensate parties injured or harmed through Microsoft's egregious misdeeds. In addition, the PFJ will not take into account all Microsoft gains made through its illegal maneuverings. With all due respect, the final settlement is basically acknowledging the acceptance of Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior. What kind of message does this send out to the public? I can assure you that the message is clear and simple. The Proposed Final Judgment encourages big corporations to engage in monopolistic and predatory conduct, which in turn is detrimental to the technology industry at large. With all due respect your honor, I am outraged at such a preposterous proposal that only helps Microsoft to remain intact and continue with its unethical practices. To the court, I submit my objection to this Proposed Final Judgment.

All the Best,
James Anthony
Lodi, CA

MTC-00011220

From: janerest funa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:45am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
With all due respect, I am stating my personal objection to the so-called Proposed Final Judgment in regards to the Microsoft case. As history will prove, Microsoft continues to violate Anti-Trust laws. As a matter of fact, the final settlement does not deny Microsoft its past violations and illegal acts. As one can see, every court, which has been involved with the case, has found Microsoft guilty of breaking the anti-trust laws. However, under the proposed final settlement, Microsoft, surprisingly enough, will be permitted to retain most if not all profits gained through their illicit activities. In addition, the PFJ will not compensate parties injured or harmed through Microsoft's egregious misdeeds. In addition, the PFJ will not take into account all Microsoft gains made through its illegal maneuverings. With all due respect, the final settlement is basically acknowledging the acceptance of Microsoft's anti-competitive behavior. What kind of message does this send out to the public? I can assure you that the message is clear and simple. The Proposed Final Judgment encourages big corporations to engage in monopolistic and predatory conduct, which in turn is detrimental to the technology industry at large. With all due respect your honor, I am outraged at such a preposterous proposal that only helps Microsoft to remain intact and continue with its unethical practices. I submit to you my objection to this Proposed Final Judgment.

Sincerely,
Jan Ernest Pacual,
Sacramento, CA

MTC-00011221

From: justin funa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
With all due respect your honor, I object to the following Proposed Final Judgment. The final proposal undoubtedly gives Microsoft complete authority to abuse their existing monopoly position. After further review, there is one glaring mistake. The flaw entails an inept enforcement mechanism to implement restrictions on Microsoft. With in the settlement, Microsoft will be closely scrutinized and monitored to comply with all restrictions entailed in the stated agreement. Supposedly, a three man compliance team will oversee and insure that Microsoft comply with the stated rules and regulations. However after closer inspection, this proposal only benefits Microsoft in the end. The three-man oversight team will be composed of the following: one appointee from the Justice Department, one appointee from Microsoft, and another appointee chosen by the two existing members. In turn, Microsoft will control half of the oversight team. Also, in the likelihood of any enforcement proceeding, all findings by the oversight committee will not be allowed into court. The sole purpose of the committee is to inform the Justice Department of all infractions by Microsoft. Subsequently the Justice Depart will launch its own investigation into the matter and commence

litigation to halt all infractions. When all is said and done, the oversight committee is just a complete smoke screen. In turn, this team will not strictly oversee Microsoft's business moves. In many aspects, the Proposed Final Judgment does not provide adequate or appropriate restrictions and penalties against Microsoft. One cannot take comfort in the fact that the Proposed Final Judgment helps Microsoft's illegal and illicit activities. Therefore I submit to the court my objection to the Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
Justin Montefrio
Lodi, CA

MTC-00011222

From: serafin jimenez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

I am filing my personal objection to the proposed final judgment on the Microsoft case. Supposedly, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating all rules of proper business ethics and practices. However with the PFJ (Proposed Final Judgment), the Department of Justice throws out, if not abandons all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In fact, the PFJ permits Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets. Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past, such as AT&T and Standard Oil, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb altogether.

Also, Simple slaps on the wrist or severe reprimands by the Department of Justice will not radically alter Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. As history has proven over and over again, Microsoft will undoubtedly abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless something extraordinary is done such as breaking up Microsoft's business into several parts or meting out severe punishment, Microsoft will persistently continue to implement illegal business practices. I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment does not solve the Microsoft issue.

Respectfully,
Serafin Jimenez
Lodi, CA

MTC-00011223

From: arlene funa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,

I adamantly oppose the proposed final judgment in the Microsoft case. All courts, involved with the case, have found Microsoft guilty of violating all anti-trust laws implemented by the Justice Department. The PFJ basically throws out all previous court findings indicting Microsoft. In other words, Microsoft has been given the green light to continue on with its monopolistic endeavors. I'd like to focus on one fundamental flaw present with in the proposed settlement: For the most part, the proposed final settlement does not sufficiently break up Microsoft. Instead, the settlement allows Microsoft to utilize and leverage its current market position to branch out into other technology markets. Most monopolies in the past, such as Standard Oil, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However in this case, Microsoft is given a full waiver to this rule altogether. Also, a severe reprimand by the Department of Justice will not change Microsoft's present operating methods. Without a doubt, Microsoft will abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless something drastic is done such as breaking up Microsoft itself, Microsoft will continue to commit egregious offenses. Thus I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment is a huge mistake.

Best Regards,
Ping Funa
Sacramento, CA

MTC-00011224

From: Peter Black
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern:

The proposed settlement with Microsoft is neither fair nor appropriate, and rewards monopolistic behaviour that has destroyed many companies and severely distorted the market for software. Actions to date have failed to understand the breadth of Microsoft's monopoly, or the ways in which they continue to enforce it. In particular, the Office package is used highly successfully to reduce the ability of users to change operating systems platforms. Microsoft should be ordered to place the Microsoft Office file formats (for Excel, Access, Word, Powerpoint) in the public domain, and to be given equal voting rights with a range of parties for changes in this format. Microsoft should be forced to maintain adherence to this structure as its primary file format. Such a change would make it immediately possible for others (such as StarOffice or WordPerfect) to use the same format, either as its principal storage mechanism or for interchange. Competition would then be based on the best software tools on the best platform, rather than the lock-in that is created by Microsoft's frequent changes to an unpublished format. This change would be far more effective than any other remedy, and should be extended to open publication of all file formats for any product that Microsoft produces.

Sincerely
Peter Black
Dr Peter Black
Lead Architect
Digital Steps Limited, 1 Bell Court, Leapale Lane, Guildford GU1 4LY

Tel: +44 7976 243 919

MTC-00011225

From: arnie mamon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I am voicing my personal discuss and outrage at the proposed final judgment in the Microsoft case. Supposedly, the Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating all rules of proper business ethics and practices. However with the PFJ (Proposed Final Judgment), the Department of Justice throws out, if not abandons all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In fact, the PFJ permits Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets. Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past, such as AT&T and Standard Oil, are either broken up or carefully regulated. However, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb altogether. Also, Simple slaps on the wrist or severe reprimands by the Department of Justice will not radically alter Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. As history has proven over and over again, Microsoft will undoubtedly abuse its monopoly position at the expense of others. Unless something extraordinary is done such as breaking up Microsoft's business into several parts or meting out severe punishment, Microsoft will persistently continue to implement illegal business practices. Therefore I submit to the Court my objection to the Proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully,
Arnie Montefrio
San Francisco, CA

MTC-00011226

From: Anthony Mamon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:04am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I object to the proposed final judgment on the Microsoft case. The Court has found Microsoft guilty of violating all Anti-Trust rules. Yet, the PFJ (Proposed Final Judgment), the Department of Justice throws out, if not abandons all previous court findings that indicts Microsoft. In fact, the PFJ permits Microsoft to continue with its monopolistic and predatory practices, which in my opinion is a detriment not only to the software sector but also to the technology industry as a whole. Without a doubt, I strongly believe you will receive thousands of similar appeals encompassing the many flaws that are apparent in the proposed final

settlement. My main focus entails one fundamental flaw clearly noticeable in the proposed settlement: The PFJ does not effectively break up Microsoft, but in fact allows Microsoft to leverage its current market position, or should I say, Monopoly to expand its business into several other technology markets. Under the general rule, most monopolies in the past are either broken up or carefully regulated. However, Microsoft is given a pardon or a waiver to this general rule of thumb altogether. Also, severe reprimands will not drastically change Microsoft's existing operation methodologies. Undoubtedly, Microsoft will continue to abuse its monopoly position. Unless something extraordinary is done such as meting out severe punishment, Microsoft will persistently continue to implement illegal business practices. I submit to the Court that the Proposed Final Judgment does not solve the Microsoft issue.

All the Best,
Jun Mamon
San Francisco, CA

MTC-00011227

From: Andy Raynor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:09am
Subject: Microsoft case

I wish to express my concerns with the ongoing Microsoft anti-trust trial and the remedies that have been suggested. The current proposed remedy, a monitoring system, represents the least effective solution imaginable since it relies on independent policing efforts.

The remedy for Microsoft's violation of anti-trust law and violation of previous consent decrees must be two-pronged. Failure to implement both portions will fail to compensate consumers harmed by the monopolistic behavior and curtail that behavior in the future.

First, the company should be compelled to pay some significant sum in the form of computers and software to public school systems as Microsoft has offered in its settlement. Consumers are entitled to this compensation but associating individual damages to specific consumers would be impossible without overwhelming discovery costs. The provision of equipment and software to public schools represents a good reparation to the citizens of this country for the damages incurred.

The details of Microsoft's donation are critically important. Microsoft should be required to provide a pc and software fund for each state. This provides each state flexibility on achieving their education objectives and allows states to explore open source alternatives running on pc hardware. Software must be provided at Microsoft's best price. This will greatly increase the real compensation received since retail pricing may be between 400%-800% higher than volume pricing.

Apple's opposition to this is entirely self-serving and represents an attempt to hold onto ever decreasing market-share rather than benefiting consumers. A focus on pc's would allow schools to maximize volume discounts for hardware purchases and leverage either the growing open source movement or Microsoft solutions.

Second, the company must be broken up. The market is the most efficient and reliable mechanism for regulating behavior. Any other solution with either be ineffective at changing behavior or much more costly. By breaking the company up, management of each company will perform in a "correct" manner based on market forces.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input.

Andy Raynor

MTC-00011228

From: Mauro Talevi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:18am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I very very strongly urge the Department of Justice to ensure that the dominant and de-facto monopolistic position that Microsoft has gained be corrected—with strong and effective measures. The terms of the settlement are clearly insufficient and unsatisfactory in this regard. Information technology has enormously grown in importance in the last 20 years, and can be comparable to energy and telecommunications as strategic and vital economic sectors. In the past the Antitrust Act has been applied to oil and telecommunications companies.

This case is equally—if not more—important and critical. Monopolies are extremely damaging to any capitalistic system. I hope the Department of Justice will act promptly and not be intimidated by the catastrophic predictions made by Microsoft.

With very best regards,
Mauro Talevi

MTC-00011229

From: RITMON@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It appears that the competitors of Microsoft (and the states where they are situated) have decided to improve their lot not by being better and having something better to offer the consumer. They've decided to punish Microsoft for having a superior product.

Please be aware that finding in Microsoft's favor, you would be doing a great deal for the consumer—and for the economy—since millions of us are investors in the company, because we believe in it...

Rita and Richard Monley

MTC-00011230

From: Martin Coles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

Having been in the Computer industry for the last 20 years, I can only say that Microsoft has performed brilliantly for the consumer.

Through their success and resultant position, they have been able to bring down the cost of computing such that it is now affordable by everyone.

Further, the inclusion of various components in the operating system is once again in the consumers interest, enabling them to use the software easily.

Multiple operating systems from numerous suppliers would not have provided a uniform and easily understandable and affordable opportunity for the man on the street to own and use a computer.

Well done Microsoft!
Kind regards
Martin Coles
Pinnacle Orlando LLC.
Florida . USA
407 891 2857
See our website <http://www.thereyougo.net/>

MTC-00011231

From: Baumgart, David
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 7:19am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am adding my comment on the proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft. It is my opinion that the DOJ has "gone soft" on Microsoft, dropping some of the key provisions for a just and fair settlement. It also appears to me that the DOJ is preparing to let Microsoft off with a slap on the hands instead of any real penalty.

Microsoft was convicted of predatory practices aimed at squashing the competition and I believe they should be punished. Their conviction held up under appeal.

I agree with the 9 states that "pulled out" and are seeking tougher remedies.

David Baumgart
Executive Director, Information Systems Dept

John Morrell & Co.
805 East Kemper Road
Cincinnati, OH 45246
(513) 346-3562

MTC-00011232

From: mrivan@mediaone.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
From: Anthony D'Andrea
Box 1209
Randolph MA 02368
Re: Microsoft prosecution
People:

I still remember the last thing Microsoft produced which, as far as I know, was a legitimate creation of their own company. It was a Floating-Point BASIC Interpreter for the old Apple II Machines that came out around 1979 or so. Since then, it has been all downhill for MS.

It is common knowledge that Bill Gates stole the MS-Dos operating system from his partner at Altair, then sold IBM on using it for the OS in their first computers which appeared several years after the Apples.

Gates' next lie read like this: "If you want a personal computer that you can hook up to your business mainframe, it will have to be an IBM". Not an ounce of truth in it, but between the cosmetic value of the lie and IBM's massive market share, it enabled MS to capture a good 85% of market share from what had been mostly Apple's territory. Later, after Apple had begun incorporating mouse and windows technology into their

later Apple II's, the Apple III, the Lisa and early Macs, MS produced the first version of Windows, for which Apple promptly and properly sued them for copyright infringement. Apple won that round, and MS's "Trash Can" has been a "Recycle Bin" ever since.

Unfortunately, the lies and thievery from Gates & Co. was far from over. Since that time, every innovation that has come down the pike has run headlong into Bill Gates. Innumerable companies have had to make the choice between selling out, licensing the technology to MS or being driven out of business by being undersold. To this day, hardware companies sell their wares at near cost, simply in an effort to undercut the competition and keep others like Apple from regaining any market share, then they make their profits from the software later. I own a Macintosh machine. The machine is equipped with a package called "Virtual PC", which allows me to run Windows on the Mac and use any of MS's software, should I choose to do so. I have consistently found Mac software to be far more easy, user-friendly and stable than the MS equivalents. Still, when I visit most software vendors, I find them reluctant, almost fearful, of carrying Mac software. Chains such as Walmarts get their stock thru central buyers which have shown reluctance in the extreme to carry anything BUT MS compatible software. In one case, a chain called "Best Buy", I discovered Mac and Windows versions of identical software on the shelf together, with the Mac version selling at \$10 more than the MS version. I summoned the store manager and demanded an explanation. I was told that if he did not price the products in that fashion, MS would pull all their products from his shelves. This has not been the exception, but the rule. How blatant does MS have to act before they can be found guilty of racketeering? How obviously does a monopoly have to conduct themselves to be recognized for what they are? And how many people will have to be hurt or driven out of business before someone takes this monster in hand and administers justice???

The dangers of such a concentration of power go far beyond simply fair business practices. Their efforts, for instance, to modify Sun's JAVA language earned them lawsuits and produced a certain degree of confusion among web programmers. Their regular introduction of new media formats without the software to allow other systems to immediately keep up with the changes provides them with additional pressure to sidestep fair competition. And thruout these efforts, there is always the MS database, in which a great deal of personal information is kept. Does a database of personal information provide a threat in and of itself? Of course not. I am sure Apple has my name and address somewhere in its files. But think of the back-door that MS gave to the NSA, which allows them to enter anyone's computer, anywhere in the world, examine the hard drive and even read and write on that drive with complete concealment. When the Chinese discovered that, they began a campaign to eliminate Windows from every machine in their country and replace it with Unix. Think also of the Eschalon program,

which has had Japanese and German authorities angry at us in the USA for some time now, as they have justifiable fears of corporate espionage if that aforementioned "back-door" gets into the wrong hands.

Right now, business has almost no alternative to Windows. And since Windows is nearly completely borrowed or stolen technology, several years behind Apple and others, and since some real security threats exist and grow more ominous on a daily basis, something MUST be done and done soon to eliminate this threat.

The only solution is to deal with Microsoft thru the courts, in the most appropriate way possible, under the RICO laws as racketeers. By taking them in hand, forcefully, and compelling them to adopt practices that will open the market to real competition, you will find that rather than hindering development, it will enhance the opportunities for competing companies to enter the marketplace and speed the development of new technology. The companies are already out there, working on new ideas, developing approaches to market their ideas while defending their battlements from the MS assaults that will surely head their way when the threat of innovation becomes visible.

There are nine states at this time that disagree with the DOJ resolution of the case against MS. This may be the last opportunity to wield the sword of the Law against a seemingly unassailable threat. I beg you, use the power that you have in this just cause. For just one of hundreds of sources of more background and documentation of the illegal and anti-competitive practices of MS, I refer you to this website... <<http://hive.me.gu.edu.au/csand/md/0soft.html>><http://hive.me.gu.edu.au/csand/md/0soft.html>

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. Your response would be appreciated and a dialogue welcomed.

Anthony D'Andrea
Randolph Massachusetts

MTC-00011233

From: david zhang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:43am
Subject: Stricter punishment!

Dear Sir/Madam,
Microsoft behavior in the past has shown us its greediness and its true nature. The punishment should be stricter. If we cannot do it today, we will end up in the same situation as we have now with Iraq because we did not finish the job at that time. Please, for a better and more dynamic and diversified technology world, give Microsoft a stricter punishment.

Sincerely,
David

MTC-00011234

From: Christopher L. Lupton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to accept the settlement. The Attorney Generals in the 9 states opposing the settlement are definitely not acting in the best interest of their constituents, our economy or the nation. I kindly ask that you

please review this e-mail and take it into consideration during your decision.

Sincerely,
Christopher L. Lupton
President
InfoDynamics, Inc.
7351 Shadeland Station, STE 260
Indianapolis, IN 46256

MTC-00011235

From: jhauf2@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:54am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please, settle this issue as soon as possible. Microsoft is a fine company and should be allowed to get on with its business. It is bad enough to permit these states to extort millions from Microsoft. Do not compound the damages by delaying the conclusion.

James G. Hauf

MTC-00011236

From: Neil Stahl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:56am
Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement:
Don't Do It

Sirs:

The future of the American computer industry is in your hands. It will be a bleak future if Microsoft is left as the monopoly your proposed settlement would achieve.

As long as one company makes the dominant operating system and applications it will always have an incredible advantage in both markets and will have little reason to innovate or to do a good job. This is born out by the way Microsoft has achieved dominance in both markets, from a start where there were many competitors and software was evolving fast. If you are watching the evolution of software now, you must notice it has slowed to a crawl. If you are watching the quality of software Microsoft produces you have seen security for our computers running their software is remarkably poor. In a market with real competition this wouldn't happen, market forces would correct it.

As a computer user I urge you:

1. Do not go through with this settlement.
2. Do split Microsoft into two or more parts, isolating the part that makes operating systems from the rest.

Sincerely,
Neil Stahl
248 Rainbow Drive #14876
Livingston, Tx. 77399-2048

MTC-00011237

From: Larry Hannay
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:57am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can't believe the way you guys are buckling under. Current situations, now matter how extreme, should have nothing to do with resolving the problem at hand. I think legislators that have been, shall we say, "influenced", by Microsoft campaign contributions are using the Sept. 11th tragedy and the economy in general to go easy on Microsoft without incurring a negative public response. And I think that stinks. Especially since it is your job to represent the public's best interests. But as always, the public loses

out to corporate concerns. I spend a lot of time reading newspapers and technical magazines, and every stinking article I have read points out that not only is Microsoft not getting punished, but your so-called "solution" will help it to increase its monopoly by giving it inroads to the school market that Apple now does so well in. If every stinking magazine article author can see this, then why can't you? Huh? You people disgust me. And then you wonder why the voting populace is so cynical and uninvolved. Or is that the way you want it.

Please don't bother to respond. Your "spin" makes me sick.

Larry Hannay
16 Cutter Ave.
Somerville, MA

MTC-00011238

From: Rail, Marcus E.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 8:00am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
See attached Microsoft WORD document for comments.

Renata B. Hesse January 15, 2002
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

This letter is written to comment on the Department of Justice proposed settlement of the Microsoft Antitrust case.

As a corporate purchaser of Microsoft products, we conclude that the settlement does nothing to address the real concerns of the customer. Those concerns involve the increasing ability of Microsoft to set extreme pricing policies without fear of customer loss, and to design products without proper concern to the customer's needs. Microsoft products have served our company fairly well in many areas and we believe Microsoft brought many innovations to PC desktop tools. However, we also believe that Microsoft used questionable practices to drive out the competition or acquire it at a very low cost. For the most part, especially for products like WINDOWS, OFFICE, and INTERNET EXPLORER, we feel we had and still have no real alternative to Microsoft products.

Our other software vendors who work with Microsoft endure extreme pressure to do it Microsoft's way. If they don't, they face severe penalties by a company that truly controls the desktop market. Rather than respond to the customer, we find many of our vendors responding to Microsoft so that Microsoft revenues are maximized.

We question the "freedom to innovate" banner that Microsoft uses to justify their practices. In fact, all we see is slavery to Microsoft for customers and other software vendors. It may be that Microsoft could have won its present monopolist position just through the quality of its products and hard work. We'll never really know. We do know that they are now exercising that monopolistic position to the detriment of the customer. We are now being forced to pay millions of dollars to upgrade to product versions we don't need. The only viable alternative given to us is to pay much higher

prices when they finally force us into obsolescence. All software companies try to generate revenue through planned obsolescence, however, only a monopolist can carry it to the extent that Microsoft has, and make the profits it has. The present proposed settlement barely slaps Microsoft on the wrist for past practices and will not deter it from future anti-competitive practices. Moreover, the root of the problem Microsoft's control of both the dominant desktop operating system and the major application software for desktops—will result in costs for the consumer that are not controlled by competition and not in line with the value delivered.

Marcus E. Rally Manager, System Software, Information Systems, Cooper Tire Company
John E. Mitchell Vice-President, Information Systems, Cooper Tire Company
Todd E. Shin Barger Director, Information Systems, Cooper Standard Automotive
Cooper Tire & Rubber Company, Lima & Western Aves., Findlay, Ohio 45840

MTC-00011239

From: Ronald Ford
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/15/02 7:36am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ronald Ford
1211 S.W. Anita St
Arcadia, FL 34266

January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice ,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ronald T. Ford

MTC-00011240

From: Alan L. Hansen
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:49am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alan L. Hansen
124 North 155st

Shoreline, Wa 98133-5926
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Alan L. Hansen

MTC-00011241

From: TSulli8693@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:06am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

I am a personal computer user. I think the settlement that has been reached is fair and should be approved. That will allow the public to continue receiving the services of the many new products that Microsoft can develop for our computers.

Thomas F. Sullivan
219 Alpine Dr.
Winter Haven, FL 33881

MTC-00011242

From: William Enouen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:11am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen: At a time when American Industry is challenged to continue to do better and the technology firms are in a downturn, it would seem appropriate to conclude some of the legal activities against Microsoft with just settlements rather than letting such settlements drag on, costing the company and its shareholders and the government and its taxpayers. The case should be concluded and the settlement agreed upon allowed so both parties can get on with more effective use of their time. Thanks for your attention.

MTC-00011243

From: Jim Presley
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 8:18am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement—No!

Hey, I thought you guys were supposed to be protecting us from predators— not siding with them! What kind of Justice Department have we got here? A bunch of toadies for political donors.

MTC-00011244

From: John Keyes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:24am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To whom it concerns,
I think the settlement is a betrayal of America. It is an insult to suggest that the terms of the settlement are sufficient. Micro\$oft will continue its predatory approach to the software market and will continue to hold institutes of education to ransom. It is time to resolve the issue and extract adequate compensation from Microsoft for the companies that have been damaged and for every child whose education costs rise as a result of disgusting licensing terms. It is also necessary so the collective power and choice of a free market can begin to thrive in the software market.

-John Keyes
Ireland

MTC-00011245

From: Morris, Perry
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 8:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to get on with life.....this has drug on long enough. The public will not be well served to have this linger on.

Thank you,
Perry Morris
Coordinator, Computer Applications
Facilities Operations and Maintenance
Florida State University
850.644.8699
pmorris@admin.fsu.edu

MTC-00011246

From: Julie Noll
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Again, I am outraged. While reading the article in USA Today, dated 1/15/2002, written by Kevin Maney, Silicon Valley CEOs don't pull verbal punches, I couldn't believe what I was reading. "In one corner is the tag team of Larry Ellison, CEO of database software company Oracle, and Scott McNealy, CEO of computer maker Sun Microsystems. In the other corner: their professed enemy, Microsoft, and its leader, Bill Gates. Ellison and McNealy consistently and publicly hurl harsh, sometimes personal and sometimes funny insults at Microsoft and Gates. Ellison has called Microsoft products "pathetic" and motivated employees by showing a computer-generated image of Gates giving them the finger. McNealy has referred to Gates as "Butthead," compared his management skill with Bozo the Clown and proclaimed that the battle of the future is "mankind vs. Microsoft." I cannot believe our government would allow themselves to be influenced by CEO such as Scott McNealy and Larry Ellison. If you ask me I believe their tactics need to be further investigated. I have wrote many times before

this case is no longer about justice. It is simply a few CEO allowed to use our government to further their causes.

I am growing ever tired of all these grown men acting like babies. What they need to do is simply create great products, build their companies and stop whining.

It is time settle this entirely.
Julie Anne

MTC-00011247

From: Gerhard Beck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:28am
Subject: Additional Remedies

Microsoft continues to work towards the utter destruction of any possible competition. Currently in Microsoft's sites are Java and Linux. It is informative that because of Microsoft's monopoly position, only products offered free (such as Java and Linux), cause any threat to Microsoft.

I would propose the following remedies:

1) Microsoft be forced to charge a minimum price for each piece of bundled software such as the Media player, Word, Excel, PowerPoint. The charge would be separately stated and users could decline to purchase the software with thier new machine. This would create a price envelope which competitors could exist within.

2) Microsoft be forced to include the latest release of Java unmodified with its latest releases of Windows. This would ease the integration burdens for Java-based competitive packages.

3) Microsoft be forced to release Linux versions of its Microsoft Office suite at the same time as comparable Windows versions. This would be extremely helpful in developing Linux as a viable competitor to Microsoft on the desktop.

4) Microsoft be forced to stop bundling software with Windows or Office and be forced to charge for the software. Since both products are basically provided with all machines, anything Microsoft bundles in destroys a previously existing market since it is hard to get folks to pay for what Microsoft provides for free.

5) Microsoft be forced to charge one price for Windows both retail and wholesale to manufacturers. Microsoft's current scheme strongly encourages the purchase of a new machine to get a new copy of Windows because the retail cost of Windows is so high compared to the cost of a new machine with the same copy of Windows. Since the cost to duplicate a CD is so cheap, there is no economic justification for the discounts given.

Gerhard Beck
703 676 4403

MTC-00011248

From: e cummings
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

rather than rewarding the guilty party (microsoft) by allowing them to continue monopolizing their markets, (under the guise of donating their products to schools and such) i think a more fitting punishment would be to compel microsoft to sponsor independent contractors to install the free

and open-standard Linux operating system and compatible program on the computers they donate, and to train students, faculty, and other users on the use of Linux.

allowing microsoft to "lock in" even more customers by compelling the company to indoctrinate even more people in the use of their closed, proprietary products is no punishment at all. allowing microsoft to write off the retail cost of any software they donate is a reward—the company's true cost for this extra software is negligible, and they will profit from the sale of "upgrades." (the term "upgrades" is in quotes because traditionally microsoft's upgrades primarily consist of bug fixes and patches to their already faulty products.)

ed cummings

MTC-00011249

From: Paul Speer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:29am
Subject: Do not settle—the 1930s parallel

In the 1930s, the motion picture industry (read applications software) controlled the theaters (read operating system). The DOJ brought suit and broke up this set of monopolies (different companies owned different theater chains). The same principle applies here.

Microsoft makes and will continue to make economic rents from the present system. In so doing unnecessary costs are added to businesses using MS products which are passed on to the consumers. Having the Windows operating systems opened to the entry of applications software without the present arbitrary constraints can only be assured through a break-up of the monopoly.

Paul Speer
pdsjunior@earthlink.net

MTC-00011250

From: Dave G
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:40am
Subject: Apple in Schools

The big move in education is standardization on skills that will do the most good. Learn math basics, learn english basics, etc.. The political engine has dictated to schools that they need to teach only things that have value in the market place.

Based on this logic, Apple should be as popular in schools as UNIX computers. Apple Macintosh is a niche machine used primarily by print shops and graphic designers. UNIX is a bigger niche product used primarily in enterprise server environments. Both can be, and in the case of UNIX is learned in college for specialized fields. The rest of the world for the most part uses Windows with or without MS applications. Like it or not, that is the economic and business norm. Hence, our children should be taught this because it IS the norm. My kids went to a grade school that bought gobs of iMacs. They sat in the halls in boxes for two years. Eventually the teachers ended up setting up the machines. These machines were rarely even used. The reason was the schools IT dept. did not understand Mac nor did they care to. No one wrote an education plan using Mac software. These machine were simply a waste of

donation. My kids have moved on to Jr. High. The school is just dripping with Dell Wintel boxes, 4 to every classroom and several all computer labs. Not an Apple to be seen. These computers are up and running and being used. Sorry Steve. As for software bundling, everyone does it. MS does, Apple does, Linux does, even big UNIX vendors do. That is how you get consumers to buy. Apple comes with both Netscape and Explorer and iTunes, and CD-Creator, and etc..... Why are these other companies not being censored for their use. Back when the Netscape/Explorer issue was hot, the argument was MS was giving their browser away. So was Netscape. I have never paid for a browser. I only switched to Explorer when Netscape became an unusable application under version 4. Even today, when designing web pages, you still have to be careful to code around Netscape's poor programming habits.

Enough from one person.

Dave Gould

Graphic Designer (My Macintosh side)

MSCE (My Microsoft side)

Geek (My Linux side)

MTC-00011251

From: Koestler, Jim

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:44am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear United States Dept. of Justice, Under the Tunney Act, I would like to provide my comments regarding the Microsoft settlement.

As a US citizen and a tax payer, I'm very concerned and quite frankly disappointed about the continued efforts of my government to pursue a company that continues to innovate. Here is a company that started with nothing, developed quality software at very competitive prices, became successful and now the government wants to punish them. Microsoft's software continues to deliver more features, integrate additional applications, increase performance, all at lower prices. As a consumer, I'm not sure how I'm harmed.

I disagree with the appeals court ruling against Microsoft, but respect their decision. I feel the recent settlement reached is tough, but reasonable and fair to all parties involved. I, along with many others consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy. I hope you reach the same conclusion.

Regards,

Jim Koestler

Manager, Sales Engineering

MTC-00011252

From: Cartier, Philip

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 8:54am

Subject: MS Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I think the proposed settlement in the Microsoft anti-trust case is totally inadequate. As a user and occasional buyer of MS products, this settlement does nothing to reduce the excessive prices, poor functionality, and lack of choice that I have faced in the software market due to Microsoft's predatory practices. In addition,

the proposed settlement simply extends the Microsoft monopoly to one of the few remaining areas where it is not the major supplier- the education market. The only kind of settlement that provides meaningful redress for us abused customers would be one that would prevent future abuses. That would mean significant penalties, i.e. cash payments that are at least 10-20% of published profits over the last five years and criminal charges against the current and future management if abuses occur again.

Phil Cartier

ph: 5167

MTC-00011253

From: Bev Mautner

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:56am

Subject: I support the recent settlement between US DOJ and Microsoft

Bev and Mark Mautner

600 SW 100 Terrace

Pembroke Pines, FL 33025

Jan 15, 2002,

US Attorney General John Ashcroft, DOJ

Dear Mr Ashcroft,

End this protracted litigation. Enough is enough. The settlement is fair.. I support the recent settlement between the US DOJ and Microsoft. Some of the terms seem fair and reasonable. Others, I do not feel knowledgeable enough to make a judgement call on, but one of those terms, I am concerned about. This involves the issue of being forced to give up the internal interfaces and protocols needed to develop products that are compatible with Window' operating systems. Let's face it. Microsoft has without a doubt been one of the principal driving forces behind America being the leader in technology advancements in computerization. I object to any government entity not protecting their property and/or intellectual rights. Microsoft has worked hard and spent incredible amounts of money and devoted much of their resources to making products and developing new technologies that spin off entire new industries. It is essential that companies be reassured their intellectual property rights are protected by the American justice system whether they be a company has powerful as Microsoft or the next "Bill Gates wanna be".

I therefore urge your office to persuade the nine states holding out to settle, and bring closure to this long and protracted lawsuit.

Sincerely yours,

Beverly and Mark Mautner

MTC-00011254

From: Ferraro, James A

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 8:55am

Subject: Microsoft Litigation

I think it would be in the American public's interest that the DOJ look into the Enron Case than to waste time attacking Microsoft for helping to make this the financially strongest nation in the world.

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-00011255

From: Lloyd, Chris M.

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 8:55am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Thank you for allowing the public to comment on the referenced settlement for Microsoft Corporation. I urge the Department of Justice to accept the terms of the antitrust settlement and immediately stop this endless waste of public tax resources. From my perspective, the Justice Department and the nine states contesting this settlement are tilting at windmills, wasting the tax payers investment and needlessly persecuting one of the most innovative and creative private enterprises of both the 20th and 21st centuries. I would rather the resources we are using to witch hunt a major American corporation be diverted to the attack on terrorist organizations in this country.

Thank you again for this opportunity to weigh in.

Chris

Chris M. Lloyd, AICP, REM

Senior Supervising Planner

Parsons Brinckerhoff

757-466-9675 Office, 757-466-1493 Fax,

757-581-9695 Cell

lloyd@pbworld.com

MTC-00011256

From: Danielson, Miguel C.

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 9:00am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

For the past 10 years, I have watched in terrific disgust at the effect of Microsoft, Inc.'s business tactics on average American consumers. For much of this time period, I have been a casual computer purchase consultant and/or Internet development consultant. In both capacities, I have seen the process of decision making in computer hardware and software purchases.

Consumers, particularly in the field of high-technology, are incredibly swayed by the options presented to them at retail locations in their area. For more years than I wish to think about, such options were horribly limited. There was essentially one choice of operating system on one choice of platform. This is all well and good, but when the choice of Internet Service Provider and Internet browser are then thrust upon such consumers by the same provider of the operating system, the choices seem to evaporate.

When I first began using the Internet in 1994, Microsoft's Internet Explorer wasn't even in existence, of course. For many years after that, nobody would touch a non-Netscape browser. This was all well and good, just as it was fine that Microsoft dominated the computer market. But Netscape never had a true monopoly on its product, and it never took advantage of any marketplace dominance it had. As the years went by, the inclusion of Internet Explorer on Windows machines was simply too easy for people to avoid. Though virtually every person of technical computer knowledge I knew preferred Netscape, Internet Explorer

somehow became the standard for Web browsing.

As an Internet developer, I struggled with the mess that Microsoft created by supporting only certain HTML standards in its Internet Explorer. Moreover, it extended the HTML command set so Web programmers could do things with their Web browser that weren't "allowed" by the HTML standard that makes the Web run. Developers found themselves having to design three different versions of the same website because of Microsoft's marketplace antics.

With the dawn of Linux, it seems as though, at least for the power users, there was some choice in operating system. Of course, Microsoft swiftly ended such hope by making sure major PC manufacturers couldn't offer any such alternative operating system and still sell Windows in addition. All of these examples are to say nothing of the predatory business tactics that Microsoft employed to extinguish smaller software and hardware businesses that might legitimately compete with them. To be a lawyer in the high-tech industry is to know of many stories of the Microsoft bullying that is commonplace among companies they see as a threat to them. It is truly a farce that Microsoft purports to be a company of innovation. It is well known amongst computer buffs like myself that Microsoft has never have a creative thought in its collective corporate history. It acquires what it wants and fills in the holes. This does not create value for consumers—it reduce what they see in the marketplace and limits them to a single provider.

Please reconsider your course of easing the punishment for Microsoft. The computer and Internet industries will only continue to spiral downward if Microsoft's antics are not swiftly defeated. Under NO circumstances should they be allowed to put their operating system or other products into the hands of consumers. Regardless of whether such products are delivered for free, it is well known that the use of these products by consumers will only further Microsoft's goal of universal adoption and continued monopolization. It MUST be a requirement that any software or computers donated as a part of the settlement must be non-Microsoft related.

Thank you,
Miguel Danielson
Cambridge, MA

MTC-00011257

From: Suzie Overman
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/15/02 8:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Suzie Overman
8055 Creekwood Cir. E.
Southaven, MS 38671
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending

accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Suzie Overman

MTC-00011258

From: TEEdC12@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:02am
Subject: Settlement

The very idea of allowing microsoft to place its own products into schools as part of its monopoly "cure" is ludicrous beyond words. Please help build a little faith in the government by making this part of the settlement PURE CASH

Thanks
Ted Ciolli
2000 Seven Hills Road
Jefferson City, MO 65101

MTC-00011259

From: Mr Bleakley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:05am
Subject: Microsoft settlement
Sirs: My opinion is SETTLE. Get off Microsofts back. Mr. Bleakley

MTC-00011260

From: James Eshleman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
US Department of Justice:

I strongly support the proposed settlement between the US Government and Microsoft. This trial has gone on for long enough and with or economy in recession the last thing we need to do is harass profitable US companies like Microsoft.

From the beginning this case has seemed like Netscape, AOL-Time Warner, Sun, and other Microsoft competitors have been pushing to have Microsoft broken up, or punished, and not because they believe Microsoft is stifling innovation and hurting consumers, but the opposite. Microsoft is innovating and lowering the prices of computer software all the time, but companies like Netscape who have an inferior products can't keep up, don't forget that before Microsoft started giving away Internet Explorer, Netscape was charging for its Communicator browser.

The settlement is a good idea, and hopefully it'll go through. Microsoft is one of the most valuable companies the US has, and we need to realize that and let them keep operating and out-performing the competition.

Thanks,
James Roy Eshleman
Charlotte, NC

MTC-00011261

From: Marty McClamma
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In section C: I think that having a MS employee oversee MS is like having a Cat watch over a bird. The settlement would have more effect if MS had to pay for a Federal Employee to over see MS.

Marty McClamma

MTC-00011262

From: Harold Burstyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:11am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In my opinion, the proposed settlement does not meet the needs of consumers. It will leave Microsoft's unlawful monopoly largely intact. Nothing in Microsoft's market behavior since the appellate remand suggests that they are prepared to play by the rules applicable to companies that have a monopoly. In fact, everything they have done, since the D. C. Circuit unanimously upheld the judgment of monopoly, to increase their products' position in the marketplace has undercut free and fair competition. I believe the District Court should reject the proposed settlement and encourage the settling states to join the non-settling states in continuing the litigation until Microsoft is forced to change its behavior. Harold L. Burstyn, Attorney-at-Law (NY & FL) and Registered Patent Attorney 216 Bradford Parkway, Syracuse NY 13224-1767, tel. (315) 445-0620

MTC-00011263

From: Norman Plankey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:14am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am appalled by the current degree of ?justice? being levied in the Microsoft anti-trust suit: does this current administration dole out favors ONLY to the powerful and wealthy, while turning a blind eye to the average American? I believe Ashcroft/Bush/Gates are playing a dangerous game and the majority of Americans are fed-up with big business calling the shots through government officials (in the olden days, we used to call them ?elected officials? but that too has become an arcane phrase). regards,

Norman Plankey
129 Good Hill Rd
Oxford, CT 06478
203-881-1390

MTC-00011264

From: Roy C. Dixon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice:

Pursuant to the Tunney Act, I am submitting comments on the United States v. Microsoft settlement. Please see the attached Microsoft Word document that briefly summarizes the significant costs of Microsoft's innovation to one of its customers.

In preparing this document I have tried to report only factual details about the use of one of Microsoft's programming products and not make any accusations on what development practices within Microsoft were the basis for the problems experienced by this customer.

Roy C. Dixon
Cary, North Carolina

MTC-00011264-0001

The purpose of this document is to relate how innovation by the Microsoft Corporation has affected one of its customers. It will focus on one Microsoft product, Microsoft Office, specifically Microsoft Access 2000, and how Microsoft/Es innovation has resulted in significant costs to this customer. The cost has been reflected not only in terms of dollars, but also in ease-of-use and performance.

The customer in this case is a church that needed a database product to maintain information about its members. In the early 1990/Es, Microsoft introduced Access 2.0 at an introductory price of \$99.00, a price significantly below other database products. This purchase proved to be a wise investment since Microsoft Access 2.0 was a very well designed product that was extremely easy to use. In fact, the set of help menus offered by this product are unsurpassed by any other programming product this author has used.

A Microsoft Access 2.0 database was designed by the author of this document and deployed by the church on multiple computer systems that were interconnected through a local area network. By splitting the database into two components, an application component and a data component, multiple members of the church staff could each use a copy of the application component of the database at one time and share the single copy of the data component of the database. This is classically the way a Microsoft Access database is deployed over a local area network.

During the 1990 decade, the church also used other Microsoft Office products, Word, Excel, Internet Explorer, and Outlook Express. Although some members of the church staff would of preferred to use other competing products (the church secretary and the associate pastor preferred Corel WordPerfect over Microsoft Word), using only Microsoft products provided a level of interoperability among the products that was not always possible with using a collection of competing products. If the Microsoft Corporation had defined and negotiated with its competitors a set of common programming interfaces, the church would have had an option to employ one or more competitor products in conjunction with it/Es Microsoft Access database. Late in the decade the church was compelled to upgrade their versions of Microsoft Word and

Microsoft Excel. Microsoft had released updated versions of their office software, specifically Office 95 and Office 97, and the file data formats were incompatible with the earlier version of Microsoft Office that was being used by the church. Files received from members of the church drafted in these newer versions could not be read with the older Microsoft Office software. So the church was obligated to upgrade the Microsoft Office software, even though the old software completely suited the needs of the church staff.

At this time, Microsoft had just released Office 2000 and the decision was made to upgrade to this new release. This included updating Microsoft Access from 2.0 to 2000. This has since proven to be a mistake. Microsoft Access 2000, a complete rewrite of the older versions of Microsoft Access, is basically a very poor product. It is extremely difficult to use as a design tool and the programming interface is extremely complex. Furthermore, the help menus within Microsoft Access 2000 and the other Microsoft Office 2000 programs produce an overabundance of references for a given search (50 or more is not uncommon), many of which have absolutely nothing to do with the search topic. In this author/Es opinion, the Microsoft Access 2000 product is basically unusable.

But a more serious problem is that to run Microsoft Access 2000 requires a computer system with a relatively high-speed processor (at least 400 MHz) and a considerable amount of memory (at least 256 Megabytes) to provide an acceptable level of performance. This meant that the church had to replace three of its four computers, an expense that the church should not of occurred. One of the computers was kept since it had been purchased in the previous year and additional memory was added to this computer. Due to extremely poor performance of Access 2000 over a local area network, the church staff is still using Microsoft Access 2.0 on this one computer. Fortunately in the past month, a church member has donated a computer to the church that will allow the church staff to replace this remaining computer system.

Given that the church can overcome the performance problems with Microsoft Access 2000 by purchasing new computer systems does not overcome the technical deficiencies within Microsoft Access 2000. Specific concerns are programming services that have worked properly within previous versions of Access, 2.0 and 97, but do not work within Microsoft Access 2000. The author has stumbled on a handful of such problems, all of which have been documented by Microsoft as being known problems. The sidebar on this page illustrates one of these problems. Now the church has decided to use the e-mail support within Microsoft Access to send reports to its members over the Internet. Once this service is made available to the church staff, considerable savings will result due to reduced mailing costs. This employs a programming statement called SendObject. This programming statement works properly within Microsoft Access 2.0 and Access 97. When executed within Microsoft Access 2000, however, the program reports that an

illegal operation has been performed and the program shuts itself down. Microsoft has documented this to be a problem within Access 2000 and has suggested a five-page code module to replace the existing code that executes the SendObject statement (this problem has been corrected in Microsoft Access 2002).

So the first question to be asked is why Microsoft failed to detect this error during testing of Access 2000 and why have they not supplied a program update to correct this problem? Furthermore, the Microsoft Knowledge Base article referenced in footnote (NOTEREF —Ref534630788 (h 7) contains the following qualifying statements: ??The following code may not work properly if you have installed the Outlook E-mail Security Update.?? ??If you have limited programming experience, you may want to contact a Microsoft Certified Partner or the Microsoft fee-based consulting line at (800) 936-5200.0 ??NOTE: This code has only been tested by using Microsoft Outlook as the MAPI client. It may not work with other MAPI-enabled mail applications. Microsoft does not support the use of this sample code with third- party MAPI applications.??

And thus the second question to be asked is why Microsoft, a corporation that states its innovative practices are for their customers/E benefit, would need to make such statements? The option exists to invest in upgrading all the computers at the church to Microsoft Office XP (i.e., Access 2002). Thus the church would again be faced with paying Microsoft Corporation additional funds for newer versions of programming products that have little value over the older versions. Furthermore, the author will not only need to upgrade his home computer with Microsoft Office XP, but will have to purchase new versions of at least two development tools and more than likely invest in a couple of new reference books. The author believes that these development tools are critical in designing a Microsoft Access database of any magnitude.

If the decision is made by the church staff to upgrade the church computers to Microsoft Access 2002, the author will still design and develop the church/Es database within a prior version, probably Microsoft Access 97. This version of Access has proven to be stable, usable, and provides a reasonable set of help menus. Furthermore, the author already owns the Access 97 versions of the development tools mentioned in the previous paragraph. This means that the database will require conversion to Microsoft Access 2002 every time a new update is provided to the church. Based upon the author/Es experience with converting a database to Microsoft Access 2000 this conversion process is not completely automatic, requiring a number of manual changes and additions after the program completes the conversion process.

Thus as the church migrates from the earlier versions of Microsoft Access (2.0 and 97) to the later versions (2000 and 2002), the following observations can be made: The performance of the database program has decreased significantly. The usability of the design interface to the program has decreased significantly. Some original design and

programming constructs are specifically not supported. Many new design and programming constructs have been poorly implemented and tested. The usefulness of the help menus and technical manuals has degenerated significantly. Services within the database program interoperate with fewer supporting programs. Along with the monetary expenses mentioned earlier, these are the ever-recurring costs to a customer for Microsoft/Es innovation through its Access database program product!

MTC-00011264-0003

Mike Gunderloy within his article on Access 2002 in the June 2001 issue of Smart Access states, "Subform and subreport design is also much improved in Access 2002 from Access 2000. For starters, the scrollbars for a subform or subreport in design view now scroll in increments small enough to be useful, making it possible to edit subforms/reports in place without making you want to throw the keyboard through the monitor."

As an illustration of this deficiency, open Microsoft Access 2000 Help and perform a search for the SUM function. One obtains a list of 137 references, none of which describe the SUM function. Or do a search for the COUNT function. One obtains a list of 320 references, none of which to the author/Es knowledge describes the COUNT function. The carton containing Microsoft Office 2000 states that the system requirements for running under Windows 95 or 98 are a PC with Pentium 75 MHz processor and 16 MB of RAM for the operating system, plus an additional 4 MB of RAM running simultaneously (8 MB for Outlook or Access). This is a considerable understatement.

Complicating the performance issue was using WinProxy, a program from Ositis Products, which allowed all the church computers to simultaneously share a single dial-up connection to the Internet. It was realized that WinProxy was causing a significant traffic load on the local area network only after the church switched to a cable modem for accessing the Internet. The author has been unable to discover the reason behind this disruptive behavior. The author has estimated that the performance of Microsoft Access 2000 over a local area network is approximately ten percent the performance of the same database running within Microsoft Access 2.0.

Please refer to the following two articles within Microsoft/Es Knowledge Base (the first relates to Microsoft Access 2000 and the second to Microsoft Access 97):

HYPERLINK "<http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q208364>" <http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q208364>

HYPERLINK "<http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q155077>" <http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q155077> Please refer to the following article within Microsoft/Es Knowledge Base:

HYPERLINK "<http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q260819>" <http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb;en-us;q260819>

Based upon private communications with Mike Gunderloy, author of the Smart Access article mentioned in the first footnote, and Peter Vogel, editor of Smart Access (<http://www.smartaccessnewsletter.com>). The SendObject code module does not work on the church/Es computers when running Microsoft Outlook Express, only when running Microsoft Outlook. More importantly, the code module does work on the church/Es server that is running Microsoft Windows 2000, only on the other computers running Microsoft Windows 98.

The two development tools are Speed Ferret by Black Moshannon Systems (a global find and replace utility for all objects and code within the database) and Total Access Analyzer by FMS (a database analysis and documentation utility). Since the developers of these tools just released their Microsoft Access 2000 versions, support of Microsoft Access 2002 will probably not be available in the near future.

Microsoft Access 2.0 was shipped with two technical manuals thereby giving complete documentation on how to use the product. Microsoft ships the Office XP product with little documentation. This is a fundamental flaw. Preparing documentation on any product is an excellent method for checking the logic and usability of a product. The author through his Microsoft Access database development activities has stumbled on many problems in support of these observations. Only a limited number have been documented in this paper to illustrate the problems.

MTC-00011264-0004

The church publishes a roster of members that contains a subreport listing the e-mail addresses of the members. This subreport is printed in two-column format like a phone book (names are listed alphabetically starting in the first column and then continuing in the second column). This formatting works within Microsoft Access 2.0 but does not work in Microsoft Access 2000. Furthermore, this formatting does not work in Microsoft Access 97. Microsoft suggests the following resolution to this problem:

"To work around this behavior, follow these steps: (1) Open the subreport in Design view. (2) On the File menu, click Page Setup. (3) Click the Columns tab. (4) Under Column Layout, click Across, then Down." This is not a work around! This is an entirely different column layout, one that is not appropriate for a telephone-book type of listing. Has this problem been corrected in Microsoft Access 2002? Probably not is the author/Es guess.

August 23, 2000
To: Microsoft Freedom to Innovate Network
(HYPERLINK "<mailto:msfin@microsoft.com>")
msfin@microsoft.com)

Dear Microsoft,
Please stop your style of innovating! Your customers cannot continue to absorb the significant costs to their computer systems caused by your type of innovation.

Since purchasing Microsoft Office 2000, I had to purchase a new sophisticated computer system just to run Access 2000 (Access 2.0 and Access 97 run perfectly well

on my old computer system). My church, using a Microsoft Access 2.0 database that I wrote, will have to endure the cost of replacing or upgrading their existing computer systems in order to run a Microsoft Access 2000 version of the database.

Bill Gates and others at Microsoft do not seem to have the perspective to appreciate the problems they have caused. From what I have read about the ruling in the antitrust suit against you, Judge Thomas Jackson appears to understand and appreciate the problems your style of innovating has imposed upon your customers, even though he is has minimum expertise in computer science.

And compounding the issue, Microsoft Access 2000 is barely usable from a programming perspective.

Microsoft Access 2.0 is one of the finest programs I have ever used (and its help screens are unmatched by any other program). Microsoft Access 2000 is one of the worst. Please stop your style of innovating!

Regards, Roy C. Dixon

MTC-00011264-0005

MTC-00011265

From: Chengxia You
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:59am
Subject: The Microsoft case

The Microsoft case should be settled. The provisions of the agreement are reasonable and fair. The settlement should be good for the American economy and all parties.

Chengxia You, FNAI, Florida State University
1018 Thomasville Road, Suite 200-C
Tallahassee, Florida 32312, USA
Tel: 850/224-8207 ex 219
E-Mail: CYou@fnaai.org

MTC-00011266

FROM: Dennis Whittaker
TO: MS ATR
DATE: 1/15/02 9:20am
SUBJECT: Microsoft Settlement
Dennis Whittaker
34 Jewett Hill, Berkshire, NY 13736
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft, Department of Justice

950 Penna. Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing in support of the settlement with Microsoft. The changes it requires will restore fair competition and prevent future antitrust violations.

Microsoft has agreed to release the interfaces that make Windows work with software applications to competitors, meaning that other companies can figure out how to better write programs for Windows. Naturally, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against software or hardware developers who develop or promote software that take advantage of this new information. Plus, Microsoft has agreed not to enter into any agreements that force third parties to distribute any Windows technology exclusively. Clearly, these restrictions will benefit the consumers as well as the technology sector as a whole.

This settlement is in the best interests of the State of New York, The U.S., and the

economy because it will stop any anticompetitive behavior before it starts. Continued litigation against Microsoft will put millions of dollars into a case that has already seen a fair and reasonable end. Let the IT industry concentrate on business as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Dennis Whittaker

MTC-00011267

From: James Sweetman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:27am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement between Microsoft and the government does nothing to deter this arrogant behemoth from continuing to bully the rest of the industry into doing its bidding. Microsoft has a monopoly on the operating system level, and continues to illegally extend this monopoly by requiring users to purchase unwanted features. The settlement does nothing to address this, and will only encourage Microsoft to continue its illegal acts.

James Sweetman
Arlington, VA

MTC-00011268

From: Seacrist, Ben
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 9:26am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good Morning

I read somewhere that you all are looking for opinions on the case involving Microsoft. If that is not the case please forgive me for wasting your time with this e-mail.

If it is the case, then I'd like to voice my opinion. Personally, I'm not a big fan of the Windows OS. My 98 crashes way too often and XP is a joke (Windows 2000 saves the day, though, so I am not totally anti-Windows). That being said however, I think Microsoft being sued on anti-trust grounds is ridiculous. If the Windows OS has a big share of the market, it's because it markets its products better. Apple was doing years before what Windows does now. However, thanks to Apple's not-so-savvy marketing and its insistence on proprietary hardware (i.e. no Apple "clones"), they were not able to get a big chunk of the market. Enter IBM and its slew of "clones", most using MS-DOS. Microsoft had a better market saturation because it aligned itself with IBM, which allowed other companies to mimic its hardware, meaning more people came in contact with MS products. That's not Microsoft's fault. Heck, that's capitalism pure and simple. To make Microsoft pay because it used business sense while its competitors did not goes against the grain of our system. Don't punish them because of our companies' shortsightedness. Also, I've heard a lot of complaining about Windows being shipped with Internet Explorer and that that was unfair to other browser companies because it gave MS an unfair advantage. Rubbish. I only recently started using IE on machine at home and at work and only did that because Netscape kept crashing. Windows does not force anyone to use Internet Explorer.

Thanks for your time.
Sincerely,

Ben
Bennett P. Seacrist—EDS @ Detroit Diesel Corporation
13400 W. Outer Drive
Detroit, MI 48239
United States of America
Telephone/Telefon: (+001 313) 592.5189
Facsimile/Telefax: (+001 313) 592.7430
E-mail (EDS): ben.seacrist@eds.com
<mailto:ben.seacrist@eds.com>
E-mail (DDC): bennett.seacrist@detroitdiesel.com
<mailto:bennett.seacrist@detroitdiesel.com>

MTC-00011269

From: Wallis J Morgan Jr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a small businessperson involved in the specification and development of computer software for businesses of all sizes, on a regular basis I find the need to integrate solutions utilizing software from a variety of vendors, including Microsoft. Because of this I've found that solutions from Microsoft's competitors are evaluated and selected just as often as those from Microsoft, at least by the customers I support.

Although I have disagreed with the antitrust suit from the beginning, I support Microsoft's position on the settlement, believe it is fair and good for all involved.

Regards,
Wallis J Morgan Jr
databaseinternals
432 Glenmeade Court
Gretna, LA 70056
(504)296-4944 Voice
(504)392-3156 Fax

MTC-00011270

From: AllynnH@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:32am
Subject: Microsoft Case

The Microsoft case is over, as far as the federal government is concerned, and thank heaven for that. The national economy has suffered enough, and its driving engine, the high tech industry, has not been helped by the fact that one of its leading competitors has been dragged into court for more than three years by the Justice Department.

The settlement's provisions protect Microsoft's freedom to innovate its products and will hopefully lead to a new era of revitalized competition in the software market and other areas of the technology economy. Consumers and investors will both benefit from this settlement, and hopefully, it will be the last time the government interferes with the high tech economy.

Allynn Howe
11005 Sweetmeadow Drive
Oakton, VA 22124
703-798-5627

MTC-00011271

From: Doyle E. Whitten
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:40am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get this settled. Although some Microsoft programs irritate me, nothing justifies the way Janet Reno and her justice

department went after Microsoft. What can be done to force the rest of the states to agree to the settlement so we can get this over. I do not like my tax dollars being spent to prosecute a lawsuit against a company. It is time to get this over.

Doyle Whitten,
O'Fallon, Mo.

MTC-00011272

From: Terrence
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:43am
Subject: Microsoft settlement comments
Date: 11/22/01
Subject: Comments on Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

I strongly oppose the proposed settlement in the Microsoft antitrust case. Microsoft has been proven before the law to have abused its monopoly powers and needs to be punished for that and effective rules must be put in place to restore competition in the marketplace. The recently publicized settlement does neither. Healty competition, innovation, and consumer choice are ESSENTIAL to the high-tech economy. The way I interpret the settlement it is full of holes and will not stop Microsoft from steamrolling the competition with unfair business practices and does nothing to prevent Microsoft from gauging consumers for years to come.

In particular:

- Microsoft must be prohibited from engaging in exclusive and semi-exclusive agreements with any parties for any time period.
- Microsoft must not be allowed to provide financial or other incentives to other parties for favoring Microsoft's products over a competitors product.

- Microsoft must not be allowed to bundle or cross-license its products in any way.

- Microsoft must make public the programming interfaces to all of its major products to allow competitors to implement meaningful interoperability with Microsoft's products. Also, Microsoft must notify all interested parties well in advance before it decides to change any such interfaces and must make these changes available.

- Microsoft must be prohibited from breaking public technology standards by adding proprietary and incompatible features to such standards and then bundling this proprietary technology into hundreds of millions of Windows platforms, thus creating a de-facto standard that overrides the existing public standard.

No exemptions or loopholes can be allowed for the above rules if meaningful relief is to be achieved.

I urge the court to understand the impact Microsoft's past behavior has had on the high-tech marketplace. If Microsoft's ruthless business practices continue unchecked the American economy will pay an enormous penalty in the long run.

Microsoft should compete as much as it wants, but it must stop doing so in an unfair manner. The proposed settlement does not guarantee this in any way.

Sincerely,
Terrence Barr
20875 Valley Green Dr #27

Cupertino, CA 95014

MTC-00011273

FROM: Renee
TO: MS ATR
DATE: 1/15/02 9:44am
SUBJECT: Microsoft Settlement
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to voice my concern on the recent events behind the Microsoft Antitrust case. I am against any further government action. What I do not understand is the punishing of Microsoft for producing a quality product. Under our system of free enterprise, we are free to purchase and use any computer products we wish. It just so happens that Microsoft has created far better products than other competing companies have been able to.

Can you imagine that use of the Internet by ordinary citizens would have been possible without a common platform for communications? In addition to the superior software Microsoft has created, the company has created a niche in the marketplace that in the past decade has brought a huge amount of growth to our economy, not to mention the standardization of computer software programs that have allowed computerization to become part of everyday life.

As an investment portfolio manager, I represent clients who have invested hard-earned savings into American companies like Microsoft whose financial success benefitted ordinary Americans willing to invest in these companies. The additional litigation risk to shareholders has risen dramatically in this country as tort lawyers, including state Attorneys General, seek deep corporate pockets. It is no coincidence that the peak in our financial markets coincided with the Justice Department's announcement in March 2000 that it would seek to break up Microsoft.

Microsoft has agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows to promote non-Microsoft software programs. Microsoft has agreed to design future versions of Windows to make it easier for non-Microsoft software to be installed within Windows, and Microsoft has even agreed to a technical committee to monitor future compliance. I doubt if other firms would do as much. It is shameful that companies like Microsoft should be punished for their success whatever happened to the American dream? I urge you to support this settlement.

Sincerely, Renee' M. Smith

Sincerely,
Renee Smith

MTC-00011274

From: Greg HEck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:45am
Subject: Microsoft

To whom it may concern, as a long time user of Windows I feel as a consumer I have been harmed by Microsoft's unlawful

practices. As they stem rolled or bought and abandoned technologies that I wanted or needed these technologies just disappeared or "evolved" into products from Microsoft that were less useful than the original product. As I have been time and time again frustrated by Microsoft and their practices I strongly urge you to prosecute Microsoft to the full extent of the law.

Thank you

Greg Heck

MTC-00011275

From: R. Easley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:56am
Subject: Microsfot

I think enough of the taxpayers money has been spent on trying to punish Microsoft for being successful!

The economic downturn started about the time DOJ jumped into Microsofts case?

And by the way, where was DOJ when ENRON was stealing from just about everyone?

Best get your priorities right
R.V. Easley
PO box 54
Loon Lake, WA 99148
509-233-2950

MTC-00011276

From: Mark McKay
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 9:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been following the case and am dismayed that the settlement does not go far enough. It does not address Microsoft leveraging it's monopoly to severely damage other web browser manufacturers (such as netscape), nor it's attempt to destroy the Java programming language. The settlement leaves the door wide open for Microsoft to continue to use technical nasty tricks embedded in it's operating system and closed protocols that do nothing but make it more difficult for non-Microsoft companies to compete.

I would encourage the plaintiffs in this case to reconsider and leverage more effective and severe penalties against Microsoft.

Mark McKay

MTC-00011277

From: Barry Baumbaugh
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/15/02 9:50am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barry Baumbaugh
12032 Timberline Trace North
Granger, IN 46530
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Barry Baumbaugh

MTC-00011278

From: artsieber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:08am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The remedy should some how benefit the people that are damaged. The consumer is the injured party. How about making Microsoft provide free 800 number tech support for all past and present windows users. A lot of tech companies that still have compition offer this. I as a consumer never ever buy hardware or software that does not offer free tech support by phone. Except of course Microsoft products cause I DO NOT HAVE ANY CHOICE.

MTC-00011279

From: David F. Schreck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:12am
Subject: Public Comment on Antitrust Settlement with Microsoft

I feel that it is in the best interest of all parties to settle this suit now.

Thanks, Dave

MTC-00011280

From: Micheal Anderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:15am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Though it would never happen, it sure would be nice to have at least a semblance of choice in the OS market.

I would love to use an IBM version of XP, heh. Even an AOL version, Compaq, HP, any first to third tier manufacturer would be able to license Windows to make their own version. Microsoft would still make money on licensing fee's, still have over site control of the standards, and we would at least be able to honestly pretend to have a choice in OS's.

Micheal Anderson
Edge Computer Games
1245 Woodmere Ave.
Traverse City, MI. 49686
231-932-4263 voice 231-932-2441 fax
<http://www.edgecomputergames.com>

MTC-00011281

From: Howard Peterson
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:23am

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I REALLY THINK IT'S A DISGRACE, HOW MICROSOFT HAS BEEN HOUNDED, BULLIED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. IF THEY HAD PUT AS MUCH EFFORT INTO FIGHTING TERRORISM, THE WORLD TRADE DISASTER MAY HAVE NOT HAPPENED. THE SETTLEMENT REACHED BY THE MICROSOFT AND THE GOVERNMENT WAS "OVERLY" GENEROUS. ITS JUST PLAIN GREED AND POLITICS NOW, FOR ANYONE PURSUING ANYMORE FROM MICROSOFT. ITS MICROSOFT'S "SOUR GRAPE" COMPETATERS WHO ARE PURSUING THIS OUTRAGE.

HOWARD C. PETERSON
907 VANCE ST N
WILSON, NC 27893-2917
252-237-1228

MTC-00011282

From: Soindianabob@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:17am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am transmitting the attached letter which contains my views regarding the Microsoft case.

Sincerely,

Robert P. Simpson
10 Portage Place
Jeffersonville, Indiana 47130
January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I am writing to ask that you settle the Justice Department's lawsuit against Microsoft after this comment period. The case has dragged on with absolutely no favorable results. It is time to put the matter to rest.

I know firsthand that the Justice Department's action against the company affects more than the company itself. It affects the entire technology sector. Ending the antitrust case under the terms of the settlement seems like the best way to resolve the matter quickly and to everyone's approval. The settlement is fair, and enforceable. It rearranges the way Microsoft does business in virtually every aspect, from engineering and design to licensure and marketing. Any continued action against Microsoft will unfairly impede their progress and ability to continue developing innovative technology. Please end the case as soon as possible.

Thank you for considering my views on this important matter.

Sincerely,
Robert Simpson

MTC-00011283

From: Jim McGurrin

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:21am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Please do consumers a huge favor and DO NOT leave the language of Section III(J)(2)

and Section III(D) as is. If you really are interested in promoting competition and innovation, level the playing field by allowing open source software to compete unobstructed by Microsoft's interpretation of "business criteria". If there is ANY competition for Microsoft at all—it is in the open source world, specifically linux. Microsoft is fully aware of this and the DOJ is not playing their oversight role if language such as this is left in the settlement.

As a side note, it is naive to allow Microsoft to extend their monopoly by allowing, as a "remedy", the putting of their software in our school systems for 5 years. This will damage Apple and others and not Microsoft at all, and it is not doing those school systems or the kids any where near the good spending that same level of money on other technologies (ie open source). Take a hard look at RedHat's counter proposal to provide ALL school systems the software and support.

Please take do not rush to "clear" this case in an effort to "jump start" the tech sector with a pro-microsoft remedy. This is a crucial time in our industry and decisions here will set the direction of our industry (stagnant monopoly dominated or vibrant competitive diversity) for the next ten years at least, and like dog-years, ten tech years are like 70 normal years in terms of the effect on economy wide productivity growth.

If allowed to compete on a level playing field, Linux is a viable competitor to Microsoft, but if linux is to really have a chance to compete for the desktop then it needs to be seen as having a chance of success so that software vendors will put resources into writing applications targeted for linux—without fear of reprisal from Microsoft.

Thank-you

MTC-00011284

From: Carol Hemmen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:30am

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Attention: Renate B. Hesse

My comment is this—This settlement should have ended a long time ago. It weren't for the Attorney Generals of seven states—one of which I am sad to say that I am a resident of—continually wanting to bring charges against Microsoft, it would have been settled. I do not know what these "seven" think they will accomplish. What is wrong with competition?

It sounds more like a vendetta than anything else. Money spent in court with charges against Microsoft could be spent in so many better ways. Accept what Microsoft has offered and get on with life.

Carol Hemmen—An Iowa resident.

MTC-00011285

From: ALLNCL@cs.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:35am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The suit against Microsoft should be dropped outright by the Federal Government. It was instituted by the previous administration in Washington as repayment for campaign contributions given by AOL,

Oracle, at that time, Netscape and others. There is not now and there never has been a monopoly in operating systems. People who buy computers are free to install any operating system they wish or to buy a computer with the system preinstalled. Preference does not make a monopoly.

Technology in recent years has been a blessing for this country and due to companies such as Microsoft we have been on the leading edge. Are there people in Washington who would prefer that in addition to most computers being manufactured in Red China the operating systems should also be? I think the downturn in the NASDAQ is directly related to the Microsoft suit and should serve as a shot across our bow.

MTC-00011286

From: wgstelenet

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:35am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

American Outback

N 43.7 W 74.916

Box 270 South Shore Road

Old Forge, NY 13420-0270

January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

United States Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my support for the settlement with Microsoft. The settlement is in the best interests of the state, the American IT industry, and the economy. The recession has had a devastating effect on state budgets and the Federal budget. It is important that the technology industry be allowed to concentrate on business now.

The settlement imposes a broad series of restrictions on Microsoft. Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against computer makers who ship software that competes with anything in its Windows operating system. Also, Microsoft has agreed to license its Windows operating system products to the 20 largest computer makers on identical terms, including price. In addition, Microsoft has agreed to document and disclose for use by its competitors various interfaces that are internal to Windows' operating system products—a first in an antitrust settlement. This agreement will clearly benefit both consumers and the American IT industry as a whole. This settlement is both fair and reasonable, and it will prevent future anticompetitive behavior. The sooner the technology sector gets back to business as usual, the better. Wasting more time and money on further litigation is a bad idea.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincere regards,
W. Shaw

MTC-00011288

From: Kris Bredemeyer

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:44am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft Settlement is a setback towards fostering competition in the marketplace. Microsoft has used its monopoly powers to leverage licensing terms

on its customers that are punitive towards users.

The Windows product activation system is a violation of users right to privacy as a hash of users computer systems is sent to Microsoft. This is the most abusive company to its competitors I have ever seen and because of its monopoly powers it has been able to engage in such conduct unchecked. The only effective way to combat this problem is to split the Microsoft corporation into an operating system company, an office and other software company, and an internet company.

MTC-00011289

From: ray winn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen I believe strongly that the Microsoft Settlement be rendered as quickly as possible.

Further litigation will create continued deterioration for all concerned, and most importantly the American public. Let's please get our total focus on rebuilding the economic foundation of our country instead of to weaken it further. A possible first step might be a self introspection by the DOJ. Thank You, Ray Winn

MTC-00011290

From: margaret jarrard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:48am
Subject: microsoft settlement

In the interest of the public, people like me, settle the Microsoft issue as soon as possible. I would like to remind you that big business and big government is not the people, although they claim to have our interests at heart. There is just too much politics in the Microsoft settlement issue and I see no reason to prolong the settlement. Our economy as well as everyday folks will benefit most from the settlement of the current agreement. Thanks for your diligence. Margaret Jarrard

MTC-00011291

From: Antworks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposal settlement for Microsoft's transgressions would seem to be self-serving and, if implemented, would bring about an unanticipated result. The better settlement would be for Microsoft to provide the designated funding to the schools and to permit the schools to make the determination as to which equipment best meets their needs.

Richard McMains
4180 S. Ranch Road
Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

MTC-00011292

From: Doug.Wilkinson@Sun.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:51am
Subject: microsoft settlement

The proposed settlement to the Microsoft antitrust case is plainly no more than a slap on the wrist and a reprimand to "play nice". Mr Gates wont be losing any sleep over this

judgement as it is nothing more than an inconvenience in his journey to dominate the software market to an extent where there is no option on which operating system to use for a computer system.

I feel this whole case will have been a complete waste of the taxpayers money.

MTC-00011293

From: Johnson, William
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 10:52am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Fails to include other Microsoft software products such as Micorsoft Office which regularly uses interfaces (APIs) that are not provided to other developers of Office products. While Micorsoft Office is not technically a middleware program, the judgement should be expanded to include all Micorsoft software products that have inteface access that either is not available to non-Microsoft software deveopers or is made available after the last beta of a new version of the Windows operating system

Fails to provide any remedy (fines that double in size on every reoccurrence of the same problem and increase in size by 50% for each month after 90 days that Micorsoft fails to provide a solution to any single problem/short term incarceration for the group leader or any higher Microsoft officer who either verbally, or via e-mail or written note tells a product group to do something that violates any reported compliant that the TC determines is meritorious or any TC proposal for a cure on a date that is one week or later than the TC reported its finding to the Micorsoft Compliance officer) should such a failure be found again in the future!

Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected. It also fails to provide any remedy like fines paid by Microsoft that are given to the company that documents a case against Microsoft. Microsoft should also have to reimburse the company for all documented expenses related to collecting, preparing and reporting the compliant that are reasonable and not deemed excessive by a court appointed arbitrator.

Fails to force Bill Gates and the current CEO of Microsoft who both are billionaires due to their creation of a monopoly to pay any fines. At a minimum, they should personally be forced to reimburse the federal government and all state goveremnts for their costs in this case. In addition, punitive damages should be paid to a fund that could be used to provide seed money to software developers who wish to enter the market. This would be a significant step in addressing the barriers that Micorsoft created in the past.

Fails to remedy the injury done to the JavaTM technology community. Microsoft should be forced to provide a mechanism like the Control Panel Add/Remove program that makes it easy for customers to add the latest Java Virtual Machine and Browser plug in to any and all Windows Operating Systems. In addition Microsoft should be forced to provide to the Java development community any additional interfaces that are provided to any middleware or other Microsoft product in such a fashion that the Java Community

deems is necessary to make Java use of the interface efficient. As an example, DCOM works best with C++ or C# or .Net. It has data types that are not easily mapped into Java Objects/types. Thus we as a software development company were forced to purchase a product from JIntegra that wrapped our C++ data structures with Java code. Even after purchasing JIntegra, the effort was so difficult that we paid the JIntegra company to provide one of their software experts to assist in the work. Even with the help of the expert, we had to rewrite our C++ code to use simpler data strctures than the original code. Even now, we are limited to the set of types that the JIntegra expert successfully wrapped. This extra barrier to Java developers who want to use DCOM to communicate to a C++ DLL that runs on a remote server needs to be eliminated. Microsoft should be fined every month after 90 days that it fails to provide a solution or at least provide a team of twelve developers who at Microsoft expense are dedicated to working with the Java development community to eliminate this barrier and any additional barriers reported to the Java development community by members of the community.

Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market. Why is their no fine paid by Microsoft to the court and then paid by the court to Netscape? Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system.

Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism.

MTC-00011294

From: lmfhn@worldpath.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Clearly great care effort and energy is the hallmark of the last year of this issue. As it should be: a new technology in a new time. However it s time to move on: let Microsoft return full focus to its entrepreneurial roots—for shared collaborative benefit—for schools to our economy.

MTC-00011295

From: john@rrci.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs Please do not allow the criminals running Microsoft to continue to illegally bilk consumers and use their ill gotten gains to quash any legitimate competition. The settlement should cost Microsoft at least \$10 billion real dollars and prevent them from quashing competition in the future. JDR

MTC-00011296

From: kjacob@thurston.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I send this note in the hope that the government s case against Microsoft will be closed with not further action. I do not

believe action should have been taken in the first place and certainly no further action should be taken at this time.

MTC-00011297

From: renslin@enslinpc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not agree with the government interfering with the innovations of a company just because their competitors believe it is unfair. The lawsuit against microsoft because some people think they are charging too much for software is ridiculous. If you compare the cost of products and/or services from other software/service vendors you will see that Microsoft is right inline with market standards. The complaint of competitors that Microsoft ties or bundles software with and operating system is simply laughable. Since when does a consumer complain when they get a free add-on for a product they purchased. It is like saying that a car manufacturer cannot install Goodyear tires on a car because maybe a consumer will not want them. If you dont want to use the feature then dont. AOL I believe is more guilty of poor software than any other vendor I know of.

MTC-00011298

From: pholland4@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Microsoft settlement is more than fair for all involved. Please let s settle this in move on.

Peter Holland

MTC-00011299

From: carolk01@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The previous administration made a grave error of listening to Microsoft s competitors who wished to KNOCK MICROSOFT S SOX OFF . Unfortunately not only did the government s decision to HIT MICROSOFT WITH A STIFF PENALTY bring down Microsoft s stock but it crumbled the entire Tech Market. NM is a Democrat state and WE THE PEOPLE had to voice in NM s decision to side with the Government in slamming Microsoft. A few top Democrats in this state made that decision ! MY REQUEST FOR YOU IS TO MAKE A QUICK SETTLEMENT WITH MICROSOFT ONE IN WHICH MICROSOFT CAN AGREE. My news media tells me that Microsoft has offered \$1 000 000.00 for computers to be placed in POOR schools. Again Microsoft s competitors are screaming unfair . If their products were as good as Microsoft s they wouldnt have to CRUSH private enterprise. After all America was built on THE ENTREPRENEUR making good in private industry.

MTC-00011300

From: Paolo@TheCornerStore.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As the head of a company that started out selling IBM s OS/2 I know for a FACT that

the emergence of Windows in the OS wars was due to the terrible performance of IBM s marketing department and its treatment of ISVs. IBM s attempt to dominate the PC marketplace was far far more egregious than what MSFT did and once again I know I was there in the thick of that war . We are nhot even talking about Apple which tried to own the whole space of desktop computing by owning both the hardware and the software. I shake my head when I see who is doing the complaining against Microsoft! With regard to its supposed Monopoli today we as resellers are only too acutely ware of how tenuous the grip of any technology is on a marketplace especially Microsoft s whose reputation is constantly being threatened by reports of bugs and other attacks. I firmly believe that a new technology could easily displace a Microsoft technology either in the OS or in the applications arena. Microsoft s success is due to its pleasing of the customer and the channel. While I did not believe that Microsoft should have ever even been charged by the Department of Justice (for which I once worked) I most strongly urge anyone there to take into consideration my experience and views and approve the settlement that has been proposed.

Paolo

MTC-00011301

From: www.Fur12521@AOL.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I Think its a Fair Deal for all. I am for the settlement the way it is. 1-14-02

MTC-00011302

From: hdibble@accs.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement is fair and equitable as it stands.

MTC-00011303

From: jczalog@silverdollarcity.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support Microsofts resolution to the Anti-Trust case of providing technology to schools. Taking Microsoft back to court and paying judgements to customers (which will amount to a pittance) benefits only lawyers.

MTC-00011304

From: peter.heinen@homestreetbank.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is more than fair. To my knowledge no one has shown any harm to the consumer.

This whole law suit is a sham. The public is not even behind it. Who is? SUN Oracle!

MTC-00011305

From: stephz@microsoft.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For the sake of technology and the US economy please make the remaining states

come to an agreement with Microsoft. I feel that these lawyers are going for the money just like they did when they targeted big tobacco. Microsoft has done a lof of good for technology and we all know that Microsoft has done a lot of good for the economy. With the events of Sept. 11th I would think that the government would be more interested in getting the economy up and running again instead of this relentless pursuit of Microsoft and its billions!

MTC-00011306

From: civie@gte.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The politically motivated attack on Microsoft has probably done more to damage the technology sector of the stock market than any other event. Competetors of Microsoft are angry because they actually have to produce a superior product in order to stay in business. There are very few end users of Microsoft that are anxious to see the company damaged. Who is the government trying to protect? End users or competitors? Dr. Charles Ivie Director R&D Dermaprobe International

MTC-00011307

From: jonathan@corbett.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please urge the dissenting states to give up the assault on Microsoft. They should be thankful for the agreement to the settlement by a company whose violations are unclear at best.

MTC-00011308

From: don—pat1@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

msft stick to your guns & keep your powder dry.

MTC-00011309

From: rbruner@ctesc.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

GOVERNMENT SHOULD STOP HARRASING MICROSOFT AND OTHER BUSINESS. THE PEOPLES NEEDS ARE NOT BEING ATTENDED TO WHEN LEGISLATER ARE HOLDING HEARINGS THAT ARE A WASTE OF TIME. MICROSOFT AS WELL AS OTHER BUSINESS S OFFER A PRODUCT PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE TO BUY IT.

MTC-00011310

From: cemkenney@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already-Stop the insanity! The settlement while not perfect should be agreed upon. I am the Public and I will decide what is in my good .

MTC-00011311

From: jreed@cabq.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The law suit against Microsoft has done enough damage. For the good of all Americans please do not pursue this issue any further.

MTC-00011313

From: snjewins@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Abolish the Sherman anti-trust Act as it is unconstitutional and un-American. Allow the consumer to deal with the likes of Microsoft.

MTC-00011314

From: luann.albertson@verizon.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settling this ongoing series of lawsuits is in the best interest of the country and the free enterprise system. The economy will benefit from concluding this suit.

MTC-00011315

From: erkkifin@mfi.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case is a simple matter of some less than successful businessmen and marketers going crying to Congress who being equally inept started an anti-trust suit. Being big and successful is NOT a monopoly. The consumer decides what to buy and if the product is so much better than any competition then the product succeeds. Nobody not Microsoft nobody FORCED anybody to do anything. The OEM s had an option other software and PC makers failed to compete so they went crying for help and the Congress in it s infinite stupidity obliged them. The settlement is not fair because it never should have come to this in the first place. But given the fact that the age of litigation being what it is this is the best a true free spirit and entrepreneur can hope for. Without Bill Gates and the Microsoft enterprise the computer world and millions of jobs would NOT be around today or at least be years behind where we are now. Why do so many people and the Congress resent free success??

MTC-00011316

From: jrb312@bellsouth.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While one one hand I am pleased that this anti-trust case is finally over with but on the other hand I am very disappointed in the actions of the government of this country. In my opinion the software playing field has always been more than fair. Microsoft is more or less being punished for putting out a consistently and above average product. Isn t this supposed to be meaning of capitalism or what is known as the American way? You manufacture a good product and it sells. You manufacture a product of poor or below average quality and you will not be able to compete with the companies who manufacture the higher quality software. The

founders of this once great country of ours would without a doubt wonder what has happened to the once fair and impartial government of which they had formed and had dreamed of not so long ago. A company which has done so much for the American economy and made it the home of high tech jogs gets a kick in the teeth by it s own government. The future of the Microsoft company will most likely end up like the automobile industry and move it s headquarters overseas and I couldn t say that I would blame them if they did. This whole anti-trust case has been an embarrassment to this country and what it used to stand for.

MTC-00011317

From: erkkifin@mfi.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The action against Microsoft is a crime against free enterprise. No settlement can erase the shame and sham that the US Govt has forced on the American consumer. You took a few nearly failing and crybaby businesses and presumed to use them as an excuse to speak for the consumer when in fact very few consumers feel that a successful free enterprise albeit quite large business is a monopoly. You have over stepped and abused your power and should be ashamed.

MTC-00011318

From: rob-smith@dell.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has always strived to make my job as a programmer easier throughout my career. This company doesn t deserve the treatment it is getting from the government and its jealous competitors. The settlement that has been reached should be accepted and Microsoft should be left alone to continue innovating and making computers users lives easier. Where would we be today without Microsoft s contributions? Most likely still in the computer dark ages.

MTC-00011319

From: Mantex1@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If the Federal Government and the Microsoft Corp. have reached an agreement then why should the States keep this dreary affair going on and on? Let s get back to business and bring this economy back to a strong growth rate.

MTC-00011320

From: michaelouise2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Time to back off Microsoft and let them go about the business of making money for there stock holders.

MTC-00011321

From: far-iman@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Nearly three years ago I wrote you a letter protesting the unwarranted intrusion of the DOJ into the competitive free enterprise system. The DOJ has cost the American tax payors tens of millions in its frivolous legal action. It is now time to terminate litigation and allow the settlement to go forward without further delay. Thank you.

MTC-00011322

From: tresstaylor@earthlink.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir: The action against Microsoft has gone on long enough. It is taking tax payers money and the company is being persecuted. They have bent over backwards to be fair to all parties. Now stop the greediness of those opposed to settlement. Since this suit has taken place the economy has suffered before 911.

Sincerely
Theresa A. Taylor

MTC-00011323

From: alan@interjot.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I guess this settlement is the best that we can hope for. There is no way that Justice Department should have initiated this silly innovation- and economy-squashing suit in the first place. Can we now at least please drop the matter and get on with letting the real engines of progress take their rightful positions of leadership in the world? Please?

MTC-00011324

From: dolanwpdctown@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement. I watched the government waste millions & I mean millions of \$ s on the IBM case. It s a hellofa price to pay for all round excellence

MTC-00011325

From: jabathomp@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is a sad day when you build a better mouse trap and the mice get the government to sue you for it. If they can t handle the competition let them stay out of the business Jack Thompson

MTC-00011326

From: gjdtz76@ndak.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I guess I just do not understand the statement by the Judge saying the Microsoft requested settlement would cause a competitive edge for them. Apple has had the competitive edge with education and printing for years. Their equipment is VERY expensive. The attorneys for the states that are holding out on the Microsoft settlement are the states with companys that have their business or satellites in those state. It appears the attorneys for these states have successfully convinced the judge to throw

out the proposed settlement. A totally political move. I would very much like to have someone explain to me why AOL/Time Warner is NOT a MONOPOLY. And prove to me that this lawsuit is NOT political.

Please respond. Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts. Gerald Dentz

MTC-00011327

From: gotip@earthlink.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case and stop harrasing the best US corporation. These delays will cost us all money and allow the rest of the world to catch up. We should be supporting Microsoft as the whole world relies on their great software.

MTC-00011328

From: joycie@cwnet.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:44am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please leave Microsoft alone. They have provided many jobs and technology to our nation also helping schools and many various programs. Please end these lawsuits. The lawyers are the ones getting rich over this while people are being put out of work because of a silly lawsuit. I bet giving a choice 99 percent of the people would use Microsoft over any other program. I say it is a choice you can use it or not. If you don't like Microsoft don't use any of their products but don't sue over it. It is just as simple as that. And other companies are just greedy as they didn't have the brains like Bill Gates to figure out all of this. I say give the guy credit for all he has done and invented. It amazes my mind what he has done to make it easy to communicate with the world and to type letters without carbon paper and to erase easy.

And to figure out computer programs. Guess this gives you a clue to my age. We have come a long ways thanks to Bill Gates. By keeping on with the lawsuits you make it hard for them to innovate so please get put an end to the lawsuits.

Thanks Joyce Siemens

MTC-00011329

From: Hartmann, George J.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 10:55am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
As a individual I want the Government to settle with Microsoft. I therefore support the Department of Justice on its proposed antitrust settlement.

Regards,
George Hartmann
CC:Hartmann George J.

MTC-00011330

From: Waterline2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:55am
Subject: my opinion on the Microsoft Case

1. Actually, I am tired of it and fairly fed up with the procedure that has taken a well-run free trade business and practically brought it to its knees. As if it isn't hard

enough to make a go of a business, the government steps in to slap their hand because of the belly aching of companies that are jealous of its success.

2. Perhaps Microsoft did create a situation where the competition didn't have as good a chance at succeeding, but they also did a lot to bring the common housewife like me into the 21st century. I am glad there is a Microsoft—and a Bill Gates. He built the empire and we came. And we love him for it.

3. I don't know Bill Gates and he has never heard of me and probably the sun will set on me before this thing ends....at this rate. Please, let him go back to doing his business so we can ALL prosper. Good management—taking care of his employees and giving us the tools we need to get our jobs done...isn't that the American way?

4. Some businesses, like Enron, didn't need the Government's help to do a miserable job and at getting into a mess. Get the Government out of Bill's business and let him finish the work he started. Slap his hands just a little if you have to do something, but do it and get it over with so we can all go forward.

5. All of this business with the unfair advantage happened so many years ago—in a different business climate. The Government should be shaking the man's hand instead of slapping it for doing the American dream....and for helping us live the American dream.

If you wish to reach me for any other comments, my name is

Alice Van de Water
1694 San Leandro Lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
(805) 969-4438

I am 59 years old and have never personally purchased any Microsoft stock. I own 800 shares, which my husband bought in about 1994 or 1995—he passed away about 3 and a half years ago. I also own Microsoft in my Keogh—and I believe another financial advisor purchased some for another account I have. Obviously, I want the stock to do well, but my comments are from my heart, not from my pocketbook.

MTC-00011331

From: Harry Crowell
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 10:58am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please stop this vicious lawsuit. Too many people have suffered because of the expensive method of persecution of an enterprising young American. My business, as have most of our country and others across the entire world, have benefitted greatly because of the great work and improvements to the ability to access valuable information and store records.

Please stop this foolish destruction of the principles that made America the place it is.

MTC-00011332

From: Cynthia Grossen
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 11:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement excerpt from Complaint

“5. To protect its valuable Windows monopoly against such potential competitive

threats, and to extend its operating system monopoly into other software markets, Microsoft has engaged in a series of anticompetitive activities. Microsoft's conduct includes agreements tying other Microsoft software products to Microsoft's Windows operating system; exclusionary agreements precluding companies from distributing, promoting, buying, or using products of Microsoft's software competitors or potential competitors; and exclusionary agreements restricting the right of companies to provide services or resources to Microsoft's software competitors or potential competitors.”

My biggest problem with “the way things are now” is that as it stands, I can not buy a computer from a large computer seller, like DELL, MICRON, BestBuy, Circuit City, etc without being forced to purchase the bundled M\$ software; even if I have no interest in every utilizing said software.

Also, it is my understanding that most of these vendors are prohibited from offering “dual-boot” systems as well, as part of their OEM license agreement with M\$. Which would be a ‘second-best’ solution to the above problem, from my standpoint at least. I do realize that their are legitimate market concerns as well, such as poor customer demand. But I find it difficult to believe that the fact that M\$ owns the OS market (read monopoly here) doesn't play into my concerns in a significant way. I feel that this area is one of crucial importance to future remedies. The browser arguments are extremely compelling and should definitely play into the settlement. But the “Browser War” is effectively over. M\$ won.

MTC-00011333

From: Mary Euyang Shen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:02am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please get on with it so that we can give the economy a small nudge upward.

Mary Shen

MTC-00011334

From: Rob Alelyunas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greetings;

I am a professional software developer very familiar with the Microsoft products and strategy, as well as many other software platforms such as Java, UNIX, and Internet development. For many of us in the software industry, the proposed settlement with Microsoft looms as a terrible mistake. Many of the reasons why have been very well illuminated by far better communicators than myself, and these reasons tend to emphasize the failure of the settlement to address the actual abuses and illegal practices that were proven in the case. They emphasize that the remedy has no enforcement, and is unlikely to stop the proven illegal practices.

But my concern is the effect that the proposed settlement has had upon the software community, and the business community at large. That is a chilling effect. New software projects have been canceled, software innovation has been put on hold in

many cases, and new initiatives have trouble getting funding. That is because the settlement is a signal that the marketplace won't reward the small, energetic innovators such as Netscape or Real Media. Companies like this, although they have virtually invented and innovated new capabilities that enrich our lives, will not be set free to compete on an equal footing. The behemoth of Microsoft will be allowed to wait for these smaller companies to innovate, then it will bundle carbon copies of their products into its operating system, and if necessary use other illegal monopoly practices such as punitive exclusive relationships with hardware manufacturers.

I ask you honestly, would anyone want to invest in a small innovative software company in this climate? No matter what quality, energy, excellence is in the product, there cannot be profitability as long as Microsoft is free to illegally compete. Investors and the business community are very aware of the Microsoft settlement. And it has already had a chilling effect on innovation and investment. It has had a chilling effect on the American economy. It is a loud, clear signal that discourages investment in small business just as it discourages new ventures.

This is not a good time to be discouraging small business which is the growth engine of our economy. Now of all times we need to carefully consider the effects of our decisions on the economy. There are reasons for the anti-trust laws, and there are reasons to enforce them. American business operating under effective anti-trust enforcement has created the greatest growth and innovation engine the world has ever known. The key is competition, and anti-trust laws are the protectors of competition. Let's have the courage to enforce the law.

Rob Alelyunas

MTC-00011335

From: Nicholas Dronen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:03am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I make my living as a computer programmer and work with Microsoft products every day. I believe the proposed Microsoft settlement will not prevent the company from continuing to act as it has in the past. The U.S. government has had agreements with Microsoft in the past, and they have had little effect. I assert that allowing this or that hardware vendor to put such-and-such icon on the desktop of a Microsoft operating system does little or nothing to prevent the company from using its monopoly of the desktop operating system market to insinuate itself in a rather forthright way into other markets.

Moreover, I fail to see how allowing interested parties to examine the source code of some Microsoft software will solve this problem. At most such a regime will give some well-funded start-up companies and successful competitors of Microsoft (that is, those firms which can afford to send a software engineer to Redmond to spend time reading code) a useful tidbit of information here and there. Since the company's

positions in its current markets (and some future ones as well) have not diminished (rather, they have continued to increase market share), it is clear that the company now has even less of an incentive to follow antitrust law than it did before.

Whether Microsoft should merely be punished for its role in the fate of Netscape Communications, Inc., is debatable. I personally think it is irrelevant and that the important matter is to restore equity in competition in the computer industry now and into the future. The proposed settlement does not ensure this; therefore, it should be rejected.

Kind Regards,
Nicholas Dronen
ndronen@frii.com
Computer Programmer
Boulder, Colorado

MTC-00011336

From: Ella Tidwell
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:07am
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I support President Bush in his desire to settle this lawsuit and persecution of Microsoft. Ella Tidwell
4298 US Highway 641 South
Hazel, KY 42049

MTC-00011337

From: Jim Fuqua
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:10am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ:

The time has come for this case to be settled and now. The axe grinders have delayed this long enough.

Thank you for your consideration. Regards,
Jim Fuqua, A concerned citizen of the US of A

MTC-00011338

From: Benjamin W. Ritcey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:12am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,

The Remedy section of the proposed Microsoft settlement lets Microsoft off far too lightly; what seems like fair and open access to Microsoft's APIs, Documentation and Communications Protocols has, in fact, a critical loophole—I can put this no better than Robert Cringly (<http://www.pbs.org/cringely/pulpit/pulpit20011206.html>): "...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. "The business climate has changed a bit from the time the Tunney Act was introduced—one does not have to pursue a profit in order to be a competitor. By excluding not-for-profit organization, the Settlement protects Microsoft from their greatest threat, and allows them to continue to stifle innovation.

I urge you to, at the very least, remove these critical loopholes.

Regards,
Benjamin Ritcey

MTC-00011339

From: Carol.McDonald@sun.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:16am
Subject: microsoft Microsoft is a monopoly.

They are not changing their behaviour as witnessed by their new Passport and Hailstorm technologies.

They should be split into OS and Other Software
Carol McDonald

MTC-00011340

From: sam travis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:25am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I for one, cannot believe that the department of JUSTICE is even considering letting Microsoft off the hook so easily! This is the company that has lied and misled the courts at every turn! I am shocked! Shocked and appalled that a corporation can engage in such blatantly monopolistic behavior, and walk away with a comparative slap on the wrist. Having been involved with the personal computer industry essentially since its' inception, I have been witness to the most egregious violations, and would like justice to truly be done.

MTC-00011341

From: Tor-Oyvind Gundersen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:21am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Since I'm a Norwegian citizen, I assume I don't have a right to comment this case. But I just can't sit still looking at injustice... As a professional IT developer, I would just like

to say one thing: The way Microsoft has chosen, is not a way the world should be going— please get the world back on the right track.

Thanks for your time.
Regards,
Tor-Oyvind Gundersen
tor@gundersen.nu

MTC-00011342

From: Harold McClarnon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:20am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
HAROLD McCLARNON
310 Westwood Drive Grants Pass,
OR 97527
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

Thank you for your efforts to settle the Microsoft antitrust case. This case was not brought because it had merit, but as a result of jealousy on the part of Microsoft's competitors. I am in support of the case being resolved as soon as possible.

As a result of this suit, Microsoft has agreed to a variety of changes in its business practices. These changes will put to rest any complaints by Microsoft's competitors that they are engaging in anticompetitive behavior. Microsoft has agreed to share the fruits of its labor with its competitors. They will disclose interfaces that are internal to Windows' operating system products. They have agreed to make it easier for computer companies to add non-Microsoft software to their computers, too. These steps will give Microsoft's competitors a giant boost in their ability to compete with Microsoft. The settlement agreement provides more than adequate protection against violation of the antitrust laws.

Nothing more should be required of Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Harold McClarnon

MTC-00011343

From: Judy Sawyer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:22am
Subject: I am against litigation

In my state of N. C. we have approximately 1,000,000, motivated, great citizens who work for Microsoft.. N. C. has been blessed with a fine company , like Microsoft, locating in this state. I own Microsoft software, as does my husband and my daughter and we are very pleased with the quality and the price. We buy Microsoft, we have a choice. and we would not change at present. In my husbands profession he has used sun, oracle and many other software vendors and finds them all inferior to Microsoft. These companies should go to work and developed wonderful software that would be competitive and I would try their product again.. I am sure there will be software beyond Microsoft and some young inventor is probably working on it right now, not expecting to find it in a court of law. I do not feel I have been overcharged for my soft ware, and I have not

been in anyway persuaded to buy Microsoft, it was my freedom of choice.

Judy Sawyer
5913 Cedar Landing Rd.
Wilmington, N. C. 28409
Sawyer@wilmington.net

MTC-00011344

From: Jim Rapp
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ,

I applaud the DOJ for coming to settlement with The Microsoft Corporation over antitrust concerns. Although the company has perhaps been aggressive in certain business practices, it seems to have curtailed these practices, and wants to move on in life, being a good U.S. corporate citizen. Unfortunately, it appears a cottage industry of media pundits, journalists, attorneys, special interest groups, politicians, and competitors, who seem to have built careers around keeping the company left dangling do not want resolution. Microsoft has created many jobs, has helped the U.S. to become a leader in information technology, and I use their products which enable me to make a living.

I hope that the DOJ continues to work hard to get all parties to settle the Microsoft antitrust case, and allows a great U.S. company to operate without the shackles of all of the above named special interests.

Thank you.

Jim R.

Northern Virginia

(Note, these thoughts also apply to my Austin, Texas based mom, and Huntsville, Alabama based cousin)

MTC-00011345

From: Steven Rubenstein
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:26am
Subject: Input for Tunney Act

I hereby do my "civic" (public interest) duty of putting on record my opinion, for Tunney Act consideration, of the proposed settlement in DOJ and "some states" vs. M\$.

Fact: Federal Judge Stanley Sporkin was disconcerted with M\$'s business behavior as he understood it.

Fact: M\$ and DOJ persuaded an Appellate panel, including Judge Harry Edwards, to overrule Judge Sporkin.

Fact: Failure to resolve some of Judge Sporkin's concerns eventually resulted in a full scale, costly lawsuit.

Fact: Federal Judge T.P. Jackson became so disconcerted with M\$'s business and courtroom behavior as to jeopardize his career.

Fact: Antitrust experts expected the DC Circuit, including Judge Edwards, to overturn the bulk of Judge Jackson's rulings.

Fact: The DC Circuit UPHELD the bulk of Judge Jackson's rulings.

Fact: The Supreme Court would not grant certiorari to M\$.

Fact: The DOJ, now headed by John Ashcroft, not Attorney General when the case began, reached a proposed settlement with M\$.

Fact: Before proposed settlement, DOJ publicly eliminated its strongest weapon: possible breaking up M\$.

Fact: News reports stated the "states" were surprised when the DOJ settled and were told after the fact.

Fact: 9 of the states and DC would not accept the settlement, contenting it would not remedy M\$'s violations as upheld by the DC Circuit.

Fact: News reports indicate antitrust experts largely feel the proposed settlement is easy on M\$ and has loopholes.

Fact: Throughout the trial and settlement talks, M\$ did not abate its campaign to make all things software its own—even dictating hardware. At least 9 Federal judges—2 at the District level, 7 at the Circuit level—and 9 Federal justices have expressed agreement, overtly or implicitly, that M\$ has repeatedly conducted illegal business practices under, at least, the Sherman Act. I, as a consumer, a scholar, a sometime software developer (without affiliation with any software company), and a concerned citizen, do not see how the proposed settlement remedies any of the findings against M\$. Further, at least from the time of the DC Circuit panel's overruling of Judge Sporkin, M\$'s subsequent actions have shown it not to be trustworthy. Further, the fact that the DOJ, under a new Attorney General, would, without notifying the states accept such a settlement, under such conditions,

REEKS OF THE VERY KIND OF BACK ROOM DEALINGS THE TUNNEY ACT WAS DESIGNED TO AVERT.

The only possible good in allowing a such a software monopolist to exist, is that it is U.S. based, and, in the fashion of the Federal government's facilitating the RCA-led oligopoly of World War I, a U.S. based monopoly in theory can benefit national security, including by facilitating standardization. Even this argument fails with M\$: its leviathan tactics have removed, in fact necessitated against, any need for it to assure software quality. The FBI recently got on M\$'s case, for building software that is so easily penetrated and subverted. The damage M\$ has done in quashing software innovation invites software developers worldwide to expose and capitalize on the inferiorities of its products. M\$ Internet Information Server and M\$ Outlook have become such wide standards as to become two of the, if not THE two, major carriers of viruses and worms in the world. Consequently, even the argument of allowing M\$ to continue in its current fashion for national security falls short.

We know that being a monopoly is not illegal, but violating the Sherman, Clayton, or Robinson Act is. M\$ continues to claim it has the right to innovate, when in fact almost every one of its products either has been bought—starting with DOS itself—or copied from a less-moned innovator—Apple, Lotus, Netscape, RealMedia, Sun Microsystems, to name a few—which M\$ can do, because it has the operating system running on 95% of the world's desktops. Lack of innovation cannot be good for the consumer. Anyone who praises M\$'s products is doing so without knowledge of what might exist if potential products weren't crushed before

inception or fruition, because venture capitalists balk at investing in something they know will be thwarted and because software developers have less chance and possible reward from following through on ideas.

Neither can the consumer benefit monetarily by there being only one major software company. The free market concept implies competition determines price. M\$, being a monopoly, can charge almost as it pleases. Recently corporate customers have become disturbed with M\$'s coercive upgrade licensing policy. Though no competition remains to which prices can be compared, it is known that M\$ has more surplus than any other corporation in the world—even more than any pharmaceutical or energy company. M\$ could lower prices on its operating systems and productivity software significantly and remain “the world's richest company.” It lowers prices on products in markets it is trying to win — browser and media player are two examples—to the point of negative revenue on those products, because its vast surplus enables it to cross-subsidize.

Surely, inasmuch as the Tunney Act is constitutional, this is a case to invoke it. The DC Circuit and the Supreme Courts await the outcome.

Humbly submitted,
Steven Rubenstein
Murfreesboro, TN
615 896-7862

MTC-00011346

From: Matt Del Vecchio
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:28am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am with the 9 states that have dissented from the others—I believe that while the proposed settlement is “better than nothing”, it is not Good Enough. without getting into it, it appears the DOJ has backed down. that it was all roar and less bite. this may have something to do w/ the new administration. a desire to protect big business, perhaps.

Sincerely,
matt
Matt Del Vecchio
Web Architect
Microgistix
(612) 486-1125
<http://www.chumbo.com> <<http://www.chumbo.com/>>
<http://www.microgistix.com> <<http://www.microgistix.com/>>

MTC-00011347

From: Gwen and DeVerne
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:29am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have chosen to use Apple MacIntosh computer and operating system. I have freedom of choice. I chose to use Apple and I chose to use Eudora e-mail software and I chose to use Office for the Mac. If Microsoft was not supporting Apple by marketing Office for the Mac software Apple would cease to exist.

Let the market place choose, not government.
DeVerne Jacobsen 01-15-2002 —

MTC-00011348

From: susanf@phys-
ha4nwka.ebay.sun.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:31am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
The proposed Microsoft settlement is unsatisfactory in many ways. In a nutshell, the “penalty does not fit the crime”. The proposed settlement does not solve for the injury done to the Java technology community or the Netscape browser market. It does not solve for the monopolistic behavior by Microsoft. Please use your power to stop the monopoly madness. Our consumer rights and security is at risk.

Sincerely,
Susan Sanguinetti
(20 year employee—high tech)

MTC-00011349

From: Alfredo Rodriguez
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,
I write you to ask your continued support of the recent Microsoft settlement. This settlement is the product of three years of deliberation and compromise, and contains terms that are beneficial to the entire IT sector. By supporting this agreement, we help to get our technology industry back to business and our economy flowing once again. By not supporting this agreement, we jeopardize our position in this highly competitive worldwide IT market.

Not only has Microsoft agreed to make changes in licensing and marketing terms, but has agreed to make changes in design and development, such as changing XP and 2000 Professional to make it more accommodating for software developers other than Microsoft. This is a bold step, and we need to support this type of agreement as it brings us together as an industry and as a nation.

Please help support this settlement by helping to stop any further actions against this agreement. let us help get our industry back to business.

Sincerely,
Alfredo Rodriguez

MTC-00011350

From: Jeffrey A. Mattero
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:33am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:
Please place me on the side of encouraging the parties to settle this ridiculous lawsuit! It should never have been filed in the first place, and I can't believe Microsoft is even willing to settle! The company was enormously successful simply because they had the best product on the market. Unfortunately, in this country, success breeds contempt, especially from the government. It honestly disgusts me. Anyway, if Microsoft is willing to settle, please quit wasting taxpayer dollars, and end this once and for all!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Thank you.

Jeffrey A. Mattero
JMattero@erols.com

MTC-00011351

From: JudiTk@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:
Our government needs to protect our economy, and not to be derailed by attempts to benefit certain companies' interest. It is unfortunate that the remaining states that rejected the agreement have strong support from Microsoft's competitors, in which they reside. Those state representatives have no choice but to support their prime resident companies, and their counter proposal is only to benefit those resident companies. The focus of this case should be based on whether Microsoft has indeed hurt the consumers and our economy. If Microsoft has not taken a lead in consolidating computer operating systems, and offer compatible/integrated software, we would have induced significant inefficiencies throughout the country, and the world. I highly encourage our government to move forward and bring this case to a closure that would benefit the crippled economy. There are other major elements that we all need to focus on, instead of continuing to deplete our valuable resources on this case. Microsoft is now fully aware of its boundaries, in terms of “anti-competitive behaviors,” and shall continue to offer more useful software tools that ultimately benefit us all.

Sincerely yours,
Takaaki Hayashi
839 Bramerton
Andover, KS 67002

MTC-00011352

From: David Baur
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:39am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: The District Court of the United States of America

Attn: Honorable Judge J. Fredrick Motz
Dear Judge Motz,

I disagree with you, as to YOUR rejection of the proposed settlement that Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson court had arrived at. I do not believe that the Corporation known as Microsoft should have been sued for anti-trust violations's in the very first place. I know of not one single industry that has done as much as Microsoft, to advance the education of millions of peoples within these United States of America, and peoples throughout the entire world.

There are however many Corporations within these United States that clearly demonstrate, and factually have, a monopolistic position as to market share....Southwest Bell, Frito Lay division of Pepsico Inc. just to mention a few. Perhaps if you truly want to pursue anti-trust as a Judge, visit your local grocery store and simply go to the chip section and see just how many competitors you have. I think you will find Frito vs Frito vs Frito...

Also instead of pursuing a Corporation like Microsoft. which in my opinion should not have been done in the first place; why not

pursue a better criminal justice system. Talk about a disgrace to the American Citizenry.... our legal system is absolutely an abortion of legal justice, and I am not speaking of anti-trust suits, I am speaking of the common everyday criminal act...of the murders, or the rape, of robbery, of the freedom that many criminals receive in the courts within these United States of America!

Let your talents be used in solving the problem of the citizen. Let's get back to basics Judge.

Someone in Gov't needs to provide a better way to communicate with the Gov't., why not spend some time with Bill Gates and develop a system in which the citizenry can vote, communicate, state their opinions, make observations, suggest solutions to our (suppose to be) government.

Let not one man have one voice, but rather have one man supported by many voices.

Thank You,
David H. Baur Sr.
David H. Baur
11770 Ferguson
Dallas, Texas 75228
972 279 4927 front desk number
972 279 4939 back office number

MTC-00011353

From: A P Story
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:36am
Subject: microsoft settlement

Will probably end up a big mess like Bell/AT&T. What's happened to the old spirit of building a business and not getting shot down? I don't own much Microsoft but am greatly disappointed.

MTC-00011355

From: Joseph Rizzo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:51am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the settlement is outrageous and very pro-microsoft. Microsoft should be hit with huge fines and required to provide only hardware to school systems. The schools should have the choice of either an Apple system or an Intel system running Linux.

MTC-00011356

From: Mark Keckeis
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 11:53am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Judge Kollar-Kotally;

I, like many people in the technology industry, am frustrated and concerned by the DOJ's Proposed Final Judgment in it's anti-trust case against Microsoft. Having found Microsoft to be a monopoly and to have acted in a predatory manner, the DOJ looks like it's about to let Microsoft off with little more than a slap on the wrist. Why should Microsoft be above the law? The DOJ should do three things in order to ensure that the law is administered fairly:

1. Terminate Microsoft's illegal monopoly,
2. Deny to Microsoft the fruits of its past violations, and
3. Prevent any future anticompetitive activity.

I cant see that the PFJ does any of these things. Judge Kollar-Kotally, I am not an attorney but I have been in the technology

industry since 1982 working for a number of vendors including Data General (now a part of EMC), Apple Computer for 8 years, and four start-up software companies since 1996 including four years at Commerce One. I have personally observed Microsoft behavior both as a competitor and as a partner. They are everything that the original suit and verdict found them to be. It's a part of their culture. It's the way their best and brightest get ahead. The PFJ will exacerbate the behavior that made them a monopoly and created the suit in the first place.

Microsoft is not an innovator. They play the late entry game that their size affords them. By the way, they are not alone in this practice. All of the largest companies, Oracle, SAP and others do the same thing. It is possible for them because they have recognized brand, distribution and money. Three things that very few small, innovative companies have in quantities that allow them to compete head to head with these giants. The difference is that Microsoft is a MONOPOLY. By "bolting", It literally costs them nothing to take the ideas and concepts of much smaller companies and leverage two of these three powerful resources.

The innovation that has made the American economy the most prosperous on the planet is a fragile thing. It starts in small ways with concepts and ideas can become powerful when properly deployed in the marketplace. The PFJ will throttle and undermine the risk-takers who have been the source of so many of the ideas that will drive our industry—and the American economy—forward.

Please, don't allow the PFJ to stand. Strike it down. The American economy will survive and thrive through a settlement that enforces the law.

Thanks for your consideration and best regards,

Mark Keckeis
Director of Sales
nthOrbit
3031 Tisch Way, Suite 12PW
San Jose, CA 95128
Cell: 925-963-0161
Office: 408-423-4690

MTC-00011357

From: Bunneyn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:58am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

Microsoft is one of this countries leading growth companies. They have contributed to our economy and citizens, and we personally have benefited from their products at a fair price.

This action is about money. How to extract money from a successful company by politicians, competitors, and the government. You cannot fool the public. Perhaps 50% of all U.S. citizens have some interest in Microsoft, either through stock or their products, and this action effects them. We have more important problems to expend our resources on, THE ECONOMY.

Rod Bunney
bunneyn@aol.com

MTC-00011358

From: Bill Richart

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:58am
Subject: microsoft settlement case

Please see the attached letter with respect to the Microsoft settlement case. Sincerely,
William Richart
2445 Sheridan Street
Williamsport Penns Ivania 17701
January 10, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

The settlement of the Microsoft antitrust case has taken too long to occur. Litigation should have never taken place from the start and the nine states that have continued lawsuits need to be suppressed.

Microsoft is an extremely important asset to the tech sector in our economy. Our government should be praising the company for all it has done instead of criticizing it. As a firm believer in free enterprise, I think it is ridiculous that Microsoft must disclose its technological secrets. Have we no more respect for intellectual property? Now Microsoft must work with a handicap like no other in the history of the IT sector.

This nation needs to get past this legal mess. The settlement presents a viable solution, so I support it. It is time to get back to the business of innovation, and leave litigation behind.

Sincerely,
William Richart
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00011359

From: SOster629@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:02pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I agree with Microsoft. Get on with this settlement instead of trying to get us stockholders to finance the several dissenting state governments' budgets. The courts have accomplished everything legal and allowable. Let the states balance their own budgets and let Microsoft go back to doing what they do best—making the software the public wants. Thanks. Sam Ostertag, Mesa, AZ.

MTC-00011360

From: David Zickefoose
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 11:23am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Zickefoose
10314 Washington Drive
Omaha, NE 68127
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry.

It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the

courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David C. Zickefoose

MTC-00011361

From: Randy Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:03pm
Subject: RE MS Settlement

As a long time software developer (who has never worked for Microsoft or owned their stock), I urge you to strike a blow for consumers, and drop your suit. MS has served as a strong competitor against potential monopolists such as Digital Research, IBM, Novell, Sun, Oracle, & Netscape, which is why current and former executives of those companies continue to lobby you against Microsoft. Instead you should stand fast for Microsoft's right to compete and for consumers rights to benefit from that competition.

Digital Research sold CP/M and derivatives for \$200 and up to consumers when IBM PC was released, it was MS's release of MS/DOS that made the PC affordable and usable. Adjusted for inflation, the price of Microsoft's operating system has barely increased (from \$40—\$100 over 20 years), yet instead of a cryptic command line interface with minimal utilities written by less than a dozen engineers, consumers now get the fruits of thousands of engineers efforts containing built in pc & printer networking, graphical user interfaces, high speed file systems, word processor (wordpad), internet browser, calculator, e-mail, paint program, terminal program, games, etc. If you force Microsoft to unbundle any of these products, you will cost consumers millions of dollars by forcing them to pay separately for each of the products they need. No software company has the right to compete by forcing consumers to pay for what another company is willing to provide as part of a bundle. As a software developer I know that "middleware" is a dangerous place to compete since it's likely to be incorporated into a future OS release, but I also know that I benefit when MS bundling continuously makes their OS more feature rich and accessible, as an internet developer I know our market would have been retarded had not Microsoft made internet access simple, easy and free by bundling explorer.

I also know that Netscape had dozens of competitors, which they brutally destroyed

by giving away their browser (they of course say they only gave away a "beta" but I was there, the beta was a very solid application that made it unnecessary to buy a browser from anyone else). Unlike Microsoft, they didn't plan to keep their browser free, just until they made it the dominant middleware for accessing the internet, then like a good monopolist they planned to stick to the consumer. Now the DOJ wants to stick to us and force everyone to pay \$49 for a "browser tax"?

Look through history. Lotus dominated the spreadsheet market, forcing everyone to pay \$500 for the "standard", a standard so entrenched that no company could compete successfully against them. Microsoft and others created better spreadsheets, but to no avail. It wasn't until Microsoft was smart enough to create Office, giving corporations much more value (word-processing and other products) for the same \$500, that the monopoly was broken. Consumers saved hundreds of millions of dollars due to Microsoft's efforts.

It's the same in networking, where Novell built a standard around their decrepit Netware Server operating systems. It wasn't until Microsoft created Windows NT, and built a cheaper, better network operating system that consumers and corporations had a choice. It's the same in databases, where MS keeps Oracle honest, and in workstations & serves, where MS keeps Sun honest. Please strike a blow for competition and drop your suit, please don't force me and other consumers to pay more for our software.

thanks,
Clarke Hill

MTC-00011362

From: Patricia Book
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 11:38am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Patricia Book
6234 E. Presidio
Mesa, AZ 85215
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and

judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Patricia Book

MTC-00011363

From: RLFiala@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:19pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

AS A CONCERNED CITIZEN I BELIEVE ALL OF THE ANTITRUST LITIGATION AGAINST MICROSOFT SHOULD COME TO AN END AND ALLOW THE COMPANY TO DEVOTE IT'S TIME AND MONEY AND ENERGIES TO THE CREATION OF BETTER SOFTWARE AND PRODUCTS TO HELP CONSUMERS AS IT HAS SO SUPERBLY DONE IN THE PAST. ONE CONCERNED CITIZEN

MTC-00011364

From: Kentyn Reynolds
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Re: Microsoft Settlement,

In my position as CTO of a large Internet based company I have the opportunity to observe the long-term effects of Microsoft's outrageous behavior. I have seen how Microsoft's undermining of JAVA and other standards has pushed the industry backwards by at least 10 years, and cost every company that I know thousands of unnecessary dollars in multiple development efforts and exception level programming. With the latest US court ruling we now have given Microsoft access to infiltrate our government with millions of dollars of crippling technology. Microsoft should feel the maximum punishment of the law for their monopolistic practices. Please reexamine the recent rulings on this case and create justice for the small technology companies that legally support our government.

Kentyn Reynolds
CTO
ClickAction

MTC-00011365

From: Steve Foerster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the whole matter was nothing more than the U.S. government trying to strongarm the only major industry that didn't kowtow to them, and thus the matter should be dropped immediately with a full apology to Microsoft's employees and shareholders (I am neither) and the American people.

Steve Foerster

MTC-00011366

From: Pete Holsberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:29pm
Subject: Revised Proposed Final Judgement
Dear Reader,
I have read the Revised Proposed Final Judgment against Microsoft and completely

concur. I do have a question: why does this judgment expire at all? Why is Microsoft not held to this forever and ever? Should Microsoft return to its old ways after this judgment expires, can further action be taken against them?

Thank you,
Pete Holsberg
Columbus, NJ 08022

MTC-00011367

From: richardlaughlin@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Folks,

How can you continue to punish our most successful American companies that give the consumer products that are worth to me as a user at least 50 times more than the small cost of their software? I'm a Microsoft WebTV user. For only \$14.95 per month I get access to cyberspace. I use my WebTV everyday and love it. I don't know of anybody, except Microsoft's failed competitors, that complains about Microsoft's products being too expensive.

Why doesn't the Federal government do something about my higher and higher electric bills at home instead of trying to fix Microsoft when it is not even broken. How about a U.S. energy policy that brings down the cost of living everyday. Microsoft has not changed my WebTV monthly cost of \$14.95 for over 3 years but my electric costs go up every year.

Thank you for listening.
Richard Stouts

MTC-00011368

From: Lee Behel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the Justice Department to accept the proposed settlement. Microsoft has suffered unjustly long enough and the entire technology sector needs this to end now.

Lee Behel

MTC-00011369

From: Randy Loflin
To: microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov
Date: 1/15/02 12:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement
Renata Hesse
Trial Attorney
Suite 1200
Antitrust Division
Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20530
January 15, 2002

Dear Ms. Hesse,

I am writing to object to the settlement of the Microsoft case which has been reached. Nothing in this settlement provides punishment of Microsoft, or relief to the consumers of computer products and programs in the United States. As a 30+ year computer user, programmer and buyer, I find the settlement, which allows Microsoft to continue its monopoly, to be of no help to me. In fact, as witnessed by recent FBI comments regarding the Microsoft XP operating system, maintaining the Microsoft monopoly can only be hazardous to the

people of the United States. Any decision in this, the penalty, phase of the trial should include provisions to make Microsoft operating systems compete equally with other operating systems, i.e., it should be an add on to any computer system, not bundled with the system. Additionally, Microsoft program document types must be available to the developers of other programs, so that document interchange will be facilitated. And thirdly, Microsoft internet schemata must interface without problems with all internet users.

Finally, I would like to say that we must remember that this is the penalty phase of the trial. Microsoft has already been found guilty of antitrust violations. Now is the time to support the citizens of the United States, the computer users, buyers, sellers and programmers in this, the new millennium.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

James R. Loflin
jloflin@elp.rr.com
6020 Camino Alegre
El Paso, Tx 79912-2606
(915) 581-1476 (home)
(915) 771-6391 (work)
(915) 373-1476 (cell)
(915) 774-4905 (fax)

MTC-00011370

From: Bob Gregg
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 12:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I want the DOJ to settle this case. The offer is fair and in the public interest. DOJ resources should be applied to more critical agenda items.

MTC-00011371

From: Jim McDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Penalty Suggestion

Here's what I'd like:

1. Force Microsoft to adopt a file format for all Office applications and PUBLISH their spec. Note that I am not asking for the publication of the source code of Office, simply the description of the file formats used. This way, people can use other Office suites (PerfectOffice, SmartSuite, StarOffice) without wondering if the files created will load properly in Word, Excel, Powerpoint, etc... Just this would open up some competition in the Office Suite market.

2. Force Microsoft to publish every single API in Windows. Again, I am not asking for the publication of the windows source code, but simply to the Application Programming Interface. This would have two benefits: It would make sure that every service, every facility is clearly exposed for use while at the same time, removing the cloud of suspicion that Microsoft has some secret APIs that make their applications work better than others.

3. Muzzle the Microsoft FUD division. This is by far the most irritating aspect of Microsoft as a business entity. They generate FUD and make believe that other competing products are not good while it's far from the case. Feel free to select your example, there are tons of them out there.

4. Forbid them to use the words "innovate" and "innovation" unless they can specifically show that they are the first-movers for the particular product they are advertising. Again, there are tons of examples out there where Microsoft has been only an "adapter" as opposed to an "innovator".

5. Offer a striped-down version of Windows. Just the bare bones and a text-based browser (like Lynx) for initial download of the browser of choice. Nothing else built-in, nothing else cobbled together. A base install should not be more than 20 Megabytes and should scream on Pentium-class machines.

6. Word the requirements that hefty fines will be leveraged for non-compliance. Hopefully, this way, we'll have more competition and a better computing environment. As well, if Microsoft is still dominant after this, it'll be because they have earned it the good old-fashioned way and we'll have little if anything to complain about.

MTC-00011372

From: Samuel Sotillo-Hermoso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:49pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Since the beginning, the decision to prosecute MS was not a good idea at all; however, the settlement is a worst one. In fact, it is a populist approach to tell MS to give to "disadvantaged public schools more than \$1 billion in funding, software, services and training, and around 1 million Windows licenses for renovated PCs." This "gift" is the imposition of a de facto monopoly under government sponsorship.

I hope you can settle this subject in a way that helps all customers, not only a fraction of them, without damaging the whole industry. Remember that the IT sector is not only MS.

Samuel Sotillo
Statesville, NC

MTC-00011373

From: mail@grsummers.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:51pm
Subject: Opinion regarding the microsoft settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I'm an American citizen overseas and I would like to express my concern about the recent Microsoft decision. I was greatly disturbed about the appearance of "injustice" that it embodies. I don't think that a convicted monopolist with a long track record of the destruction of highly innovative companies can be left virtually untouched. In many ways, this company now exerts more influence than the US government in economic terms both nationally and internationally and, rulings that allow the continued misbehavior of this confirmed monopolist, in my view, represent a real threat to our national economic welfare and our democracy. In fact, I just don't understand how this ruling has emerged from the most respected justice body in the world—although I didn't agree with the previous manner of Judge Jackson's ruling (content aside), the present situation appears

to be wholly unjust to an industry that is the very essence of innovation in America and who's strength has been built upon the emergence of thousands small innovative companies over the last 20 to 30 years. I agree wholeheartedly with the economist J Shumpeter who believed that the health of a nation's economy and its economic future is based upon innovation and that the purpose of profit is to pay for "creative destruction"—the cost of innovation. Take a look at the US computer industry—is this not an example of Shumpeter's views in the purest sense? Is this not the primary reason for the success of the US economy during the last 20-years?

Microsoft now totally dominates the desktop market in both operating systems and applications software, it dominates the hardware industry through this means, it holds a very strong position in the server market. It has done this by the elimination of competition at every possible opportunity—by leveraging dominance of the operating system. This is a fact that can be illustrated in repeated instances; IBM, Lotus, Netscape and Apple being just four examples, shall I go on? The next step for them, and the objective of their .net strategy, is to take over the internet, and place gateways for every user of the internet. This can easily be done by dominating the desktop market with Windows XP, with its raw sockets, and introducing a new MS standard MS TCP/IP protocol for the control of data transmission in the guise of greater security. Who can fight this when Microsoft controls the software on more than 90 percent of the desktop machines? And it can be done in an invisible way, so that the average consumer and the US government will not even notice—until it is too late, just like Lotus, Apple, Netscape, and others. The additional strategy that they are seeking, is to use the patent system and their legal muscle to control the Open Source Software development movement, which now is the only real threat (following the DOJ decision) that remains. If Microsoft is successful in these two ways, then the US government will definitely be relegated to a second class status and will become a virtual, economic fiefdom of the Microsoft Corporation. Can you imagine that the most important aspect of the information age in the United States, the internet, it's software, hardware and income will be totally dominated by one company? Incidentally, the internet, don't forget, was created by the Department of Defense and the UNIX world, federal government and University research agencies, not commercial entities.

The American economic system has long been based upon the idea of creating a level playing field for small businesses. This was a major concern at the time of the American revolution; many experts would say that the American revolution was a battle of the small business economic model (America) against the control of a government Mercantile system (giant global British trading companies). The American economic system maintained a relatively healthy balance until the emergence of the "robber barons" of the late 1800's, which led to the current anti-trust laws that we have today, implemented under Woodrow Wilson. I am not a socialist

nor am I a pure capitalist, but I do believe that one role of the government and that of the Justice Department in economics is to ensure a level playing field for all participants. Otherwise the entire economic system becomes skewed, such that we create a few extremely wealthy individuals and then everyone else. This is not a healthy development for any democracy; especially the greatest and most successful democracy in history.

How about some analogies to the original antitrust legislation of the previous turn of the century (1900)—the "robber barons" were largely the rail tycoons. They controlled the railroad networks and the machines that ran them, allowing them to control interstate trade. In the present turn of the century, Microsoft represents the same threat in the information age, where they control the machines (read desktop computers) and now want to control the "tracks" (read internet). Is there any real difference? Not hardly. The stakes are much greater—because it is then just one small step to the control of information. And we all know how democracy is undermined by placing the control of information in the hands of one entity, be it a person, political party of company. Look at Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia—in the future will we say Microsoft's America? If there is to be control of information (and I'm not arguing that there should), then it should at least be of the people and for the people—in other words, a (frequently) elected body—not a private individual, one person or one company. That's the way democracies work.

As I said, I am not a socialist nor am I a laissez-faire capitalist; this email is being written on Microsoft software on my laptop; I use Linux software on my desktop at home, and we utilize a mixture of Microsoft and Linux in our office network. I see advantages and disadvantages in all systems. But the development of competition has not come from other commercial entities to Microsoft, because these would soon perish. The competition has come from a grass-roots volunteer effort, of thousands of developers from around the world, working through the internet on common problems and common projects without financial compensation—rather, for the pure purpose of making computer software that is based upon a common and open standard, has freely available source code, is free to use and is technically the best that it can be. I have no doubt that Microsoft wishes to destroy this movement, as their recent public statements about open source software licensing will testify.

What are other countries doing? The EU recognizes the danger that Microsoft poses, and has their own "anti-trust" action underway. In Asia, enormous support is being given to open source software. China is basing their national software industry on government-supported Linux systems. Japan is a significant supporter and Korea has just announced the installation of Linux for some 120,000 government employees. India is supporting both commercial and open source software. I have read that our own government is moving to open source solutions in many areas - let's not let our

legal system destroy this valuable economic development.

I don't know what the correct solution is; I am not so naive as to think that this is all a one-sided situation; and I personally don't like to see any successful company penalized for that success. Nor do I like to see private, open source development destroyed by a financial power of a monopolist. The solution, perhaps, is not the present one, nor is it the previous decision of Judge Jackson. It lies elsewhere, and should be subjected to further study by technical experts. It's worth taking more time in this one—this threatens our democracy, our way of life and our economic welfare.

Just like railroads, telecommunications, power, etc, there comes a time when the government must step in and protect the economic welfare of its citizens and the economic future of the nation. Allowing such a monopolist as Microsoft to continue to operate virtually unfettered is the wrong thing to do for the computer industry and for our democracy.

G Robin Summers
mail@grsummers.com

MTC-00011374

From: Jeff Holcomb
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice,

I strongly oppose the proposed settlement with Microsoft. The "remedy" has no teeth and will do nothing to stop Microsoft from continuing to abuse its monopoly power. Only through strong enforcement and a curb on their monopoly can other companies compete with Microsoft. They have shown time and again that they will be ruthless and will continue to abuse their monopoly.

Jeff Holcomb
mrfy@mac.com
Tucson, AZ

MTC-00011375

From: Michael Motyka
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:25pm
Subject: One important facet of the settlement.

I am concerned with one aspect of Microsoft's behavior that has a serious negative effect on competition and angers me when I go computer shopping : MS using it's large market share to suppress competition by pressuring computer vendors into restrictive license agreements. Please look into MS licensing requirements that prevent vendors from offering non-MSWIN machines or dual-boot machines (machines that can boot either MSWIN or an alternative OS by a user's choice at startup). This problem is common for desktops but is even more striking in the laptop market. I would like to purchase a laptop computer but every laptop on the market contains MSWIN. It is a fact that Linux can run on laptops. Why can't I buy a laptop w/o Windows and skip the license fee for something I don't want? Laptop vendors may say they don't want to sell a product w/o MSWIN but there have been rumors of MS pressure on vendors to not sell a competing OS.

Personally, I intend to cease purchasing MS products from this time forward and move everyone in my family to an open source OS like Linux. I want YOU to be sure that I can get hardware without paying a Microsoft TAX!

Mike

MTC-00011376

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:56pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
From: Andyman568@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2002 7:48 PM
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Cc: stopmicrosoft@yahoo.com
Subject: (no subject)

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
I am a student at Boston College, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does nothing to stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly through the use of its operating system. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws in the past. It would be a terrible standard to set by letting Microsoft get away with its retaliation tactics, bolting schemes, and attacks on Java. All these tactics lower competition in a supposedly free market and also limit software standards. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

To sum up, I'm deeply concerned the recent settlement does not regulate Microsoft enough in the future allowing Microsoft to continue its monopolistic tactics. In addition, Microsoft is not even being punished for laws it clearly broke in the past. This sets a terrible standard. I would request that you do your best to overturn this settlement.

Sincerely,

Andrew Goldberg

Brighton, Massachusetts

CC:sara.Hinchey@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw

MTC-00011377

From: Mid Continent Trucking
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:00pm
Subject: U.S. v Microsoft
CC: tomist@ag.state.ia.us@inetgw
January 14, 2002
Hon. Colleen Kollar-Kotelly
U.S. District Court, District of Columbia c/o
Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, Suite 1200 Washington, DC
20530

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotelly:

I am writing to you to express my support for Iowa Attorney General Tom Miller and his efforts to obtain a fair settlement for the citizens of Iowa with respect to the pending U.S. v. Microsoft case. It is my belief that the proposed settlement is a means for the U.S. Department of Justice to make a long-standing case go away. If I were a stockholder of Microsoft, which I am not, I would definitely be in favor of this settlement. However, as a consumer, I am deeply disturbed by the failure to eliminate their

monopoly, and the eventual impact Microsoft will have on the availability of competition technologies, due to their domination of the market.

As I sit here composing this letter, my thoughts run the gamete of issues surrounding the Department of Justice proposed settlement, but not being an attorney, I feel that any argument I may make would be deficient in delivery and impact. It is for this reason that I rely on the office of the Iowa Attorney General to protect my interests. It is my hope that after reviewing all sides of this issue, that you arrive at a settlement that adequately addresses the liability of Microsoft with respect to their violation of antitrust laws.

Sincerely

Dennis K. Henderson

40404 190th St.

Mapleton, IA 51034

MTC-00011378

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
From: Salim Furth [s2000chops@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2002 2:32 PM
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

To be quite brief, I urge you to reject the U.S. Justice Department's agreement with the Microsoft Corporation. As a computer-dependent student and webmaster, I experience firsthand the MS software and OS monopoly firsthand, and find it distinctly unAmerican. The inability of other operating systems and software providers to be competitive in the American market effectively outsources innovation overseas, which will catch up with the U.S. software industry in a few years if Microsoft is not stopped.

Thank you for entertaining input from citizens, as one such citizen I greatly appreciate this service.

Sincerely,

Salim Furth

Milton, Massachusetts

s2000chops@yahoo.com

CC:sara.Hinchey@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw

MTC-00011379

From: WENDELL SPIRES
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 12:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
WENDELL SPIRES
3601 N 300 E
KOKOMO, IN 46901
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

WENDELL SPIRES

MTC-00011380

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:01pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Judge; I would like to bring to your attention what I and many other members of the technological community think is totally unacceptable in the proposed deal between Microsoft and the justice department.

1. The deal completely fails to terminate the Microsoft monopoly, allowing it to expand into new markets. The fact that Microsoft has abused its monopoly and is likely to do so again does not seem to be important enough for the justice department to stop Microsoft from monopolizing the market now, and preventing it from doing so in the future.

2. According to the deal, Microsoft is allowed to decide which product should be a "part of the OS". This gives a way for Microsoft to bind any of its non-operating system related products to Windows. It could be Internet Explorer as an example of the web browser, or a stock trading software, or any other service or software, preventing users from installing and using products other than provided by Microsoft.

3. Although the deal requires Microsoft to allow the PC manufacturers to hide Microsoft middleware programs and allow them to install icons or links to competing middleware programs, PC manufacturers are not allowed to remove Microsoft's programs completely. As a result, those Microsoft programs may prompt the user to reconfigure the system and replace all the competitor's middleware with Microsoft middleware, if they'd like. Many users would say "yes", which will remove all the competing middleware.

4. Another important issue that is not addressed in the deal is the way Microsoft deals with existing and potential competitors. For example, the deal does not restrict retaliation against potential competitors.

5. Microsoft refuses to support Java developers and alters industry standards, like Java, to defeat competition. Still, the deal does not require Microsoft to continue to distribute Java technologies.

6. The deal requires Microsoft to share information on how its middleware and

server software work together with Windows. However, Microsoft does not have to disclose this information for middleware it does not distribute separate from windows, or for middleware it has not trademarked. It means, if the software is included into the Windows package, they don't have to share any information about how it works with Windows. This is an easy way to hide API's from competitors and make sure the competitor does not have information needed to make its software to work with Windows reliably. Also, if Microsoft feels the information disclosure would harm the company's security, they don't have to share the information.

7. There is no effective enforcement mechanism for restrictions in the deal. The group of three men, half of which will be controlled by Microsoft, will not be allowed to inform the public of their work, and cannot impose fines. In addition, the work of the committee cannot be admitted into court in any enforcement proceeding.

8. The deal imposes only some fines on Microsoft, but allows it to retain almost all of the profit gained from its unlawful activities. This settlement gives a way to any monopolist to brake the anti-trust law, just like Microsoft did, without any fear of losing their profits.

Thank you for your attention,
Oleg Efimov
Saratoga, California
CC:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC-00011381

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:03pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
From: Jonathan Hill (hilljn@bc.edu)
Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2002 1:21 PM
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
I am a student at Boston College, and I am upset about the recent settlement between the Justice Department and Microsoft (PFJ).

First, the PFJ does not stop Microsoft from operating as a monopoly. It does not force Microsoft to substansively alter its structure and marketing plans. The inability of the settlement to force Microsoft to change its business sctrure makes the settlement pointless. Second, the settlement does not punish Microsoft for clearly violating anti-trust laws in the past. It would set a terrible standard if Microsoft was allowed to get away with its monopolistic and abusive tactics. Finally, the PFJ does not provide an effective enforcement mechanism for the weak restrictions it does implement.

All in all, the settlement between Microsoft and the Justice Department is weak and does not fix the basic problems the suit was brought to correct. I urge you to do everything in your power to overturn the settlement.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Hill
Brighton, Massachusetts
CC:sara.Hinchey@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw

MTC-00011382

From: venkatesalu rajagopal

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:08pm
Subject: Dear Sir/Madam,

Dear Sir/Madam,
The success and flourishing of Microsoft is essential for the economic wellbeing of the country and of individual citizens. Damaging such national 'treasure' is only to benefit some companies that can not compete in the open market place and it will do incalculable damage to ordinary citizens. Please do not do it.

Sincerely,
Rajagopal

MTC-00011383

From: McKim, Patrick
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would encourage the Department of Justice to settle the Microsoft Case. Any further action will only be passed along to consumers as additional cost, and that doesn't make sense.

Settle it!!
Patrick McKim

MTC-00011384

From: rbrhodes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:12pm
Subject: Letter
6420 SE Winged Foot Drive Stuart, Florida
34997

January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
I am writing to address the outcome of the Microsoft antitrust suit. I am in agreement with the current settlement in so far as to say that absolutely no further action should be taken against Microsoft. I believe that this antitrust suit was unfounded from the start. The issue at stake here as I see it is not whether or not Microsoft is guilty of violating antitrust laws, but is whether or not the state and federal governments are guilty of infringing on free enterprise. I am in agreement with this settlement for one reason only, and that is to see this suit come to an end immediately. I do not believe that Microsoft should have had to make the concessions that they have. Under the terms of the settlement Microsoft is required to license its Windows products out to 20 of the largest computer makers on identical terms, including cost. Additionally, they will be required to document and divulge key interfaces of the Windows operating system to their competitors for the purposes of software development. Should any of these internal interfaces fall under intellectual property rights, Microsoft will be required to grant fair license for the use of said intellectual properties. I believe that these restrictions are unfair to Microsoft, but once again I must begrudgingly support the terms of the settlement for the sake of further economic development and bringing this suit to a final resolution. I have been a long time user of Microsoft products, and have owned several computers over the years. To have

come this far only to be struck down by the jealousy of other less successful competitors is outrageous to me. To sum up my views on this issue I ask you this, where would the IT industry be today without the existence of Microsoft? Certainly not where it is now.

Sincerely,
Ronald Rhodes

MTC-00011385

From: NKatt54590@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 15, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:
I am writing to express my support for the settlement reached between the Justice Department and Microsoft. It is my understanding that you are currently entertaining public comment on the proposed settlement.

I know that the Microsoft matter was very difficult to resolve and I am sure that the proposed settlement will not make everyone happy. For that matter, I don't think there is any possible resolution to this matter that would make everyone happy, no matter how hard you tried. This settlement allows additional competition, which didn't exist before the suit, but allows Microsoft to remain a viable entity. I think that is best for all involved and for our country. The settlement is fair. Microsoft will share information with its competitors regarding the internal working of Windows, allowing them to more easily place their own programs on the operating system. I support the settlement. Thank you for allowing me to comment on this matter.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Norma Katt
911 Canterbury Drive
Columbia, MO 65203

MTC-00011386

From: Larry Lundquist
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft judgement

This settlement that the last few states are asking for, is not right. The things they are asking for is not in line with what they have accused Microsoft of. The first settlement that the Justice Department has agreed to, is all the farther this case should go.

Larry Lundquist
1630 152nd SE
Bellevue, Washington

MTC-00011387

From: Miller, Dale (HOU)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement:

Regarding the following:
The Tunney Act review period, during which the Department of Justice seeks public comment on its proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft, closes Monday, January 28. The settlement is not guaranteed until after the review ends and the District Court determines whether the settlement is

indeed in the public interest. I am in full support of the settlement terms, and in complete agreement with the Microsoft stance/approach to the settlement terms.

Regards,
Dale Miller
Compaq Computer Corporation
Platform Validation, ABG
Phone: 281-514-1695
Pager: 713-990-8265
Office: 7170
Email: dale.miller@compaq.com

MTC-00011388

From: Michael Schwartz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was completely aghast when I recently went to several major retail stores (Office Depot, Best Buy, Staples among others) looking to purchase a laptop computer. Every laptop came bundled with Windows XP.

Having read about security issues in Windows XP, I asked each store if I could get a laptop bundled with a different operating system. In particular, I asked about Linux and even Windows 2000 as alternate possibilities to Windows XP. In each case, I was told that it was not possible.

I suspect that I could have simply purchased Linux separately in the hope that there would be drivers available for the hardware in the laptop, but this is often not the case and I likely would have had to spend a great deal more money to replace existing hardware which would be compatible to Linux.

The bottom line here is that I had no choice at all. On December 21, 2001, I purchased a laptop bundled with Windows XP and installed Windows 2000 on it to have a dual boot system. Some of the hardware is new enough that there are no Windows 2000 drivers for it. In fact, there are several devices that Windows 2000 does not recognize at all and I am unable to identify them.

This is a serious problem for consumers. Microsoft's monopoly must be stopped. Not only do I have no choice regarding other vendors' operating systems, I also have no choice regarding which Microsoft operating system I want to use. I was forced to use Windows XP.

Thank you for your consideration.
Michael Schwartz

MTC-00011389

From: Carmen A. Cancel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:14pm
Subject: case

I can't believe the justice department is still harassing Microsoft. Where were you when Enron was stealing from it's stock holders. I can't believe how selective you can be about your cases. Does it have to do with the amount of money the company passes or doesn't pass out to the officials? I don't get a penny for this letter, but I say these things because I do admire a man that has worked so hard to make his dream come true. Get OFF Microsoft's back already!!!

Thank you, Carmen A. Cancel

MTC-00011390

From: RobertPH1@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's close this case against Microsoft and get on with business. As for the fine being in the form computers with microsoft o/s in them, make it cash so the schools can choose which computer and systems they prefer and are most compatible within their respective schools. Also, I think the states should drop their suits. My concern is that the states have gotten a taste from the tobacco settlements and are now looking for other ways to collect money. The fact is the lawyer friends of the politicians are probably the ones who are making out the most!!! Bob Hanson

MTC-00011391

From: Edwina Houliemi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We think that it would be in the best interest of the American economy to settle the Microsoft case and get on with life.

Edwina and Patrick Houliemi

MTC-00011392

From: Robert Fox
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:18pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

In my opinion, it is high time to settle this case and move on together to help revive the economy and win the war against terrorism. We don't need any more of this type of antagonism towards business. We need to continue to move forward and concentrate on things that really matter.

Robert

MTC-00011393

From: Gregory Slayton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:13pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
From: Kentyn Reynolds
[mailto:kentynr@clickaction.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2002 9:12 AM
To: 'Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Re: Microsoft Settlement,

In my position as CTO of a large Internet based company I have the opportunity to observe the long-term effects of Microsoft's outrageous behavior. I have seen how Microsoft's undermining of JAVA and other standards has pushed the industry backwards by at least 10 years, and cost every company that I know thousands of unnecessary dollars in multiple development efforts and exception level programming. With the latest US court ruling we now have given Microsoft access to infiltrate our government with millions of dollars of crippling technology. Microsoft should feel the maximum punishment of the law for their monopolistic practices. Please reexamine the recent rulings on this case and create justice for the small technology companies that legally support our government.

Kentyn Reynolds
CTO
ClickAction
CC:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw

MTC-00011394

From: Tom Rizzo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:17pm
Subject: Anti-trust settlement

I would like to applaud the justice department for finally settling with Microsoft. The allegations against the company, in my opinion, were unfounded. Let's move on and get back to business in the US.

Tom Rizzo

MTC-00011395

From: gjmoran1@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough taxpayer money has been wasted on this unnecessary case. Let Microsoft and this country's computer-users get back to the business of participating in the good use of technology.

MTC-00011396

From: Berkland, David
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:15pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
hi

it is time to stop the endlews lawsuits all levels of government should cease trying to grab a tobacco type bonanza from microsoft, in fact the y would be better served crafting some legislation that would prevent these types of lawyer employment suits from being initiated in my opinion the various state DA's use this case and others to further their careers at the expense of the public and the victim corporations the DA's should be jailed for misuse of public funds

MTC-00011397

From: ajcor@erols.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is not the USA that is taking action against Microsoft. It is the idiot Liberals and Clinton Administration that initiated this moronic action.

MTC-00011398

From: REWOLFX@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:17pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

PLEASE ADD MY VOICE TO THE MAJORITY WHO FEEL THAT THE SETTLEMENT IN THIS FOUR YEAR CASE WAS FAIRLY ADJUDICATED AND THE LAST THING OUR ECONOMY NEEDS RIGHT NOW IS MORE LITIGATION. PLEASE LET THIS MATTER END NOW.
SINCERELY
FERN LOWER

MTC-00011399

From: jerry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:20pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

microsoft should offer a version of windows that is JUST the operating system with NOTHING bundled into it, such as internet explorer, netmeeting, messenger, outlook express, etc.

thank you for taking the time to read my thought on the matter

MTC-00011400

From: Danuel Colter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To say that over the last few years I could puke at the sheer idiocy of the whole bit is putting it mildly. What Microsoft as a Corporation that employs so very many people around the world, has endured is truly mind boggling garbage. To say this was a trumped up bunch of nonsense is putting it mildly, such money grubbing little idiots I had never expected from my American neighbours, but as they say, the lawyers are nothing short of charlatans.

Danuel Colter
Box 154
Emerson, Manitoba, Canada
R0A 0L0
dcolter@mb.sympatico.ca

MTC-00011401

From: Liz McCollum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In view of all the facts—leave Microsoft alone—why bring down yet another company that's doing just fine without interference from the U.S. Government.

Liz McCollum
S&S Services Group, Inc.
6222 Tower Lane Suite A-6
Sarasota FL 34240
941-377-4600 Phone 941-377-4610 Fax
snsliz@snservices.com
www.snservices.com

MTC-00011402

From: Connie Williams
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

I'm really getting tired of the courts dragging this settlement issue out. Microsoft has made a fair and viable solution to the courts. It is apparent that the only voices of protest come from competitors. Consumers do not and have never had a voice in this whole debate. Microsoft has always played fair, they have had the brains and know how to market their product. If other companies had half the smarts that Microsoft does then they wouldn't be yelling foul. If competitors feel that this settlement will give even more visibility to the consumers then maybe they should step up to the plate and donate an equal amount. Fair is fair, let's settle this and let Microsoft get back to making the world a much easier place to communicate!

Thank you!

MTC-00011403

From: Harry Hertless
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
15128 W Amelia Drive
Goodyear, Arizona 85338
January 15, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Please finalize the antitrust case settlement as soon as possible and quell opposition from the nine states still attempting to continue litigation. This case has dragged on far to long. It has been conceived from political interests instead of sound economic ones and therefore has been flawed from the beginning. I am a proponent of free enterprise and believe that government should stay out of big business.

Especially in this case where a company has been pushing the drive for innovation and growth in the technology sector. The last thing our ailing economy needs is lengthy litigation that hinders Microsoft's development. The terms of the settlement are more than fair, as Microsoft has agreed to disclose internal interfaces and protocols to competitors. They have also agreed to grant computer makers broad new rights to configure Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs. It is in the best interest of the American Public for the settlement to occur. I urge your office to help make this a reality. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Harry Hertless

MTC-00011404

From: Patel, Thakor G., MD
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm
Subject: Opinion

It is important to settle and move on. This is dragging on for a long time. In this time of national crisis and other priorities, goernment should not spend too much time on this issue. None of the complainers come close to what Microsoft has done for novice computer users. The proof of this is in some nursing homes where without the Microsoft Windows and packaging none of these folks will be able to use computers.

T.G.Patel, MD

MTC-00011405

From: JKIRKPATRICK@PILLSBURY.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This continuance of litigation is wasting my tax dollars. It is time to settle this litigation and move on with boosting the economy!

James Kirkpatrick
Box 1715
Denison, TX 75021
903-415-2576

MTC-00011406

From: cavena@PGFM.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please just get this Microsoft case over with. I think the settlement is fair and should resolve this whole controversy. Enough tax dollars have been spent already. Leave Microsoft alone, go after the cable companies or somebody else.

Thank you for your time.
Craig Avena
1235 Wood Ridge Dr

Atlanta GA 30339

MTC-00011408

From: efdpvb@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets get on with progress!!time and technology advances in the competitive arena will solve any inequities in the market place!!!

MTC-00011409

From: lmalm@bsu.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the settlement as currently drafted. I think it provides a fair and workable solution and I encourage you to use the opportunity to bring this case to a close. Thank you.

MTC-00011410

From: hv3@smartconnect.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Its time to settle this case. I think the only winners in this case are the lawyers. If Microsoft stops innovating the market will run them over. Why dont you focus the DOJ efforts on find and prosecuting more terrorist? instead of pounding away on Microsoft.

MTC-00011411

From: alcastiglia@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe this is a fair settlement. If AOL/Time warner is not a monopoly I don t know what is. They are the ones pressing the Microsoft case. The longer this case goes on the more it is hurting the economy of the world. Yes world not just the U.S.

MTC-00011412

From: info@transNdigital.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough. Take the best offer MS puts on the table and run with it.

MTC-00011413

From: clyde.nieh@gene.ge.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the arrangement proposed to satisfy the penalty on Microsoft for monopoly practice is reasonable and fair. It should be accepted.

MTC-00011414

From: ron1613@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The prior e-mail may have had an incorrect State field. The correct state is: New York.

MTC-00011415

From: coffeebreakPjG@juno.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good Day Your Honor: I do not believe that anymore prolong litigaions should take place in fact POOR MICROSOFT has reached a lengthy anti trust settlement and others have AGREED then so be it DROP IT compititors should not prolong it any longer it has cost TAX PAYERS and MICROSOFT a huge amount. I believe Microsoft took the hit because they are good! It s time we start looking into the PUC.co. CABLE co. LIGHT co. GAS co. that is where ANTI TRUST IS!!!! Thank You for your time.

Peter J.Gay

MTC-00011416

From: rozenfeldt@hss.edu@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir/Madam: It is time to settle the Microsoft case now. Further tax-payer money should not be wasted on an already immoral and economically disatrous case. It is immoral because the government again attempts to use its maximum power in the application of force to prevent a company from operating in VOLUNTARY trade with other companies and individuals. Even if a company has market dominance consumers have free will and can choose a competitor (in this case Linux or Apple). The market is open to competing products. Open doesn't mean a free lunch as some competitors would like it. As for the economic consequences less efficient competitors hope to prosper from the downfall of Microsoft and the consumer will have to foot the bill since the best company providing software can no longer afford to provide the best service at the lowest prices. Now Microsoft has offered a settlement and still some are not satisfied. It seems that they would only be satisfied if Microsoft would be put out of business or at least be far less successful. In any case as a taxpayer I refuse to support an immoral unjust and wasteful process. The time to settle is now so that our economy can begin to prosper again.

Thank you.

Timur Rozenfeld

MTC-00011418

From: emerk@gte.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is a compeditor driven suit that should NEVER gone to trial in the first place and has caused significant damage to the entire Hi-Tech industry as witnessed by the free fall of stock prices since the suit was first announced.

MTC-00011419

From: davidaxel@mindspring.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned American citizen I am voicing my opinion. It s high time to bring the lengthy anti-trust case against Microsoft to an end. Microsoft's competitors are trying to undermine this settlement by prolonging the process. I do not want this settlement undermined. Thank You David Axel

MTC-00011420

From: Sunnybarb@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the government ought to SETTLE this case ! It is a waste of the tax payers money to continue any longer. Money has been allocated to schools for technical advancement among other things and this is a good thing. Let technology continue to advance !

MTC-00011421

From: rockett@dallas.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am satisfied with the Microsoft settlement. You should be pusuing America OnLine instead. They are far worse a monopoly than Microsoft ever was.

MTC-00011422

From: hjelte99@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle this now! justice delayed is justice denied! get on with life and stop making lawyers rich!

MTC-00011423

From: daniels@cniinternet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Stop the nonsense!! Leave businesses alone! You have no business interfering into the free market system especially since you are bringing supposed legal actions in fraudulent federal courts. Why don't you take Microsoft into a district court of the United States as it demanded by the U.S. Constitution instead of in a United States District Court that is only authorized to function within DC or in one of the U.S. territories! Look it up! But then again you aren t honest enough to look up anything are you? www.texasialiar.com The Federal Anti-Trust Acts don t say what you think they say so do the right thing and leave businesses alone!!

MTC-00011424

From: joelbraun@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Attorney General is abolutely correct about this settlement satisfying the requirements of the courts it may not be the result that MICROSOFT s competitors would have liked but it is clearly a satisfactory resolution and will allow us all to move forward with more important business.

MTC-00011425

From: rhjenkin@ix.netcom.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that Microsoft is guilty of nothing more than providing extremely good products with very competetive pricing. I do

not feel that the using public has been hurt in any way by anti-competetive practices. I was a user of Netscape (a competetive product) for several years and in fact I used it with the Windows Operating System. I switched to Microsoft s Internet Explorer because Explorer is a better product and for no other reason. It is true that Microsoft married their Web browser and Windows Operating system but that does not preclude the use of other browsers. It does make an efficient and outstanding package which makes a lot of business sense. I believe that the settlement proposed is already more harsh than Microsoft deserves. And it is certainly in the public interest to conclude this suit and move on. The Microsoft competitors have already received more concessions than are warranted.

MTC-00011426

From: dfernandes@adelphia.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I approve of the negotiated settlement except that it doesn t do enough to protect the victim (Microsoft) form the clutches of greedy state's attorneys who after the tobacco settlement think they have a license to steal.

MTC-00011427

From: Joey Lesh
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not find the settlement with Microsoft to be satisfying to me as a consumer. In fact, some parts of it are akin to throwing the rabbit into briar patch. Furthermore, the settlement does little to prevent further illegal and anti-competitive actions by Microsoft. I urge you to continue the litigation with Microsoft.

Joseph C. Lesh
Software Engineer

MTC-00011428

From: blev@spiderloom.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The so-called settlement is just Microsoft s way of foisting overvalued obsolete and sub-par hardware & software off on a public that would not normally buy such material it lets them increase their market share dump unsellable product at minimal cost and get a massive tax write-off for the overvalued garbage without ever admitting to or abstaining from their usual anti-competitive monopolistic practices. It does not matter to me if they are broken up or remain whole—they need to be brought to heel made to behave and financially punished for their unethical practices!

MTC-00011429

From: betodd46@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned American I am troubled by the actions taken over the past several years by the Justice Dept of the U.S. The time has come to end the expensive and time consuming case against MicroSoft. Please

bring this case to a quick resolution. The American public has paid enough for what little has been and will be gained by this on-going case. It is clearly time to quickly and quietly let this case slip into history as another mistake made by the Clinton White House. Thank you for your prompt attention in this matter.

Charles B. Todd

MTC-00011430

From: pdnRPH@worldnet.att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

You must end this discussion and enslavement of Microsoft now before YOU kill the whole technical industry. Microsoft has been punished enough. It is only those who want to punish a great company is what is holding this up. Let Microsoft contribute as they have said and tell those other states to forget it and stop now. We the public will only suffer further punishment if You the government persist in punishing Microsoft further.

MTC-00011431

From: eric@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been a follower and stockholder of Microsoft for no less than 12 years. I beginning to lose faith in the American Enterprise System and feel that our basic American lifestyle is being undermined by greedy lawyers and politicians who really no nothing about the struggles of technology enterprise and who want to turn everything good into a legal battle for money and power. How did lawyers suddenly become the directors of our lives. What s happening in this arena is destroying the financial resources I use to support my family. We are in dire financial trouble because of this terrible fiasco. There is something terribly wrong in America today.—USAF Viet Nam Era Veteran Veteran

MTC-00011432

From: armckenzie@1st.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ms. Hesse With regard to the Microsoft case—enough is enough. It s time to drop any further litigation. Microsoft has been penalized more that it should have. I have wondered if this case was a witch hunt. Just to show who was in charge. Thank you for considering my request.

Albert R. McKenzie

MTC-00011433

From: kngibson@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is another instance of dragging feet. I think enough is enough and we need to move on. Let s get this matter of with. LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE and move onto issues—real issues. I believe that if it weren t for Microsoft we wouldn t be where we are at today with our technology. I m glad that MS is not going to be split up but we need to get

on with things. You know before all this we ran Netscapes browser at home—but we have since than switched to only running IE as we feel it s a better browser. I don t see a monopoly here I see competitors that might have an inferior product and want the help of the Government to boost their product. Let s drop this shanigans and get on with the business.

MTC-00011434

From: oopapada@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs: I think US Government VS Micro Soft is a travesty of justice and a crime against the American public. Micro Soft is being punished for selling an ever better product for less and less. [Nobody points a gun at anyone for buying Windows the reason being they buy Windows because it works.] Remember our American motto with Liberty and Justice for all. A trust to work has to keep out competition from it s point in the market by force or the threat of force. i.e. the only way that this would be possible. i.e.to make it illegal by government fiat for anyone to compete against this business. Our US Mail service is a monopoly. No one but the incompetent US Post Office can deliver mail at ever worsening service and ever rising prices. And look at the result. It is not Micro Soft which gets better and better for less and less. We should be ever so grateful to Micro Soft instead of punishing them for being good at what they do. And to make what Micro Soft does so well a crime is first....UN-JUST....and second it deprives we citizens of our...FREEDOM... to choose the product we want at the price we want to pay. To continue to harass this manificent company is a crime beyond reason. Stop it if you have any decency left. Sincerely and with great contempt to the miserable scum who brought this crime of anti-trust against this manificent company Micro Soft. I remain Sincerely J.
Billy VerPlanck

MTC-00011435

From: lindaherne@eznet.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly wish government was less involved in many aspects of business. I believe the consumer will decide what products do well by their desire to purchase or not. Where would we be without microsofts inventions? America was founded on the idea of free enterprise. Let it be. The tax payer should not have to continue to support these government actions. If competitors come up with a better product it will sell.

Lets let the public consumer decide which products it uses and how. L.H.

MTC-00011436

From: William—Jack@MSN.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Some Microsoft publicity outfit gave me a call (along with hundreds of thousands of calls to other people?) and wanted me to go

to this web site (www.techleaders.org) and fill out this form in support of Microsoft. There is no doubt that Microsoft is a very powerful corporation that makes quite a bit of money. The problem is that Microsoft plays hardball by punishing its partners in business if they don t toe the mark. They also seem to have an amazing control of judges—imagine a settlement that causes schools to give up competing products in favor of Microsoft products! This must REALLY hurt Microsoft to see the anemic competitor (Apple) kicked out of one of its few remaining markets. I view the games between judges and Microsoft as more of a test of the corruption of U.S. judges than as a case about Microsoft. Microsoft is only one of a long string of well-heeled outfits that can purchase the kind of justice they feel they want from our crooked judges.—If only we had an interest in following the money trail to our federal judges...

MTC-00011437

From: brtyv60@msn.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

the gov.should settle the case against microsoft. the gov.&the states seems to want to run microsoft that will cost the comsumers lots of money.microsoft has a lot of great products.I buy them because I like them not because their is no other choise

MTC-00011438

From: Jeanine Leone
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled with no further litigation.

Jeanine Leone

MTC-00011439

From: sanben240@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get off Microsoft s back! A strong Microsf t is good for America.

MTC-00011440

From: J.REID
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The comprehensive agreement should be implemented as soon as possible to free up the courts and lawyers for other matters.

Yours truly,
Jeanette Miles Reid

MTC-00011441

From: Brett Glass
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
January 15, 2002

Attn: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001
To whom it may concern:

The proposed settlement in *US v. Microsoft/State of New York et al v. Microsoft* has shaken my personal faith in the integrity and competence of the US Department of Justice. It is not at all in the public interest and hence should be roundly rejected by the Court.

The proposed settlement is riddled with loopholes which would allow Microsoft to continue many of its existing anticompetitive practices and to begin engaging in new ones. For example, Section IV, Paragraph U of the proposed settlement states, The software code that comprises a Windows Operating System Product shall be determined by Microsoft in its sole discretion.

This clause allows Microsoft the ability to engage in the anti-competitive practice of "bundling" merely by claiming that a product distributed for the sole purpose of destroying markets or businesses is part of Windows.

Likewise, Section III, Paragraph J of the proposed settlement states: J. No provision of this Final Judgment shall:

1. Require 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.

2. 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 a reasonable business need for the API, Documentation or Communications Protocol for a planned or 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 APIs, Documentation or Communication 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.

This paragraph would allow Microsoft to make any number of excuses for failure to disclose its APIs and communications protocols to any competitor. For example, clause 1(a) would permit Microsoft to claim that its protocols had to remain secret for security reasons, even if the alleged security problems were due to bugs in Microsoft's

own software. Clause 2(a) could allow Microsoft to condition the release of information on an intrusive and disruptive license audit of the recipient's premises. Clause 2(c) would prevent access by groups which developed software collaboratively rather than as part of a formal business. Clause 2(d) could allow Microsoft to delay the release of competitive products, obtain advance information regarding competitors' product plans, and/or create barriers to market entry by imposing prohibitively expensive testing requirements.

These are only some of the immense and egregious defects in the proposed settlement which would allow the company to continue to engage in the anti-competitive practices which motivated the filing of this case. The fact that there are so many defects in the proposed settlement has raised suspicion among members of the general public that it was politically motivated; that it was authored by, and/or for the benefit of, Microsoft; and that it represents the fruits of Microsoft's infinitely deep legal war chest and lobbying power rather than anything remotely resembling a remedy.

The Court would be remiss in its responsibility to protect the public interest, and would permanently impact Americans' faith in government and in our free enterprise system, if it accepted this settlement rather than directly and quickly addressing the ongoing anti-consumer and anti-competitive practices described so eloquently by Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson. The Court should roundly and firmly reject the proposed settlement and instead impose conduct and/or structural remedies that have at least a reasonable chance of success.

Sincerely,
Brett Glass
P.O. Box 1693
Laramie, WY 82073-1693

MTC-00011442

From: Klausnh@VolksParts.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough already. Microsoft has helped put a computer in 70% of the homes in the US and now it's getting punished for it. The government has spent millions of taxpayers money because some companies like AOL are whining. Please end this waste of taxpayers money and accept the settlement deal

MTC-00011443

From: Thatcher, Conley S
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.l@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 1:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a private citizen, who owns Microsoft stock, and who uses their products daily, I have a strong interest in seeing this antitrust case finished. I think the settlement worked out with the U.S. DOJ is fair and should end the issue. I sincerely hope that this issue isn't dragged out interminably in the courts of the nine holdout states. It would not be good for the consumers or the country.

Conley Thatcher
120 Laurelwood Ave
Placentia, CA 92870
Tpsicon@aol.com

MTC-00011444

From: Dan Damon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:21pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please get this case settled. Microsoft's latest settlement offer should be ample punishment considering the huge expense they have already incurred in defending themselves from over aggressive government intervention. Wedbush Morgan Securities employees may not accept any orders or instructions to buy or sell securities of any kind by e-mail. All such instructions and orders must be placed by telephone or in person with your Investment Executive. The information contained within this e-mail is based on information available and believed to be accurate at the time it was prepared. It reflects the opinions and beliefs of the individual sender and not necessarily those of Wedbush Morgan Securities.

MTC-00011445

From: jreece@northstate.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's put an end to this issue with the Department of Justice and Microsoft. The technology industry needs a resolution the economy needs a resolution and most of all the taxpaying citizens need a resolution. Microsoft has made an offer for settlement that is more than fair. Let's be realistic the issue is being perpetuated by competitors of Microsoft. If there is any doubt of that just refer to the January 15 2002 comments in USA Today by the CEO's of both Sun Microsystems and Oracle.

MTC-00011446

From: jack@muhlenkamp.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft Issue immediately.

MTC-00011447

From: Jay Tucker
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department Officials,
I am writing this letter to express my support for the proposed settlement. The ongoing legal action has severely depressed the technology industry as a whole, and notably hindered Microsoft in particular. The settlement proposed takes appropriate action, but leaves the freedom to innovate in the hands of Microsoft, and does not set any untoward precedents for the industry as a whole.

So far, I have been extremely impressed with the DoJ's handling of the case over the last few months. I look forward to a speedy resolution.

Sincerely,
Jay Tucker
Technology Coordinator
St. Luke's School

MTC-00011448

From: Raypholtz, Jeannette

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice:
 I am told that our voice counts in determining whether settlement will be reached during the review period of the Tunney Act, ending January 28, 2002. I think it is now in the best interest of the company (Microsoft), their shareholders, and the tax payers money to settle this antitrust suit once and for all. After all this time, why can (9) states not accept the terms of the settlement, and continue to squeeze Microsoft for more retribution for something they have already paid dearly for. Please consider my opinion, and please, let this long drawn out case be settled.

Jeannette Raypholtz
 <<Raypholtz, Jeannette.vcf>>

MTC-00011449

From: vera reitmeier
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Please settle this as soon as possible and lets get on with our lives. Don't let this drag on and on!!

MTC-00011450

From: Clete Bayer
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:20pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Enough!

Microsoft and the American economy have been punished more than enough. Let's get this settled and be glad it's over.

Clete Bayer

MTC-00011451

From: tom.barnard@dowcorning.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:22pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

The time has come to put an end to this endless badgering of a great company. Time will show that this "monopoly" is temporary and the settlement that has been arrived at is reasonable. Any company that sits on it's laurels and tries to throw its weight around will soon fall by the wayside in the fast changing world of computer software. Microsoft has a competitive advantage for now. So be it.

Tom Barnard

MTC-00011452

From: Hawkins Duane S TSgt SMC DET 11 /CITS

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 1:21pm
 Subject: RE: Action Against Microsoft

I have a suggestion which I believe will benefit consumers and which seems to have been overlooked, up to this point.

1. Forbid Microsoft from issuing software under an "OEM" license. Current Microsoft OEM licenses forbid users (and, now that product activation is here, prevent users) from ever installing the software on any machine other than the one with which the software was purchased, EVEN IF THE ORIGINAL MACHINE HAS BEEN DESTROYED OR THE SOFTWARE REMOVED FROM THE MACHINE. In effect,

if a user buys a computer from an OEM with a Microsoft product installed, then chooses at a later date to perform a major hardware upgrade or replace the hardware, in order to use the SAME software, that individual must purchase a new license, in addition to the one he has already paid for, even though the original license goes unused.

2. Order Microsoft to make reparations to consumers forced to repeat purchases of Microsoft software due to hardware upgrade / obsolescence by issuing retail license keys to holders of OEM software. In the case of software which is included on a "System Restoration Disk" which cannot be used on machines other than the one with which it was purchased, order Microsoft to provide full retail copies of the Microsoft media included with the system, in exchange for the original system restoration CD. This exchange could be implemented through the hardware OEMs' support divisions, but should be paid for by Microsoft.

I believe that Microsoft has profited unfairly by coercing hardware vendors into bundling Microsoft software with their products in such a way as to force users to purchase new copies of the software every time they upgrade their hardware.

Purchasers of new systems are ordinarily unaware that such restrictions have been placed on their use of the software, unless they are accustomed reading the fine print of a license agreement which may span several pages, and which may still leave users with the question of software transferability unanswered.

Note that this measure would not prevent Microsoft from enforcing its "One user one license" software licensing policy. It would merely protect users from having to purchase new software each time they upgrade their hardware.

Sincerely,
 Duane S. Hawkins
 happycampers@pcsisys.net Software Developer

MTC-00011453

From: Bill Christy
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:22pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear DOJ:
 In my opinion, the original agreement is enough. If it had not been for Microsoft, our computer technology would not be in the advanced condition that it is. We would still be seeing corporations fighting over what standards that the industry should use. Each had their own agenda. Microsoft took all the ends and put them together and made it work. Now it is being condemned for doing what needed to be done.

The States that are not settling for two reasons. First is trying to get preferred treatment for Companies in their states. Second is just greed.

Lets get this settlement over and get back to business.

Best regards,
 William B. Christy

MTC-00011454

From: Mutasem Abu Remaileh
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm

Subject: Microsoft

The software industry would not be where it is today without Microsoft. What the government calls illegal bundling of products is really a good step forward that makes using a computer easier for the consumers. As any other company Microsoft is trying to ensure its competitiveness in a very competitive market. Lets stop this and move our economy and technology forward.

Mutasem

MTC-00011455

From: Chris Brand
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm
 Subject: The tabled agreement is NOT fair on consumers

I'm writing to express my opinions on the proposed settlement, as permitted by the Tunney Act.

Open Source / Free Software Section III.D and III.E, which require Microsoft to divulge details of interfaces (APIs and Protocols), in order to allow competing products to be developed, does not appear to recognize Open Source Software (which is often available free of charge and often has no recognizable company or other organization in control of its development) as an "entity" to which these interface details should be available. This despite the fact that Microsoft has been documented as recognizing that Open Source Software presents a significant threat (see for example, the "Halloween Memo" by Microsoft's Vinod Valloppillil).

For example, the SAMBA project (www.samba.org) is designed to allow other Operating Systems to interoperate with Microsoft-dominated networks. Currently, they have to reverse-engineer all Microsoft protocols in order to create their software, which necessarily limits and delays its functionality, making the use of non-Microsoft Operating Systems in a Microsoft-dominated network less attractive. If Microsoft were required to divulge interface details to developers of Open Source software, projects like SAMBA would make the interoperation of Microsoft and non-Microsoft machines much more achievable, and hence encourage competition. Because most of these Open Source projects do not have a corporate sponsor, there is no entity available to pay a "reasonable and non-discriminatory license fee". Note also that "reasonable" to a multi-billion dollar corporation has a completely different meaning than "reasonable" to an unemployed software developer who creates an Open Source project in order to enhance his coding skills.

The ideal solution to this problem is to change the mechanism by which these APIs and protocols are made available—rather than requiring Microsoft to license them, instead require them to *publish* them, such that they are available to all, in a similar manner to the publication of the standards for the Internet, which facilitates the communication of a wide range of different computers from different manufacturers, running different Operating Systems.

A similar problem exists where the API or protocol in question relates to Intellectual

Property rights of Microsoft. Again, providing "reasonable" licenses is not sufficient to allow Open Source projects to use the interfaces. I suggest that in these cases, Microsoft be required to license the related Intellectual Property free of charge to any implementation where the source code is made available to the public (i.e. available for download free of charge on the internet).

Education Market

Although I didn't find anything in the documents online, I have read that Microsoft may provide hardware and software to schools for free as part of the settlement. This is patently ridiculous, if true. The Education market is one of the few where Microsoft has had difficulty due to Apple's dominance. This would not be a punishment, but an opportunity for them to break into a new market.

Thank you for taking the time to read these comments.

Chris Brand [Software Technical Lead—Wireless Systems]

Spectrum Signal Processing Inc.
t 604.421.5422 // f 604.421-1764
mailto:chris_brand@spectrumsignal.com
www.spectrumsignal.com

Confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message please destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by reply email.

MTC-00011456

From: Grehan, Yvonne
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm
Subject: LAW SUIT

It is TIME to settle this case and get on with the business of BUSINESS. It is in the best interest of the American economy to get beyond this stumbling block and focus attention on REPAIR, OPPORTUNITY and SUCCESS. The damage done by this law suit has gone far beyond Microsoft and has impacted negatively numerous areas of our domestic and global business sectors for too long. LET'S MOVE ON.

Please SETTLE.

Thank you.

Yvonne Grehan

MTC-00011457

From: Joyce Cuyar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets settle this affair and move on with our lives. This settlement is fair to the consumer and good for the economy. Too much time, money and effort has already been expended.

Joyce Cuyar . Owner
Pro-Search Prof. Recruiting
PO Box 372 . Jackson Center . PA . 16133
Phone: (724) 475-4420 . Fax: (724) 475-3519 . Email: cuyar@staffing.net .
http://www.pro-search.net

Charter Member of TOP ECHELON NETWORK OF RECRUITERS Charter Member of US RECRUITERS (membership by invitation only).

MTC-00011458

From: Larry Thompson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:24pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the terms of the review agreement: I am unequivocally opposed to further legislation. The so-called "monopoly" did not come about by covert means but by the public, the users selecting in the market place the software that best suited them. In the beginning there where a myriad of competitors, what did Microsoft do that was illegal except provide software at a price most of us could afford that did 90% of the things we wanted 90% of the time for 90% of what we wanted to pay. The competitors, whose products could not then and certainly can't now, have resorted to litigation to overturn a free market decision.

No more litigation, settle now.

Larry Thompson 1
1801 China Spring Rd Waco, Texas 76708
(254) 867 2615
larrythompson@hotmail.com

MTC-00011459

From: Kelley Jones
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am not a lawyer, an activist, nor am I exceptionally well informed as to the specifics of the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft.

However I would urge those involved on the government side of this case to settle quickly and with as little punitive action towards Microsoft as possible. My feelings are that Microsoft is very successful because they sell something that may consumers and businesses want, not because they are evil or unlawful. In nature diversity is good and in our capitalistic system, competition is good. When one entity is successful they should not be punished to protect those that were not as successful. I believe that this case is more about protecting the competitors of Microsoft rather than the consumers.

It is good to have many companies supplying cars, appliances and even computers. It is not necessarily good to have many sources of the standards that allows them to operate. Imagine if each washing machine had different power requirements, different plumbing attachments etc. The cost to install and operate any one would be higher. Microsoft is supplying a base standard that is allowing people and companies to communicate in ways that would be simply impossible if it were not for the consistency in operating systems and office utilities that microsoft provides.

Our economy is struggling to overcome a number of negative factors. Please do not add another by drawing out this senseless process.

Thank you for considering my opinion,

Kelley Jones
Austin, Texas

MTC-00011460

From: Richard
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please do whatever is necessary to approve the proposed settlement as proposed. It's time to move on.

MTC-00011461

From: Mark Price
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Justice Department,
Get off Microsoft's back. Spend your time and our money bringing to justice true and real violators of the Constitution and anti-trust laws. Microsoft should be admired for their success not attacked for it. This pettiness of the Federal Government and Justice Department is not only unbecoming but borders on un-American.

Respectfully,
Mark Price

MTC-00011462

From: Mspani@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I favor acceptance of the proposed settlement in the Microsoft Antitrust Litigation.

Marco Spani
Commercial Properties Northwest, Inc.
500 Union Street, Suite 530
Seattle, WA 98101
206-650-0852 phone
206-624-8584 fax

MTC-00011463

From: Jennifer Holms
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Attached is my letter on behalf of the Microsoft settlement. Please include it as part of the official record.

Thanks.

Jennifer Holms
11246 NE 145th St.
Kirkland, WA 98034
425-488-9038
11246 NE 145th Street Kirkland, WA
98034-1015

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice, 950
Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
January 12, 2002

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

Microsoft and the Justice Department have spent three years in court and a tremendous amount of resources on the antitrust case. I was pleased to learn that a settlement was reached and that this case may soon come to a conclusion. If this case is ended both sides will be able to return to more important priorities. Microsoft has agreed under this settlement to major concessions and changes. Under this agreement Microsoft will share their internal interfaces with competitors, which is an unprecedented release of information by a software firm to competitors. Microsoft also has agreed to end any contractual restrictions that would possibly harm competitors. With these provisions in the settlement there is no reason to continue this case, as some special interests would like. Please end this case and the wasteful flow of resources to fight it by the Justice Department and Microsoft.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Holms

MTC-00011464

From: John E. Burns
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:25pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In accordance with the Tunney Act review period, I wish to register the following opinion:

I feel strongly that the proposed settlement is not adequate. As a forced consumer of Microsoft products, which are overpriced and inherently defective, a breakup of the Microsoft corporation would permit free market competition and price competitive, interactive operative units to fit my needs.

Thank you,
 John Burns

MTC-00011465

From: LORETTES2@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:25pm
 Subject: Settlement—Microsoft

I've read the terms, think they are reasonable. People I've talked to, stockholders or not, want this to be settled. Enough time—enough money!

Lorette Schneider
 17914 23rd Lane NE
 Shoreline WA 98155

MTC-00011466

From: Richard Wessels
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:26pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although, I find the actions being proposed in this settlement harsh and far reaching as well as possibly damaging to the company they are targeted at. I find the alternatives far worse. I find it reprehensible that the nine desentencing states that agreed to combine their case with that of the DoJ now want to impose even harsher restrictions on Microsoft. These "honorable" people are acting only in the interest of the companies in their states. Utah = Novell, California = Netscape, Apple, and a host of others, and Mass = AOL Time Warner (possibly the largest single threat to competition that exists today). Something must be done to stop this madness. And although I did not agree with the settlement as it put way to much power in the hands of government officials who know nothing of the computer industry. I would rather have the lesser of the two evils then to have one of the largest employers in the country ruined by over zealous lawyers getting paid off by other companies.

Richard Wessels
 Durham, NC

MTC-00011467

From: Jeff Pearce
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I wanted to take an opportunity to voice my support for the proposed Microsoft Settlement. I think that the settlement is more than fair, and I also believe that settling this case now rather than later is in the best interests of consumers.

It is my belief that this case hanging over one of America's greatest success stories is part of the reason our economy has been

suffering for over a year. In that light, I believe that delaying this case any further only benefits Microsoft's competitors at the expense of everyone else. It's no coincidence that most of the states who are pushing for a stronger settlement are also home to Microsoft's biggest competitors.

It is my desire as a citizen and taxpayer that my government does what is right for the majority of Americans and approves the current settlement.

Sincerely
 Jeff Pearce
 Sammamish, WA

MTC-00011468

From: Charlotte Lesan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Settle the dispute with Microsoft! The nine states involved no doubt have companies intent on further damage to Microsoft or even have the intention of driving Microsoft to Canada. Originally states with jealous competitors of Bill Gates and Microsoft instituted the suit and our stock market has been spiraling downward ever since. Put an end to this foolishness and allow the country to recover.

Yours truly,
 Charlotte H. Lesan (Mrs. James E.)

MTC-00011469

From: Robert Lantz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement.

Robert J. Lantz 5249 S. Joplin Pl, Tulsa, OK 74135

MTC-00011470

From: Joseph Maccaro
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

It is time to settle with Microsoft.
 Get on with national crisis business.
 Joseph Maccaro

MTC-00011471

From: Andrew Fox
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi please break Microsoft into at least two parts. Their monopolistic practices are spiraling out of control and the proposed "settlement" actually does more harm than good. Have you looked at Windows XP yet?

The answer is right there in plain view in XP. Thank you for your time.

Andrew J Fox

MTC-00011472

From: Behdash, Behzad
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 1:27pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam:

I would like to add my voice to support the proposed settlement terms between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I truly believe that these terms are in the best interest of consumers and our country. I believe that

DoJ's limited resources are best utilized in dealing with more pressing issues at this point and the current terms of the settlement will insure fair and open competition in the marketplace. In my view, most of those opposed to this settlement are direct competitors to Microsoft who would rather gain a competitive advantage in the courts and at the expense of taxpayers instead of doing so in the marketplace. That should never be the objective of an antitrust case.

Behzad Behdash
 Oakland, CA

MTC-00011473

From: Ralph Hudson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:28pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Get this Microsoft litigation settled. America needs to move on from attacking legitimate business. DOJ time is better spent chasing ENRON. They are REAL criminals.

Ralph Hudson
 5174 Apple Road
 Springdale AR 72762
 501-750-3488
 ralph@nixonlaw.com

MTC-00011474

From: Charles Guatney
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:18pm
 Subject: What is the problem?

Why is the government even involved with this issue? Microsoft works as a company, bringing wealth and success to the nation and countless hundreds of thousands of people who rely on what MS produces. To have the imperial federal government intrude on such matters defies logic. Microsoft produces wealth, whilst the imperial federal leviathan consumes wealth.

Get out of this issue and, instead, promote Microsoft's well being. The federal government should stop consuming the nation's intellectual and financial resources.

Charles L. Guatney, Professor Emeritus
 Central Washington University
 445 Chatuge Trail
 Hiawassee, Georgia 30546
 706-896-6065

MTC-00011475

From: Beverly Ann Sowell, REALTOR
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This lawsuit should be settled NOW on the terms agreed. Let Microsoft give computers to schools as their "punishment." I feel this lawsuit existed because of competitors using the government to attack Microsoft. Microsoft has done extremely good things for me and for computer users at very reasonable prices. Leave Microsoft alone, so it can continue innovating good products and contributing to the IT revolution.

MTC-00011476

From: Lalitha Mahajan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let Microsoft's side win.

MTC-00011477

From: Jan-Erik Rottinghuis
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: MSN settlement

Dear sirs:
 Job protection is surely on the minds of Attorney generals.their own? Can we just get on with innovation and competition: do it in the marketplace please, not the court rooms. The only people to benefit are not the consumers but the lawyers.

Regards
 Jan-Erik Rottinghuis
 President & CEO
 PubliCARD, Inc.
 Office +1-212-651-31.19
 US Mobile +1-917-691-54.61
 GSM +33-609.617.787
 E-Mail jrottinghuis@publicard.com

MTC-00011478

From: Jim
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: DOJ vs Microsoft

The point of antitrust investigation is to protect the public interest from businesses that abuse the customer. Microsoft has always sold an excellent product at well below fair market prices. Take Windows XP for example, it's priced less than \$200 while its biggest competitor "Linux" sells for over \$300 and the origin of Linux was a "free" program. How can this be monopolistic? DOJ, please don't screw up another business like you did to AT&T. That "breakup" sure didn't do much for the customer.

Jim Krass
 1226 Main St.
 Windermere, FL 34786

MTC-00011479

From: rcw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:26pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Please get off Microsoft and all the other business people whose efforts make life more of a joy. I am sick of a bunch of lawyers and politicians becoming the blood suckers of the business world. Get off now. Dick Welch. 6810 Rocky Road Blanco Texas. 78606.

MTC-00011480

From: BigsBernegger@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I firmly believe that it is absolutely important to proceed with the proposed settlement and avoid further litigation which, in my opinion, hurts our economy.

Sincerely yours
 M. Bernegger

MTC-00011481

From: Jerrysafediver@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settlement proposals of Microsoft go beyond that recommended by the Court of Appeals. In the interest of fairness—and the economy of the United States—this matter needs to be closed. I urge you to accept the

settlement proposals of Microsoft without further delay.

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

MTC-00011482

From: Scott McNairy
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft's competitors are wishing that they had and trying to create ground to stand on by politically pressing on thru their host state's attorney generals with this litigation that claims that Microsoft is a Monopoly. But the fact remains that if you ask these companies who their number one competitor is—they will tell you Microsoft. Not because Microsoft is a monopoly but because Microsoft can do it all—on any device, any time, and anywhere. The lawsuit should not proceed any further against Microsoft to pad the pockets of Microsoft's competitors.

MTC-00011483

From: BruceG@tisi.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft and DOJ crafted settlement goes beyond what was needed for a settlement. It should be accepted and the remaining states should accept it too, although they will not be satisfied until Microsoft is dismantled to the benefit of Sun and AOL who the dissenting states claim as plaintiffs. The true plaintiffs should be consumers but consumers are not considered by the dissenting states. The only concern the dissenting states have are SUN and AOL. Sun and AOL own the Attorney Generals in those dissenting states. And this 'bought and paid for' justice is not in the public interest. The dissenting states should not be listened to as they will only settle when Microsoft is destroyed.

However antitrust is not about propping up competitors and such further sanctions against Microsoft, such as forcing Microsoft to fully disclose its software source code or breaking the company into pieces, should not be entertained.

Additional measures are not required.

Thank You,
 Bruce Garrick
 Sr. Application Developer
 Total info Services
 88-634-9942 x2484
 bruceg@tisi.com

"In three words I can sum up everything I've learned about life: it goes on."—Robert Frost

MTC-00011484

From: Dwain Nelson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:32pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This note is in regards to the Microsoft Settlement. It is my belief the settlement that has been proposed punishes Microsoft far more that is deserved. I consider Microsofts' actions to be nothing more than hard business tactics and they succeeded based on public demand. Nevertheless, the poposed settlement calls for support plan to our

nations schools, this will provide badly needed resources and has no long term affect on the use of Microsoft products. They will continue to succeed based on their features and the public demand for those features. If they fail to provide needed features, their sales will decline. Apple Computer made an attempt in the late 80's to influence our nations young with a program that provided deeply discounted equipment to students. History shows that this attempt failed; computer users and business will use the solutions that are cost effective and that provide interoperability amount all programs. The company that provides this will attract new customers.

As a data processing professional, I am well aware of the speed at which new software and features are being developed and deployed. The courts seem to find themselves in a position of hearing testimony and making rulings based on (obsolete) technology.

It is in the best interest of the USA economy, of the Microsoft Shareholders, and of Microsoft to settle this and move on.

MTC-00011485

From: Marshall A. Brown II
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:32pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
 I believe as a citizen of this country that further litigation serves no purpose but to waste my tax dollars and does not do what is important for the economy. Why waste Millions in tax revenues that could be used for the war effort or education in this country, when the benefit to be gained "Might" lower the price of the OS a few dollars and save the average consumer, with a PC, \$10 over several years? and of course \$10 to the price of a \$600 makes little difference.

Marshall Brown II
 Dir. of Business Development

MTC-00011486

From: Joyce Harness
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:32pm
 Subject: Msft case

I feel this case should be settled once and for all. Msft has made tremendous contributions to consumers, have helped a lot of people and it is time to stop the nine states from continuing this suit.

Thank you.
 Joyce Harness
 3015 NW 73rd Seattle, WA 98117
 206-784-9126

MTC-00011487

From: Terry Moore-SPS
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think one only needs to look at the states that are opposed to this settlement to understand that most of them are more concerned in protecting Microsoft's competitors than they are in protecting the general public. Utah and Mass. are prime examples of this! Microsoft and other high technology companies have lead our economy for the past 9 years to new heights.

Now that the economy is sluggish to say the least, let move on and let Microsoft lead again rather than wallowing around in this litigation hogwash we have seen for the past 2 years. This is a fair settlement for all parties involved including the general public.

Regards
Terry Moore

MTC-00011488

From: Jim Hurst
To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Litigation
To Whom it May Concern:

I strongly support the settlement of the Microsoft litigation in accordance with the agreement reached with the DOJ. Further litigation is non cost effective and a waste of taxpayer money. Thank you.

James R. Hurst
2847 Butter Creek Drive
Pasadena, CA 91107

MTC-00011489

From: George Gillespie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It would be my greatest hope that this case against Microsoft be settled soon. That way we can get on with our lives and let Microsoft be free to innovate, with the result of MSFT hiring more people and helping the US Economy rebound a little faster.

Sincerely, George R. Gillespie

MTC-00011490

From: John (038) Dorothy Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft

Sirs: Microsoft software has been a boon to me since I started late on PCs and now am 84. To have software on my PC that is all coordinated (with no language problems) makes it easy for my wife & I to pursue our genealogy and family history projects. The "others" only cover small areas and are complicated, both in installing, but in maintaining. If you want to go after monopolies take on people like AOL, QWEST and the various cable companies.

Just leave our good software alone!

Thank you,
Wilbur T & Dorothy H Johnston
wtj@olympus.net

MTC-00011491

From: brian.pollack@milliman.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Reneta B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-001

Dear Ms. Hesse:

I am writing to express an opinion to the judge of the federal trial court considering the Microsoft settlement. I have been told that I can file written comments with the United States Department of Justice by January 28, 2002, and that those comments can be sent by email. I am concerned over a

decision by Microsoft that impacts our firm. I believe it is an example of Microsoft wielding unreasonable power over 3rd-party software through the non-level playing field approach of their operating systems.

I am the Corporate Secretary of Milliman USA, Inc. We are a nationwide (and international) firm of consultants and actuaries. We started in Seattle in the 1940's, and have grown to nearly 2000 employees in over 30 offices. Computing is key to our business. We predominantly use Microsoft operating systems and office software. We use Lotus Notes for email and groupware. We chose Notes a number of years ago because of its unique capabilities. It has become integral to our business function over the years. Our consultants work long hours, both in the office and (at times) at home. Our agreement with Lotus allows our employees to have Notes on their home computers as well as on their office machine. Notes and Microsoft operating systems have always coexisted well together.

We have been made aware that Microsoft will end its support of Notes on its XP home version. They say it is a business application. It is interesting that the biggest competitor for Notes is Microsoft Outlook. Microsoft is not declaring Outlook to be a business application.

If Microsoft is successful in their strategy, and Notes does not work on the XP home version, we may need to provide our employees with an expensive upgrade to XP professional for their homes. Not only is this costly, but our employees will have to give up features of the XP home version that are aimed at the family: audio, video, etc. These are attractive features for the home. Please relay my concern to the judge of the federal trial court. As a business, it is imperative that we at Milliman treat our customers well. Microsoft's decision appears to be directed at Lotus, but impacts us significantly. I do not believe it is in the best interest of the business community at large to have Microsoft be able to advantage itself due to it providing both operating system and application software.

Sincerely,
Brian S. Pollack
brian.pollack@milliman.com
1301 Fifth Ave.
Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101
cc: Tim Muth, Esq.

MTC-00011492

From: monaphil
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am a computer trainer and have been for many years. I'd just like to say that the introduction of Windows has made my life much easier as the Windows product has standardized all software. Microsoft has provided an invaluable service to the population and software students everywhere by providing a standard upon which all software is based. In my perspective, this is an invaluable service rather than a 'monopoly' situation. I think the Microsoft suit should be settled and taxpayers' money should go elsewhere to truly fight injustice.

Sincerely,
Mona Mehta Steffen
3731 N. Military Rd
Arlington VA 22207

MTC-00011493

From: Don Leslie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft Settlement. While I know that both sides have their views (backed by their own facts) Microsoft is still one of Americas finest companies ever. They play hardball (as all large companies have to), they stepped out-of-bounds, got called on it, they've already paid a high price and will no doubt pay a hell-of-a-lot more to settle and settle we should. Many of the states holding out are doing so for political reasons and that's an injustice to our country. Let's move on and let Microsoft continue to be the leader in their industry. Microsoft is a great American company and I'm proud to support them and a quick settlement for the good of our economy and country. For the few states that are holding out, let-it-go and get on with life and compete instead of complaining.

Don Leslie
MDB & Associates, Inc.
dleslie@mdb-inc.com

MTC-00011494

From: Paul Larmon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think you should settle this case now. It is in the best interest of all consumers and our economy to stop this litigation.

Paul Larmon

MTC-00011495

From: Don Holt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear US DOJ. Please settle the case with Microsoft. The current proposal seems fair, and we need to move forward and let the technology industry get back to a sense of normalcy. If there is continued doubt about one of the most successful companies in the industry, it will be hard for vendors, partners, and customers to make informed decisions about the future. Please don't let a few competitors try to disrupt one of the most successful runs of technological innovation this country has seen.

Thanks,
Don Barren

MTC-00011496

From: Louis F Schneider
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a home user and believe that it is time to approve the settlement because it seems that the terms of the settlement are fair for all involved. Also I feel that since the 9-11 event it is more imperative that we get business back to normal as soon as possible.

Regards,
Louis Schneider

MTC-00011497

From: Chuck & Cindi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:37pm
Subject: Please Settle the Microsoft Case

It is in the public's best interest, the economy's best interest, and the tech industry's best interest to put an end to this litigation and settle the case promptly.

This has never been a case brought on nor fought in the best interest of the consumer. It was brought on by the executives of Microsoft's competitors and has always been predominantly in their own personal/corporate best interests. Please let corporations and their executives battle out market share in their own arenas—not in the political or court system. Especially in such a fast growing and competitive arena such as the tech sector.

Thank you.
C. Solomon

MTC-00011498

From: JACK PURSER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:38pm
Subject: Micro antitrust

Why don't you leave this company alone, pretty soon NO company will want to do business in the US because of actions by money grubbers like you!!

Jack Purser Sr.

MTC-00011499

From: Gary Smith (Numar)
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:38pm

Subject: Why is Microsoft's stranglehold on computing being supported by U SDOJ?

I am so frustrated that I felt compelled to write. I have been having considerable difficulty with instability of Windows98. After months of trying to get Linux up and running I made the horrible mistake of purchasing Windows XP. It is a disaster. First time I have upgraded an operating system in 15 years where the upgrade is worse than the previous problem. Of course the non-working OS software is non-returnable (because Bill Gates doesn't have enough money yet I suppose?). Technical support is almost impossible to get. I should have just sent \$100.00 to the RNC. At least I would have felt better about who got my money. This guy is not right. He really needs to be reigned in. As for me, it's \$100.00 in the trash and back to wrestling with Linux.

Best Regards,
Gary Smith
Principal Mechanical Engineer
NUMAR, Div. of Halliburton
610.251.0116 (main #)
610.722.4576 (direct #)
610.296.9651 (fax)
gary.smith@halliburton.com

MTC-00011500

From: KENNETH J RUSZCZYK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:38pm
Subject: MSFT SETTLEMENT

I feel that anything that benefits the consumers is best for the economy. Why is it that Politicians, who can't run the country in an orderly fashion. Which is their job, by

the way! Feel that they know best how to run the economy? The government officials are so "out of touch" with rest of the population.

That most of their decisions are only for themselves & for those who contribute to their campaign chests. One of the most important reasons that the US economy has done so well. Is that there wasn't too much government involvement in the early stages of it's growth. Now the politicians think that since this country is so great & strong. That they were the ones who made it so. It wasn't them, it was the people who built & grew on this land & made it productive. As usual, the politicians take all the credit for things that go well in which they had no "hand" in. Then deny any involvement in the things that go wrong in which they were in charge of. I know there is not much, if anything I can do to altered their decisions. I do vote but I'm not thrilled about any of the candidates, except those who want to make less government.

I don't look forward to the end of my life but at least I do know that I won't have to put up with government after it either.

Kenneth Ruszczyk

MTC-00011501

From: Sharon Corboy
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.?@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 1:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

its a real shame that a few A.G. WITH POLITICAL AGENDAS are holding up a reasoned settlement and getting on WITH THE BUSINESS OF GROWING OUR ECONOMY THOMAS A CORBOY GIG HARBOR WASH. 98335

MTC-00011502

From: Lois Tilles
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:38pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I hope that you will finalize the Microsoft settlement as proposed. It is tough and fair. We must get on with business and not wring the life out of successful companies who agree to cooperate.

Lois Tilles
415-310-7654 (phone)
ltilles@pacbell.net

MTC-00011503

From: Michael.Mehler@sce.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to settle this case and move on.
Mike Mehler
Labor Relations
Southern California Edison

MTC-00011504

From: MaryAnn(u)Walters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Case

Time to stop this madness. These attacks on our American Companies are the main reason our economy and stock markets are in the dumps. Time to get the lawyers out of Washington's Federal Justice Department and get back to business.

Mary Ann Walters
Brecksville, Ohio

MTC-00011505

From: Subhash Grover
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The case should settle as agreed upon. This will help the economy to get out of recession.
Subhash Grover

MTC-00011506

From: Schober, Larry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Forget Big Tobacco. Forget Microsoft. I'm going to make you a star: I am shocked and appalled to learn of a potent delivery system that luridly and unfairly bundles a highly addictive substance in a seemingly innocuous way. This delivery system threatens and harms the national interests in our food distribution system. I am seeking an immediate stop order be issued to the industry. In addition, I would like to be granted whistle blower status in this case.

In particular I am referring to the bundling of sugar in prepared foods. As opposed to simply dusting foods with sugar, which can be casually detached (brushed off), food preparers needlessly bundle this highly addictive substance in their products. Furthermore, this delivery system (and it is a delivery system—the amount of sugar in the product can be controlled in the recipe) is used to create an artificial craving for a product within the unsuspecting purchaser.

I urge you and your colleagues to take up this vital matter post-haste, and send me my whistle blower check.

I anxiously remain awaiting your response,
Lawrence Schober

MTC-00011507

From: JCir2000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

To Whom It may concern: I think the remaining nine states are obsessed with punishing Microsoft. They have taken up a personal position against Microsoft and Bill Gates only because they do not like either, just as Judge Jackson did. This is outrageous unnecessary and a complete waste of time and money to their constituents in those states. The Justice department reached a decision which was fair and brought this long legal process to an end. The nine remaining states should join in, rather then look at what they see as a company which they believe performs unfairly. Look at a company which has been primarily responsible for the huge technology movement throughout the world in the last ten years with their software moving information around the world, allowing world markets to develop faster and therefore creating jobs throughout the world.

Joe Cirillo, a patriot, business man and consumer. I speak on behalf of many friends and my family.

MTC-00011508

From: Sherri Wender
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:41pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Department of Justice:

I am writing in support of your proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft. The settlement is fair, and it is time to move on in the interest of fairness, competitiveness, and for the sake of the economy.

Thank you,
Sherri Wender
21464 President Point Rd
Kingston, WA 98346
sherri@wendertodd.com

MTC-00011509

From: MPavlow@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:40pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case, we have so much going on now, with the economy and the other problems we are facing. We need to set some real priorities, this has gone on long enough.

Marlene Pavlow

MTC-00011510

From: Dr Whom

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Anti-Trust Trust,
Please leave Microsoft alone, go after some dishonest politicians!!

Thank you,
monty johnson

MTC-00011511

From: Bradley Bobbs

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:42pm

Subject: accept MicroSoft settlement

Please accept the MicroSoft settlement, and stop harassing them already! Go bother someone doing some harm instead of wasting any more money on that nonsense!

Thank you,
Dr. Bradley Bobbs
6862 Hayvenhurst Ave.
Van Nuys, CA 91406
(818)947-3192

MTC-00011512

From: jjm@mpc-inc.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Court Ruling a Joke

Hello.
I would like to inform you that the recent court ruling in favor of Microsoft is an absolute joke. This in light of the fact that Microsoft was found guilty of using it's monopoly to further it's cause. Now the DOJ virtually guarantees more of the same by allowing the company to distribute more software, and thus have a stronger monopoly in the market. What kind of judgment is that?

Sincerely,
Jim Mosher

MTC-00011513

From: Roseanne Woo

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 1:40pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The settlement with Microsoft is fair and reasonable. Do not allow the 9 renegade

states stall the process. The country has wasted enough energy during the long-drawn-out lawsuit. The time has come for settlement so that a great company can re-direct its resourcefulness to its core business. At the same time, the government needs to adjust its thinking to the new economy.

Roseanne Woo-Haltresht
1973 Lord Fitzwalter Drive,
Miamisburg, OH 45342

MTC-00011514

From: GBee172271@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:42pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Justice Department:
Stop hurting taxpayers. Anything that hurts Microsofts, hurts the investors, the economy, and the country. Let the CEO's of envious companies work hard as Bill Gates did. Stop the madness! It's about time.

Graciela Beecher
2904 Shawnee Dr.
Fort Wayne, IN 46807

MTC-00011515

From: Christina Bishop

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:43pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotally,
I believe that the Proposed Final Judgement (PFJ) in the case U.S. vs. Microsoft is flawed in the following ways:

The PFJ does not End Microsofts Monopoly and Even Allows Microsoft to expand its Monopoly into Other Technology Markets. The deal fails to terminate the Microsoft monopoly, and instead guarantees Microsofts monopoly will survive and be allowed to expand into new markets. Microsoft has always found it advantageous to leverage its operating system monopoly position in order to maximize its own profits, which many of us have experienced firsthand.

The PFJ Does Not Adequately Address Anticompetitive Behavior Identified by the Appeals Court. The PFJ Incorporates Such Large Loopholes to Its Enforcement Provisions as to Render Enforcement Meaningless.

The PFJ Does Not Provide an Effective Enforcement Mechanism for the Weak Restrictions it does Implement. The proposed settlement requires a three-man compliance team to oversee Microsofts compliance with the Agreement. Microsoft will appoint one person, the Justice Department another, and the third will be chosen by the two people already appointed. In essence, Microsoft will control half the team. This new team will not be allowed to inform the public of their work, and cannot impose fines. In addition, the work of the committee cannot be admitted into court in any enforcement proceeding. The committees sole remedy for infractions is for them to inform the Justice Department of the infraction and then the Justice Department will have to conduct their own research and commence litigation to stop the infraction. The Justice Department does not need a compliance group to tell them when Microsoft is doing something wrong, so in reality this group is just a smoke screen.

The PFJ Does not deny to Microsoft the Fruits of its Past Statutory Violations. Under

the proposed settlement, Microsoft is only marginally penalized for its anticompetitive misdeeds. Every court involved with this case has acknowledged that Microsoft broke the anti-trust laws, yet under the terms of the proposed Agreement, Microsoft would be allowed to retain almost all of the profits gained from these activities. Nor does the PFJ make an accounting of all the gains Microsoft made through its illegal activities, nor does it try and compensate those harmed by Microsofts misdeeds. Through this proposed settlement, the Justice Department is sending a very clear (and very dangerous) message that anticompetitive behavior is totally acceptable. Every large potential monopolist is being told that they can get away with this sort of illegal behavior without fear of losing any of the profits made from such conduct. There is every incentive for future monopolists (most definitely including Microsoft) to engage in this type of predatory conduct and no incentive not to.

Thank you for your time.

Christina Bishop

MTC-00011516

From: Jeff W

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:43pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would like to see this settlement accepted by the 9 remaining states and the industry move on.

MTC-00011517

From: Tom (038) Wilma Llewellyn

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:33pm

Subject: Opinion

To Whom It May Concern:
I feel a reasonable agreement has been reached in the "Microsoft Lawsuit" and further litigation does not benefit the country. It seems as if this lawsuit precipitated the current financial situation in this country. I say "Enough already" and let us move on.

Thomas Llewellyn
593 Vintage Dr.
Elkton, OR 97436

MTC-00011518

From: Steve Dehekker

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:44pm

Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:
I believe that it would be an appropriate remedy to split Microsoft Corporation into at least two, completely independent components—one that develops software applications and the other that develops operating systems. This would promote competition and innovation by providing incentive for the applications software entity to develop for platforms other than Windows. It would also serve as incentive to make the Windows operating system more compatible with application software developed by companies other than Microsoft.

I am a non-technical consumer who uses computers, including Microsoft products, on a daily basis. My observations are based upon my actual experience and informal observation of this case for many years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
 Stephen E. DeHekker, AIA
 Hastings+Chivetta Architects, Inc.
 700 Corporate Park Drive, Suite 400
 St. Louis, MO 63105
 (Main) 314-863-5717
 (Direct) 314-863-4361 Ext 138
 sdehekker@hcarchitects.com

MTC-00011519

From: Rocky859@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:45pm
 Subject: settlement

pleases settle this case and get on with life...i am sure these attorneys have more to do than make headlines in their state using this high profile case to further their political ambitions

MTC-00011520

From: Tom Moore
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 1:43pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT WOULD BE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST IF YOU WOULD SETTLE THE MICROSOFT CASE AND MOVE ON TO MORE PRESSING MATTERS.

THOMAS L. MOORE

MTC-00011521

From: David Brookes
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft case should be settled

This case should be settle at once. We need to move forward not backward. This case was brought upon Microsoft because they would not give money to politicians in Washington. Why is every time the USG decides to help us we get screwed?

Are the prices of computers going up or down? Down is the correct answer and not only are they going down but you get more for your money. Name one other industry where that is happening?

This case has been a total waste of tax payers dollars. The only real reason the states will not settle is because of poor fiscal policy they are broke. And look here, Microsoft has 40B in cash...so lets go steal it. Your no different then criminals but since you make the rules so your always right.

I vote and the best policy is to vote out everyone who is in office. Ross Perot said it best in 1990, "It's time to clean the shit out of the barn".

Dave Brookes

MTC-00011522

From: david milton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We have in place a fair settlement that needs to be adopted in order for the industry to commit reasouces for further inovation. Without the settlement as it stands we cannot expect companies to invest in ideas that that they may not be able to control in the future. Settle this and lets get back to leading the world into the next age. David Milton, 5728 Meadowhaven Dr., Plano TX 75093

MTC-00011523

From: Mark Johnson (PREMIER)

To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:45pm
 Subject: The Tunney Act review—Microsoft

It is my understanding that The Tunney Act review period is still open. I understand the Department of Justice seeks public comment on its proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft, and the public comment's close on Monday, January 28. I also understand the settlement is not guaranteed until after the review ends and the District Court determines whether the settlement is indeed in the public interest.

It is my opinion that the provisions of the agreement are tough, reasonable, fair to all parties involved, and go far beyond the findings of Court of Appeals ruling. Still, while consumers such as I overwhelmingly agree that the settlement is good for me and the American economy, I and every citizen I have come in contact with overwhelmingly want to see this move beyond this litigation, it is also my understanding that nine states have refused to join the settlement. In fact some, including Utah Attorney General Mark Shurtleff and Massachusetts Attorney General Tom Reilly, are urging citizens via email or Web site to submit their comments to the DoJ during the Tunney review period.

Thank you for your review of my opinion,
 Mark Johnson

MTC-00011524

From: TOM R MCMAHON
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:45pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I SUPPORT THE LITIGATION BY THE 9 STATES AGAINST MICROSOFT TO PRODUCE A FAIRER DEAL FOR THE AVERAGE CONSUMER.

TOM MCMAHON/ SAN DIEGO

MTC-00011526

From: Mark Herrick
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 1:47pm
 Subject: Microsoft
 CC: microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw.gws@clickactio...

Dear Judge Kollar-Kotally: The Court should disallow, in its current form, the proposed settlement between the U.S. Department of Justice and Microsoft in U.S. v. Microsoft (hereinafter referred to as the ?Agreement?). There are two main reasons this Court should disallow the Agreement.

1) The Agreement completely ignores the standard laid down by the DC Appellate Court.

2) The Agreement runs contrary to the public interest of the people of the United States and therefore should be held in violation of the Tunney Act.

I. The Agreement fails to meet the Appellate Court's Remedy Standards. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as the ?Appellate Court?) in a 7-0 decision upheld the District Court's decision that Microsoft violated the antitrust laws and was liable for such illegal conduct. The Appellate Court further ruled that any remedy found by the District Court must ?terminate the monopoly, deny to Microsoft the fruits of its past statutory violations, and prevent any

future anticompetitive activity.? The Agreement fails to meet any of these three standards.

A. Terminate the Monopoly. The deal fails to terminate the Microsoft monopoly, and instead guarantees Microsoft's monopoly will survive and be allowed to expand into new markets. All other businesses in the U.S. market that have a ninety percent market share are considered per-se monopolies and are regulated or have some sort of government oversight (i.e. utilities, local phone companies, cable companies etc.). This is done because it is in such a company's best interest (in the interest of their shareholders) to abuse their position. In other words, to gain maximum shareholder value, they are almost required to abuse their position. Why is Microsoft allowed a waiver to this general rule? Does Microsoft not try to gain optimum share value for their shareholders?

B. Deny to Microsoft the Fruits of its Past Statutory Violations. Under the Agreement, Microsoft is not penalized for any past misdeeds. In other words, they are being allowed to retain all the profits gained from their illegal activities. Every court involved with this case has acknowledged that Microsoft broke the anti-trust laws. Through this Agreement, the Justice Department is sending the message that this sort of anticompetitive behavior is acceptable. Every large potential monopolistic company is being told that they can get away with this sort of illegal behavior without fear of losing any of the gains made from such conduct. In other words, get away with as much as you can until the Justice Department brings an action. There is every incentive for future monopolists (including Microsoft) to engage in this type of predatory conduct and no incentive not to.

C. Prevent any Future Anticompetitive Activity. The Agreement fails to prevent any future anticompetitive activity because it completely ignores anticompetitive behavior highlighted by the Appellate Court. In addition, for the conduct the Agreement does try to remedy, it creates such huge loopholes to the rules it does establish as to render them completely useless. Lastly, the Agreement provides no effective enforcement mechanism for the rules it does establish.

1. The Agreement Does Not Address Anticompetitive behavior identified by the Appeals Court.

a) Retaliation. The settlement does not address Microsoft ability to retaliate against would-be competitors and to take the intellectual property of competitors doing business with Microsoft. The Appeals court found such past conduct by Microsoft highly egregious yet the Agreement does not address these issues.

b) Bolting. The Agreement does not address the issue that fueled consumer criticism and which gave rise to this antitrust case in 1998: Microsoft's decision to bind—or "bolt"—Internet Explorer to the Windows operating system in order to crush its browser competitor Netscape. This settlement gives Microsoft ?sole discretion? to unilaterally determine that other products or services which don't have anything to do with operating a computer are nevertheless

part of a "Windows Operating System product." This creates a new exemption from parts of antitrust law for Microsoft and would leave Microsoft free to bolt financial services, cable television, or the Internet itself into Windows.

2. The Agreement Incorporates Such Large Loopholes to Its Restrictions on Microsoft as to Render Such Restrictions Useless.

a) Middleware. As part of the Agreement, Microsoft is required to allow the PC manufacturers to hide Microsoft middleware programs and allow them to install icons or links to competing middleware programs. The only problem is that the PC manufacturers are not allowed to remove the code that could be used to reactivate Microsoft's middleware programs. In other words, two weeks into owning the machine, a consumer could be asked if they want to reconfigure their desktop, install all the Microsoft middleware and delete all the competitor's middleware.

b) Communication Protocols. The Agreement states that Microsoft must now share information on how its middleware and server software work together with Windows. However, Microsoft does not have to disclose this information for middleware it does not distribute separate from windows, or for middleware it has not trademarked. In addition, Microsoft does not have to disclose this coding information if Microsoft deems such disclosure would harm the company's security or software licensing.

(1) Software it Does Not Distribute Separate from Windows. This is a huge loophole of "Bolting" that was discussed above. If Microsoft wants to drive a competitor out of business, they just attach the specific type of software the competitor is involved with to their Windows platform. Once they do that, they do not have to share the coding information that allows the competitors software to work with Windows, thus driving the competitor out of business. Once the competitor is out of business, Microsoft can separate the software from the Windows package, sell it separately and derive huge margins.

(2) Viable Business. Microsoft does not have to disclose their information to companies that in "their view" do not have a "viable business". This loophole will allow Microsoft to prevent new software start-ups from forming because Microsoft could decide they are not a "viable business". Who can really say which new start-ups is a "viable business"? Preventing new companies from starting is undeniably bad for competition, and therefore, the consumer.

(3) Harm to Company's Security or Software Licensing. Microsoft does not have to share coding information if they believe that such disclosure would cause harm to the Company's security or software licensing. There is no provision to say who is to make this determination so it is clearly up to Microsoft. Could not Microsoft make the argument that sharing coding with any software or P.C. Manufacturer would endanger its security of software licensing?

c) Bribing Competitors. The Agreement states that Microsoft "shall not enter into any agreement" to pay a software vendor not to develop or distribute software that would

compete with Microsoft's products. However, another provision in the Agreement permits those payments and deals when they are "reasonably necessary." Who is the ultimate arbiter of when these deals would be "reasonably necessary"? The Agreement does not specify so Microsoft will be allowed to make that decision.

3. The Agreement Does Not Provide an Effective Enforcement Mechanism for the Weak Restrictions it does Implement. The Agreement requires a three-man compliance team to oversee Microsoft's compliance with the Agreement. Microsoft will appoint one person, the Justice Department another, and the third will be chosen by the two people already appointed. In essence, Microsoft will control half the team. This new team will not be allowed to inform the public of their work, and cannot impose fines. In addition, the work of the committee cannot be admitted into court in any enforcement proceeding. The committee's sole remedy for infractions is for them to inform the Justice Department of the infraction and then the Justice Department will have to conduct their own research and commence litigation to stop the infraction. The Justice Department does not need a compliance group to tell them when Microsoft is doing something wrong, so in reality this group is just a smoke screen.

II. Violation of the Tunney Act. The Tunney Act clearly states that the court should disallow any agreement between an anti-trust violator and the Justice Department if such agreement is "contrary to the public interest". It is hard to imagine an Agreement that would violate the public trust more than the proposed Agreement. How could an agreement that ignores all three required remedies laid down by the Appellate court to remedy the situation (terminate the monopoly, deny to Microsoft the fruits of its past statutory violations, and prevent any future anticompetitive activity) possibly be within the public interest. If this Agreement is upheld and then appealed, how could the Appellate Court approve this agreement when it directly violates its own mandate. It would have to find this Agreement to be in direct violation of its own mandate and the public interest. The Appellate Court's decision needs to be respected and this Agreement must be found void.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and should you have any questions about the above letter please feel free to contact me at any time. Sincerely yours,

Mark Herrick
Director of Non-Profit Services
ClickAction
Nasdaq: CLAC
<http://www.ClickAction.com>
CORPORATE OFFICE
2197 E. Bayshore Rd.
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Direct Line: 650-463-3963 Fax: 650-473-3954

MTC-00011527

From: Richard Yochum
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:51pm
Subject: Concerns about DOJ's focus and who they are working for

I remain annoyed by the 9 states that refuse to settle w/Microsoft. I believe their Attorney

Generals have been unduly influenced by Microsoft's competitors, who long ago determined that if they couldn't beat Microsoft in the marketplace, they would do it in court.

In today's global economy, it seems misguided to legally impose restrictions on one of the US' most productive and recognized companies. Has Microsoft shafted investors and employees like Enron? No! There is absolutely no comparison.

Is DOJ going to prosecute the criminal level of 'doing business' at Enron? At Arthur Anderson? These are the type of companies and individuals that need Federal and State scrutiny and prosecution. These types make a mockery, an oxymoron, of the concept, "business ethics."

Will the Feds and State go after these recognized political supporters with the same pit bull determination they attacked Microsoft? Probably not, because in this case, mostly lowly taxpayers and wage earners were harmed. People who cannot fill the coffers of the political parties and their Attorney General lackeys like Sun, Oracle, and the other disparagers of Microsoft.

Let's spend our tax dollars to defend Americans from being bilked by the likes of the criminal scum that made the decisions at Enron and Arthur Anderson. Let their comrades know that such behavior will result in crushing penalties and serious jail time! Allow Microsoft to advance its business model and lead the American economy into a prosperous new era.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinion.

MTC-00011528

From: Shaoyu Zhou
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Microsoft Settlement is in the public interest. It provides a fair and effective way to address the concerns brought by this lawsuit. By resolving this issue quickly and effectively through this settlement, the whole computer industry can move forward, which in turn stimulates the growth of our economy in this difficult time. The remaining nine states that refused to settle are clearly working for Microsoft's competitors. The penalty proposal they have made only provides benefits to those Microsoft's competitors by completely disabling Microsoft's ability to compete. These remaining states are being very unfair to a US company that has naturely grown into a worldwide dominating company by its marketing and technology (and not through merging other companies).

Shaoyu

MTC-00011529

From: vicki winn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:51pm
Subject: Anti-Trust Suit

I am aghast that this case as gone on for as long as it has for an issue that appears to me to benefit no one! Clearly Microsoft has developed a superior product and is therefore the product of choice. This does not make their polices nor practices a "monopoly". I

urge a quick an speedy settlement! I strongly believe the offer on the table is fair and benefits all.

MTC-00011530

From: Jerry N. Phillips
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:46pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Gentlemen, get this thing settled! The cost for everyone involved is far more than any award \$'s. Let Microsoft get back to work, let the litigations cease. Let's get on with using their superb products. Hopefully Microsoft has learned a hard lesson.

Thank you,
Jerry Phillips
1327 10th St. Dr. NW
Hickory, NC 29601
828-261-0200

MTC-00011531

From: Schober, Larry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Department of Justice:

The provisions of the Microsoft settlement agreement are tough, reasonable, fair to all parties involved, and go beyond the findings of Court of Appeals ruling. You are doing a disservice to computer customers and, given Microsoft's world leading position for this product, to the nation. You are hampering trade by your excessive involvement of government.

By pursuing a reckless agenda of attacking Microsoft you are neither representing justice, nor my interests as a computer user and an American.

MTC-00011532

From: Dan Warrensford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Notice:

Any person, government or corporate entity that attacks a Capitalist Institution for doing what Capitalist Institutions are supposed to do, i.e., create high quality goods and services efficiently, for affordable prices, is neo-Fascistic at best.

So, stop acting like Mussolini's philosophical heirs, get out of Microsoft's corporate face, and go after some real criminals—like the ENRON executives. Just DO it.

Dan Warrensford
40 Uranus Ave.
Merritt Island FL 32953-3158
(321) 453-2217; warrensd@gte.net

MTC-00011533

From: Bartucci, John
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I would encourage you to bring the Microsoft Anti-Trust suit to a rapid conclusion. It's gone on long enough and the effect on the consumer (which I realize is irrelevant) will be negative in the long run. I am a professional software developer and I use Microsoft as well as many other vendor's products every day.

Frankly, I'm happy to have a Microsoft around—without them (i.e., a single OS source) we would not have a commercially viable desktop computer, especially for home use. Unix (and all its variants such as Linux) will never be an alternative to a Windows OS, not because of MS business practice but because of the product itself. As a professional, I use Unix everyday—I prefer to work in a Windows environment simply because there are so many more tools available for Windows (which seems to me flies in the face of the judge's decision). And as far as the browsers are concerned, the Internet Explorer browser is far superior to any other browser available. I have several variants of the Netscape browser installed “just in case” but I hardly ever use them—usually because they simply don't work! If Netscape had a problem with Microsoft, it was because they had an inferior product—no lawsuit is going to change that fact. I'm glad Microsoft chooses to bundle it with all their OS products—it saves me the trouble of downloading it.

Please bring this case to a swift conclusion. We as a society have gained nothing from either the case itself or its outcome. And there is nothing further to be gained by dragging this out.

John Bartucci Lockheed Martin Naval Electronic Surveillance Systems—Akron
1210 Massillon Rd
Akron, OH 44315
330-796-2395

MTC-00011534

From: Stephen Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Just settle the case, get this over and done with!!!

Stephen Quinn

MTC-00011535

From: marty stephens
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge the Justice Department to accept the proposed Microsoft settlement. This issue has gone for too long, and has proved a detrimental not only to Microsoft but to the entire tech industry. Our government should be fostering industrial growth in lieu of penalizing creative industries that strengthen our economy.

Martin Stephens
2020 Deer Trail
Warsaw, Indiana 46580

MTC-00011536

From: Jim Stoneburner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time for the US Government and Microsoft to stop wasting Time and Money. The time could be better spent by parties and the Money which belongs to the Tax Payers could be better utilized by the Tax Payers.

This lawsuit has been an obvious ploy by certain disgruntled Companies to get even with Microsoft through their Clinton contacts. Stop the waste. We've wasted

enough Tax Payer money prosecuting (persecuting) Microsoft.

Microsoft in turn has wasted enough of it's revenues—which in turn—has been paid for by increased sales prices to the consumer, the Tax Payer.

Jim Stoneburner
Col USAF Retired
12779 Rueda Acayan
San Diego, CA 92128

MTC-00011537

From: Needham, James P
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 1:55pm
Subject: Let the Market Work!

I continue to be amazed by the ongoing litigation related to Microsoft. From my view if there is any anti-competitive activity going on it is that perpetrated by the DOJ, a few State AGs, and a limited number of companies that made some poor business choices and now what MSFT penalized because of their lack of wisdom. It is time for the DOJ and the courts to put a stop to this judicial extortion against MSFT. As a tax payer, let's allocate our legal resources to stopping terrorism, going after the Enron's of the world and get off the back of the only true innovator company in the last 40 years who has created unprecedented wealth for our country, the public, business and their share holders.

Regards,
James P. Needham
Regional Director Europe & Russia
Airline Marketing Services
Boeing Commercial Airplanes
P.O. Box 3707 MS 21-32
Seattle, Washington 98124-2207
Phone: 1-206-766-2585
US Mobile: 1-206-683-9105
Fax: 1-206-766-1030
e:mail james.p.needham@boeing.com
CC:'msft(a)chasmellon.com'

MTC-00011538

From: Richard Manson-Hing
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:56pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The DOJ settlement proposal seems to address the past (emphasis on PAST) illegal practices by Microsoft to protect its monopoly position in the market for its software and platforms. However, it does little to ensure that future illegal monopolistic practices are not engaged in. It particular, it does very little to address the following:

Microsoft has had time to build up a significant barrier to entry for competitive products. Even with the proposed settlement in place, it would still be prohibitively expensive for would-be competitors to try to enter any market space that Microsoft has deemed theirs. There are already examples (maybe not necessarily directly illegal) of where Microsoft will attempt to commit anti-competitive behavior. For example, their recent financial investment in Groove Networks seeks to tie-in an emerging technology (peer-to-peer collaborative technology) to their Windows platform. The Windows brand is simply too powerful to compete against. The damage is already done!

is generally agreed today that new markets such as mobile computing and small devices such as the Palm Pilot and Cellular phones will eventually command a larger share of consumer interest over the traditional PC. Microsoft has already begun to extend the Windows monopolistic brand to these new areas. A technical review board put in place to review Microsoft practices would be too slow to be effective!

The settlement does nothing to compensate Microsoft competitors for the harm that they have endured. These competitors (Netscape, Java, Real Networks etc) are now engaged in an uphill battle to achieve some prominence in the market. These companies would today be in a much better market position if the anti-competitive practices by Microsoft were never engaged in, in the first place. Microsoft's strategy is to delay litigation until they can make come up with a different method of monopolizing the market or until the point is moot!

In closing, I disagree with the DOJ proposed settlement. It is a way for the DOJ to simply "give up" while saving as much face as possible. The DOJ needs to come up with a way to "level the playing field" by giving Microsoft competitors "a leg up".

MTC-00011539

From: Sslist@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:55pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

I am appalled that the states are continuing action against Microsoft. It is simply improper for the states to serve as lackeys for the likes of Sun and Oracle against the interests of the consumer. Of all the corporate abuses that affect me financially, Microsoft is very low in the list.

I've been in the computing business for most of my working career and have seen the huge benefits to the industry that Microsoft has facilitated. The standard platforms that Microsoft has provided make it possible for my company to succeed against much larger competitors, by minimizing the advantages of size and drastically shortening the development cycle. Price of servers is coming down drastically due to the availability of Windows platforms and Microsoft databases. Compare the prices of Microsoft based servers with a Sun/Oracle of similar capability. And Microsoft hasn't lowered prices to gain share only to raise them later. You should be looking into Airline fare pricing for this abuse.

Give it a rest. Get out of the way of my business, you're hurting me.

Sam List
135 Bow Street
Unit 4
Portsmouth, NH 03801
603 436 1271

MTC-00011540

From: Nick Rosenstein

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:58pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 14, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

I decided to take time out of my schedule today to write to you concerning the importance of the recent U.S. vs. Microsoft settlement. The settlement will benefit consumers and the public interest, and therefore no further action should be taken against Microsoft.

Although there are some terms in the settlement which I feel go too far and would not accept, I understand Microsoft's desire to wrap this suit up and move forward. The settlement itself is strong, requiring, for example, Microsoft to possibly disclose intellectual property rights. This could arise if a third party wants to exercise its settlement options. If it is determined that doing so would infringe on a Microsoft intellectual property right, Microsoft will provide the third party with a license to the necessary intellectual property. The settlement actually supercedes Microsoft's property rights. Further, compliance with these terms will be enforced in part by a Technical Committee to be created under the settlement.

This agreement gives Microsoft the freedom to focus exclusively on what they do best, that is, developing new and advanced technology that consumers like myself have come to expect, whether it is at home or work.

Sincerely,

Nick Rosenstein, Ph.D.

President

IPN Interactive Payer Network

Please visit us on www.InterPayNet.com

Interactive Payer Network

Landerbrook Corporate Center

5910 Landerbrook Drive, Suite 110

Cleveland, Ohio 44124

voice 440-720-0700, x201

fax 440-720-0702

mailto:nick.rosenstein@interpaynet.com

MTC-00011541

From: Robert Gibson

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 1:55pm

Subject: Get it done!

Justice delayed is justice denied. Microsoft was denied presenting any evidence before the court ..that's not justice. Having the judge making public comment while the case is in progress. That's not justice. Asking competitors to set penalties. That's not justice. How pathetic does it get?

Even more pathetic as this bunch of has been envious companies hate Microsoft so much that in a bid to line their own pockets with their ill gotten gain they will even go so far as to deny American school kids computers.

It's not about justice is it. It's just plain envy and hate of a rich but generous man who gave \$17B to charity last year. YOU HAVE NO SHAME!!

Thank you

Robert John Gibson

Senior Systems Eng, B Eng, NNCDE

Network Engineering

Ph 919 992 5072 ESN 352

MTC-00011542

From: Randy Pelham

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:56pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have followed with interest the antitrust case against Microsoft. It disturbs me that the government will spend millions of dollars of taxpayer money on witch hunts. It is obvious that the government has selectively chosen Microsoft in this matter. Why not AOL? If the government is going to take action against those companies which strive to improve their product for the good of the public, then our whole economy will eventually stagnate from the lack of creativity. I back any settlement that will stop the waste of taxpayer money.

MTC-00011543

From: Elizabeth M(00E9)nard

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:57pm

Subject: Settlement

I honestly believe that this case has dangerously harmed the US and the Canadian economy. If the whole world has a computer on their desk today it is because of company like Microsoft who did deliver affordable software available everywhere. It is not a Microsoft illegal issue but a market demand issue! Their revenue is customer driven! We like it we buy it ! No one is twisting the customer's arms.

Today I can send this message instantly because of Microsoft and their developers all over the world. This case is all about politics not about consumers. Now days everyone can install what ever software they want! It doesn't always have to be a Microsoft product but if it is easier to use and cheaper to buy than let it be a Microsoft product. They deserve it! because they always had the product we needed!

Elizabeth Minard

Canadian citizen

a 20 year old Microsoft Product user

MTC-00011544

From: Stephen Quinn

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 1:56pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

PLEASE just settle this case. It has gone on far too long, it is out of date at this point.

S. Quinn

MTC-00011545

From: Mike Fowler

To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'

Date: 1/15/02 1:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I continue to watch with much curiosity the on-going dilemma between various states and the DOJ regarding the above class action suit and as always, try to follow the money. Of all the class-action suits that I have been aware of or had the unfortunate experience to have been part and party, the only individuals or business who profited were attorneys and accounting groups. It appears to me that because there have been no other companies who have been able to develop programs that are both functionally and price competitive with Microsoft's programs, it appears that these remaining states are simply holding out for money to fill their coffers.

Our organization is a medium size business with approximately 200 personnel and we have used and relied on Microsoft products for more than 5 years and have been extremely satisfied with their products and services.

It would be much simpler if these states would just cut to the chase and tell Microsoft how much money they want so that this suit can finally end once and for all. No individual I have spoken to who uses Microsoft products has any idea that they will receive or have ever received any compensation from a class-action suit. Individually one person (if they can verify they purchased a piece of software) will receive only a small return of monies from a suit of this sort. On the other hand, the attorneys are likely to receive millions, tens of millions or more from a settlement. For the most part, the only people interested in this suit (especially since 9/11/2001) are those states who stand to gain millions for their state coffers....I think they care little or nothing about individuals or businesses.

Settle this stupid suit and let's get on with more important matters (such as the obvious fraud associated with the fall of Enron—some blame needs to be laid on investment companies who follow and report on these types of companies and continue to encourage investors to buy their stocks, Arthur Anderson, and those executives who led people astray while dumping their own stock). It's time to move on.

Michael B. Fowler
V.P. Finance/Administration
Rogers & Brown Custom Brokers, Inc.
P.O. Box 20160
Charleston, SC 29413

MTC-00011546

From: Andrew Coupe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:57pm
Subject: Letter of comment on the Microsoft Litigation

Andrew Coupe
14 Middlebridge Court
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906
January 13, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing you today to express my opinion in regards to the Microsoft settlement issue. I am a Microsoft supporter and have been active in informing my state government of Maryland on my views. I feel this issue has drawn on long enough, and I was relieved to hear that Maryland had settled and dropped its lawsuit against Microsoft. I am extremely anxious to see this dispute resolved at the federal level.

Microsoft is a company that has done much to impact our society. Because of Microsoft, we reap the benefits of computer technology in our daily lives. This settlement will end three years of litigation and will allow Microsoft to continue focusing its energy on innovative design. This settlement was reached after extensive negotiations and is complete. Microsoft will now agree to share sensitive information about Windows with its competitors.

I find it particularly disturbing that the remaining states in the lawsuit are all homes to Microsoft competitors. It is my understanding, that the Tunney act was designed to protect consumers not corporations. It appears that Oracle, Novell, Sun Microsystems, and others are using state legislators to further their own agenda under the guise of "protecting consumers". It is ironic that state legislators are pursuing Microsoft for overcharging consumers while Sun and IBM continue to sell competing products at significantly higher prices.

During these difficult economic times, it would serve in the best public interest to stop wasting precious resources on litigation against Microsoft and allow this company to get back to business. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,
Andrew Coupe

MTC-00011547

From: Genie Morrison
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To The Folks At DOJ:

This has gone on long enough.

While I appreciate your efforts to reach a fair and equitable settlement for all American businesses and Americans, it is time for action. Settle, and let's move on.

Where is the outcry from DOJ when... Only 2 meat packers control nearly all of the food supply, here in the US? Only 3 major confectioners; Hershey, Mars, and Nestle control most chocolate/candy? Only 1 satellite TV company will control the entire US satellite TV market? Only 2 (major) food service distributors for restaurants in the US? Only 3 companies control air conditioning/furnace (HVAC) manufacturing? The list goes on and on...

We Americans will not need a DOJ if Alan Greenspan lowers interest rates again. Heck, the big companies will borrow money (so they can buyout small, competing companies), Americans will lose their jobs, and soon—a handful of companies will control EVERYTHING in America.

Nice picture? Get this settlement over with. You have many more important issues to tackle. Software giants of today, can fall tomorrow. Who thought IBM would be brought to their knees—by Microsoft?

Kindest Regards,
Genie Morrison

MTC-00011548

From: Richard Spooner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DoJ

I support the proposed antitrust settlement which reasonably punishes the wrong-doing found by the court and allows all concerned to move on. Users worldwide need the common standard Microsoft supplies. Please don't handicap the US economy by delaying settlement now.

Yours
Richard Spooner

MTC-00011549

From: Esmarrin@aol.com@ inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:

I support Microsoft in its attempt to innovate. Microsoft has probably done more to move this country forward than any other company. There attempt to be a leader has caused other companies to take notice and because they haven't been as successful they cry foul. Microsoft Corp. should be an example for other companies. No matter what Microsoft does to settle this lawsuit people are not happy. These people, especially the schools, are in it for the money. I would suggest finding some real criminals to bring to justice and leave Microsoft alone and free to innovate.

MTC-00011550

From: kamran mortezavi
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to close this case and move on to more important issues that are effecting our lives to day. My vote is for the settlement.

Kamran Mortezaavi
(301) 340-2669 (home)
(301) 762-9126 (home Fax)

MTC-00011551

From: Tom Berry
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To all whom these presents shall come,
Greetings.

(Is that how it's usually put??)

Having reviewed the documents related to this case, please let me offer the opinion that they are a good start, yet insufficient to prevent monopoly abuse on the part of Microsoft (as they have demonstrated in the past; cf. the December 17, 1997 contempt motion). Further, let me suggest an additional remedy that should lessen the probability of such occurrences while remaining consistent with Microsoft's own claims of its innovative prowess. As you will recall, in the early phases of these trials, Microsoft chose to paint the picture that the case was about freedom to innovate. I believe my (admittedly partial) solution leaves them free to innovate and reap the benefits of any true innovation.

The remainder of this email speaks to Paragraphs 36 and 37 of the original complaint, which are:

36. Neither the antitrust laws nor this action seeks to inhibit Microsoft from competing on the merits by innovation or otherwise. Rather, the Complaint challenges only Microsoft's concerted attempts to maintain its monopoly in operating systems and to achieve dominance in other markets, not by innovation and other competition on the merits, but by tie-ins, exclusive dealing contracts, and other anticompetitive agreements that deter innovation, exclude competition, and rob customers of their right to choose among competing alternatives.

37. Microsoft's conduct adversely affects innovation, including by:
a. impairing the incentive of Microsoft's competitors and potential competitors to

undertake research and development, because they know that Microsoft will be able to limit the rewards from any resulting innovation;

b. impairing the ability of Microsoft's competitors and potential competitors to obtain financing for research and development;

c. inhibiting Microsoft's competitors that nevertheless succeed in developing promising innovations from effectively marketing their improved products to customers;

d. reducing the incentive and ability of OEMs to innovate and differentiate their products in ways that would appeal to customers; and

e. reducing competition and the spur to innovation by Microsoft and others that only competition can provide.

Microsoft has in the past established a particular *modus operandi*, to wit:

1) A potential competitor will develop an innovative product with the potential of material impact in the middleware arena.

2) Microsoft will purchase, license, steal and reimplement the concepts of the product, or simply infringe patents to incorporate the competitive technology into its own product offerings. In the case of simply stealing someone's idea (e.g. Web browsers), Microsoft's operating system dominance then nearly guarantees the overtaking and ownership of the new technology's market. (If you would have evidence of this kind of behavior, especially my infringement accusation, let me suggest that some of the lawsuits brought against Microsoft whose records have been sealed be unsealed. Those cases that Microsoft wants left sealed the most will, I am sure, provide the richest examples.)

3) The threat being neutralized, Microsoft will cease any meaningful "innovation" and begin developing minor feature enhancements designed to drive revenue to Microsoft rather than provide value to consumers. (Witness the release of Word 6 on the Macintosh, which actually ran slower than its predecessor. This flaw was only corrected after massive publicity began to reflect poorly on Microsoft.)

However, the current settlement, especially the paragraphs: "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.

This Section does not apply to any agreements in which Microsoft licenses intellectual property in from a third party; does not address the behavior I have described, where Microsoft essentially stifles innovation while claiming to be innovative.

Let me propose the following additions to the settlement:

Microsoft be prohibited from acquiring (or making a future agreement to acquire) any

company or company's product, or purchasing anything more than non-exclusive redistribution rights to another company's individual product, for seven years. Also, they would be prohibited from making investments greater than, say, \$20M in any company.

Microsoft could not possess copies of the source code for any software product not developed in-house, even under license. The actions of any company in which it made investments could not be restricted by Microsoft in any way, shape, or form. Microsoft be prohibited from implementing technologies developed at any other company unless they adequately license someone else's patent. (I'd suggest a guideline of "adequacy" could be established, perhaps 3% of the product's gross revenues.) Possibly companies or individuals could also register their own innovations with an office of the Technical Committee (*not* located in Redmond). (Given that the Technical Committee will be on Microsoft's campus we have to assume that Microsoft would be able to read any database kept on its premises.) While this appears to duplicate the efforts of the US Patent and Trademark Office, the Technical Committee's innovation database could probably be updated more easily and would allow for the registration of product concepts, again the chief example being web browsers (registration would require the presence of a working prototype, of course). This does not constrain Microsoft from developing its own patents or ideas, indeed, it should encourage such "innovation".

Further, if Microsoft is found guilty in (or settles) a suit of patent or innovation infringement filed (not necessarily resolved) during the period of enforcement (listed as 5 years in the Settlement document, though I would suggest increasing this term to 7 years), punitive penalties should be 30-fold the original judgement or settlement (not the mere 3 times that I believe current law allows).

I believe that these additions to the settlements will encourage true innovative behavior on Microsoft's part to the benefit of the consumer. I recognize that these provisos flirt with restraint of trade. However, Microsoft has flouted the law without adequate recompense to date, and I believe an extraordinary remedy is in order.

Best Regards,
Thomas Berry
Galileo Systems, LLC
408-296-5223
CC:microsoftcomments@
doj.ca.gov@inetgw, ROBERT.RIGSBY@...

MTC-00011552

From: Dixie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 1:57pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Truly this has gone far enough. With all that is happening in the world I would think it is time to move on and let Microsoft run their business and end this long drawn out lawsuit. The settlement terms Microsoft offered are in my opinion more than fair, in the interest of "right" end this nonsense now.

Sincerely

Mary D. Pintler
Dixie Pintler
bobndix@oz.net

MTC-00011553

From: Ron Samford
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:00pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Let's get this settled and move on; it's time to free Microsoft from the burdens of this litigation and get the DOJ focused on more pressing needs. Microsoft has recognized it's not infallible in this issue. All objectives have been met in large measure on both sides. Settle it now, please.

MTC-00011554

From: Bakstran
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern

This email is to let you know my feelings on the proposed Microsoft settlement. I am a Massachusetts resident and do not agree with our Attorney General who has decided not to abide by the proposed settlement. I believe the settlement is fair and is certainly in the best interest of the consumers of the US. Microsoft has provided so much to us in the area of technology improvements and price/performance of their software. I look forward to their innovations in 2002 and beyond.

Sincerely
Annette Bakstran
20 Baker Road
Berlin, MA 01503

MTC-00011555

From: George Huey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is becoming increasingly clear that the case against Microsoft is not only against Microsoft but against the American people as well. The hate spewed forth by AOL, Sun and Oracle is disgusting and I find it hard to believe that our justice system would side with such companies. Our economy is in the toilet and it needs everything it can get it to rebound (like getting off of Microsoft's back). It is an interesting note that our economy didn't start to decline until the government attacked Microsoft. If DOJ is really interested in helping the American people, it will stop listening to the Microsoft bashers (AOL, Sun and Oracle) and think about what is good for the American people. If anything, I would like an inquiry into how the government justice system can take sides with companies such as AOL, Sun and Oracle when it is clear that none of these companies give a flying goose about the welfare of the American people. Anyway, this madness needs to stop. If AOL, Sun and Oracle want to compete, tell them to lower their prices and become competitive with Microsoft, not have the government destroy Microsoft so that they won't have to provide better products. Also, I resent the fact that the government and Microsoft's competitors think that the American public is so stupid that they can't make a choice on what software they want to run on their systems. If I want to run AOL

or use an Oracle database, I will do so. Microsoft has never forced me to use their products. I am very happy with Microsoft and their struggle to make the computer user experience easy. I believe that Microsoft is working for the people not against the people like its competitors. Any politician that fights against Microsoft will lose my vote. It is time for the American justice system to get out of bed with AOL, Sun, and Oracle and think about what is good for the people not what is good for Microsoft's competitors. Please stop trying to destroy Microsoft. It is not good for the economy or the American people.

Yours truly,
An American citizen,
George Huey

MTC-00011557

From: Chris (038) Marcia Wood
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:01am
Subject: MS

Whatever decision is made, I believe the ease of use by the general public is the overwhelming issue. Standardization is very important. I really don't care what the standardization is except that it should be in the user realm, not some companies agenda. I do believe that the market place will take care of 99% of all issues. I dread the government's involvement. Sometimes elected officials get involved when they shouldn't and sometimes they don't get involved when they should. I think the economy of the US is much better served by Congress when they listen to the public as opposed to a few companies which failed in their technology and or marketing.

Chris Wood
1155 Victoria Falls Dr
Redmond, OR 97756
541-504-9358

MTC-00011558

From: ML Kuzma
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 1:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
ML Kuzma
77 Worth Ave
Hamden, CT 06518
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice—Antitrust
Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Marie Kuzma

MTC-00011560

From: Mathur, Ashok N.
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Its about time we settled Microsoft case. With the current economy any dragging of the case can only hurt the cause of recovery.

MTC-00011561

From: Barline, John
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am an attorney, Republican, active citizen, consumer of computer hardware and software and daily computer user. I am writing to advise that it is my belief that the Microsoft litigation needs to be settled and not further litigated. The very software that I am using is a result of the good work that Microsoft has done and is doing. I feel that to litigate this matter further is a giant waste of the taxpayers' money, the government's time, and would unnecessarily prolong this process. Let's get on with doing things that benefit the country, instead of penalizing a company that has only benefited the US in the world and all of us citizens.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

John D. Barline
Williams, Kastner & Gibbs PLLC
1301 A Street, Suite 900
Tacoma, WA 98402-4200
Phone (253) 593-5620
Fax (253) 593-5625
email: jbarline@wkg.com

MTC-00011562

From: Bob Walters
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Anti-Trust Case

Time to stop this madness. These attacks on our American Companies are the main reason our economy and stock markets are in the dumps. Time to get the lawyers out of Washington's Federal Justice Department and get back to business.

Bob Walters
Placerville, CA

MTC-00011563

From: Academy of Music Northwest
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs,

Too many lawyers are trying to build a career out of this issue. The terms are fair, reasonable, logical, and good for everyone,

except lawyers and malcontents. Let's get on with this settlement NOW.

Thank you,
Dee Wells,
VP Finance and Admin.
Academy of Music Northwest
425 778 7711

MTC-00011564

From: Jimm Butler
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With all due respect, I have never seen a sorrier excuse as the one where thousands of mostly lower income children loose the opportunity to learn from new resources valued in the billion(s) because of the way antitrust laws are being construed. Why not just require Microsoft to fund, at whatever amount prescribed, the school's choice of computer systems, Microsoft based or otherwise?

MTC-00011565

From: Rod Trent
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:06pm
Subject: Anti-Trust case. . .

The length of time it is taking to reach a settlement in the Microsoft case is horrible. The government has already created a very good settlement, and the states not accepting this settlement are keeping the country and economy from recovering from 9/11. Let Microsoft get back to work and keep making products that provide jobs and economic and market value.

This case is no longer for the benefit of the consumer. Consumers aren't even on some of these panels that the government has allowed. Bringing folks from AOL, Sun, and NetScape into the mix only shows that this case has nothing to do with the consumer. AOL, Sun, and NetScape, specifically need to get to work and just create competing products. Microsoft has never stopped these companies from bearing down and just trying to create better products. They have stopped themselves, and in doing so, have only stopped to whine and cry. You can't compete, if you don't even try to compete. Its like me crying to my mom, asking her to tear up my friend's picture, because he's a better artist than I am. And, when I'm older and find I still have no artistic talent, do I ask the government to burn every piece of artwork in the world because it makes me uncomfortable?

AOL for one, should be under the gun for anti-trust issues. I speak to consumers every day, and the majority of them can't understand how a company like AOL has not entered into any kind of litigation, but Microsoft is forced to be beat on by companies who give as much money to the government as Enron.

If it weren't for Microsoft, these companies would have no one to compete with. From this you can see that Microsoft and its products actually spur competition. They raise the bar, forcing companies to either compete or succumb. What US loyalist can't see that as the American way?

Rod Trent
Microsoft.MVP.SMS

MTC-00011566

From: LMi3280257@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 PLEASE APPROVE THIS SETTLEMENT.
 GET THIS THING BEHIND ALL OF US.
 Luana Miller
 San Rafael, Ca.

MTC-00011567

From: Thorbz@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:08pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 Please do not allow bickering between businesses to deprive the schools and children to benefit from advancing and keeping up with technology that they cannot afford by themselves.

I believe schools and our well-informed future citizens will be able to make intelligent and informed choices in the future.

LT

MTC-00011568

From: Jody Varner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Judge,
 My name is Jody Anne Varner and I serve as the Executive Director of Hope Unlimited International and like most professionals, use MicroSoft products daily.

I do not agree with the Proposed Final Judgment that you are considering. I implore you to cause MicroSoft to have to play by the same rules all others do. Please do not let this PFJ stand.

Sincerely,
 Jody Anne Varner
 Executive Director
 Hope Unlimited International
 415-438-3350

MTC-00011569

From: Stan Young
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Justice Department Members:
 I write to you to encourage you to accept the settlement proposed by Microsoft. I believe it is fair and putting this affair behind us will be an important step towards getting our high-tech economy back in productive mode. This will help us here in California as it will help the rest of the nation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stan & Susan Young
 19903 Summit Drive
 Topanga, CA 90290

MTC-00011570

From: Jack Lawyer
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 2:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft support

I fully support the Microsoft's position in the anti-trust case. The settlement agreed to with the Federal Government is just and fair. I believe that the states that did not settle are profoundly influenced by their corporate constituencies who are motivated by

competition. They are only out to feather their own nests at Microsoft's expense. John W. Lawyer

MTC-00011571

From: Johanna Seth
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:11pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 I have read the recommended documents. I am in favor of settlement under the present terms.

Johanna Seth
 14860-16 Summerlin Woods
 Fort Myers, FL 33919
 941-481-3751

MTC-00011572

From: Jack Richins
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:11pm
 Subject: Comments on the proposed United States v. Microsoft Settlement

After reading the proposed settlement, I am strongly in favor of this settlement. It is fair, rights the wrongs done, and prevents future occurrences. This settlement will help end this case, which has gone on long enough to detriment of the consumers. Quickly accepting this settlement will benefit consumers with a more open market with greater innovation and greater competition. And that is the purpose of this entire case, is it not?

Sincerely,
 Jack Richins

MTC-00011573

From: George Howell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The proposed settlement is a farce. A company has been found to be a monopoly, and one that abuses the situation. The proposed settlement will strengthen the monopoly, and allow further abuse of the power. In addition, the marginal cost to Microsoft to implement this remedy are essentially zero.

A far more rational plan is that suggested by Bob Young of Red Hat Inc, wherein Microsoft pays for hardware, and the software is provided by a free software vendor.

A third potential, and one that I advocate is to modify the current proposal to have some real teeth. First, Microsoft should have to provide cash and/or staff members in dollar amounts annually to equal the retail price of the software it is donating. Many studies indicate that post sale support is the largest factor in computer purchases. Saddling schools with machines and no support is worse than doing nothing. Money better spent on books, etc. will be directed to computer support. Let Microsoft pay for on site personnel. This makes the computers of more use to the schools, and also imposes true monetary penalties for their actions.

Second, this must not be a one-time deal. The computers and software must be replaced on a three year schedule (common in all industries with computer equipment) and the support staff must be on site for the entire three year period.

Finally, to avoid this being simply a three year slap on the wrist, the upgrade cycle should be financed by Microsoft indefinitely. When they cease to support this program, they should be required to develop a new remedy. In other words, this only buys them time. In addition, the amount should be adjusted by the rate of inflation as determined by the GAO or some other independent body.

This proposal will not eliminate the monopoly; it is unlikely that anything will. On the other hand, it will force Microsoft to pay for the pleasure. Also, some might view this as too harsh, being indefinite in nature. The money illegally earned by Microsoft will compound year after year unless there is a monetary penalty sufficient to eliminate their advantage. This plan modification that I suggest would make sure that Microsoft would not be able to take advantage of investments made with illegally gotten wealth. The only other possibility to prevent this is to impose massive cash payments to the respective governments and other plaintiffs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

George Howell
 ghowell@familyhealthcarepa.com

MTC-00011574

From: Casey Clan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:09pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This misguided action by our government(s) should have ended long ago. As a litigation support specialist for Price Waterhouse, I participated in the last High Tech witch hunt by the DOJ against IBM (with Memorex' help). What a joke! We don't need protection from Microsoft, we need protection from our government! Let us decide ourselves whether to buy Microsoft's products, and then buy stock in the company if we think their profits are excessive. Why don't you guys go find some real criminals.

Please settle this monkey business as soon as possible.

Kevin Casey

MTC-00011575

From: Ron and Jan Miller
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:10pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the Microsoft case should be settled. What better way to have something positive comes out of this. Just think of how many children's lives could be changed if they had access to a computer. One billion in funding, software and training would make a huge difference in our classroom for the better. Just my opinion, for what it is worth. I am a grandmother with several grandchildren in grade school. Sure would like that benefit for them.

Sincerely,
 Jan Miller

MTC-00011576

From: David Sagerian
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:12pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

As a consumer, I am appalled at the manner with which nine states are stretching this incredibly convoluted issue further. I am a California resident and consider the state's actions counterproductive and not representative of my intents and wishes and I speak for many who share the same thoughts.

There has been enormous damage to the consumer out of these lawsuits. Much more than the alleged harm they are trying presumably to correct? Time to call it a lawsuit and MOVE ON!!!!!!

David Sagherian
Glendale California

MTC-00011577

From: Pierce, Jeff
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To the court:

I strongly agree that the Government should accept the proposed settlement terms and get the Microsoft case resolved without further litigation. The lawsuit is clearly Microsoft's competitors' attempt to injure, harm, distract, and frivolously litigate a successful, tough American company.

Please remember the following facts as you consider settlement:

1) The initial lawsuits were filed after lobbying by Microsoft competitors— not by citizen groups. Read Lawyer Reeback's history.

2) Microsoft is a monopoly in their own product and can modify it as they like. They can expand and add functionality to their products just like their vociferous competitors do—Oracle and SUN being two of the primary agitators.

3) There is plenty of choice for all technologists. Within the information industry, I count just four competitor's revenues (IBM/SUN/ORACLE/APPLE) at well over \$100 Billion dollars in just these four named companies. They should develop and market technologies that compete on their merits. I don't see Microsoft getting the state of Washington to sue IBM for their monopoly on IBM mainframes—AND PREDATORY MAINFRAME SOFTWARE PRICING PRACTICES THAT ARE WELL DOCUMENTED IN THE INDUSTRY. Why not? People look at "disruptive technology choices" that accomplish business goals by choosing from a myriad of other products that accomplish their goals. .

NO CONSUMER HARM

The biggest legal issue was supposed to be consumer harm. In all the documents I read on this court case, I have yet to see quantified or estimated damages to consumers. In fact, maybe consumers should PAY MICROSOFT for adding valuable features at no charge into their products— features they could otherwise pay for to "competitors".

The average selling price of PC hardware combined with Microsoft software has fallen probably 66% since I have professionally sold computers and networks for a living. Again, a CONSUMER BENEFIT due to Microsoft.

Final Note: I understand some company called Apple Computer makes an electronic box without Microsoft software; such box is

able to mimic functionality provided by Microsoft powered hardware. Consumers can order this box today, immediately, on the Internet and never have to buy Microsoft. Easy to choose alternatives, isn't it?

STATES GOVERNMENTS ARE LACKEYS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS

I am extremely disturbed by states suing on behalf of business competitors. As pointed out, there is no consumer harm—just business competition through the natural competitiveness of the technology industry. The states that choose not to settle should have some fairly well defined precedents set by the current agreement proposal between the Govt/Settling States and Microsoft. Precedents that will stop their continued foolishness in this lawsuit.

Regards,
Jeff Pierce
16 Jesse Dr
Mercerville, NJ 08619
609-584-8621
jeff@pierce.net
CC:'jeff(a)pierce.net'

MTC-00011578

From: Hal Kenyon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern,

I own Kenyon Drafting & Design and use many Microsoft products. Microsoft is a great company!

I want the settlement to benefit Microsoft as much as possible. The more we penalize Microsoft, the more we have to pay for their products & services (which are excellent quality).

Sincerely,
Hal Kenyon
www.kenyondrafting.com

MTC-00011579

From: jane mcguigan
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I cannot understand the reason these states are objecting to the settlement. The taxpayers of the US have wasted enough money with the Microsoft case. I am more that satisfied with the results of the settlement. Let Microsoft get back to their business. I am a user of MS products and a shareholder in the company They have complied over and above.

MTC-00011580

From: Tuttle,Dino M
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:15pm
Subject: Settlement

A quien corresponda:

I think the US government should get it's hands off Microsoft and give them an apology. Why punish a company for succeeding. If we didn't like the product, we'd buy Apple.

Dino Tuttle
Box 3169
Alamo, TX 78516

MTC-00011581

From: Peggy
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 2:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would personally like to comment upon the Microsoft antitrust settlement. It certainly "could" discourage people from striking out on their own and striving to be the best. I personally object to the whole antitrust case with Microsoft. As Americans we should be able to grow our business as much as possible. I am a small company, but certainly feel that "if" I were to become a LARGE company I would feel threatened by government because of this particular antitrust case going on today. I think Americans should be free, with no interference from government—unless fraud is going on - and I do not think it is with Microsoft. They have great products, and because they have developed something of far superior quality to other companies, they are being stifled and punished. I truly do believe it is a crime—and the results of some poor losers' attempts to discredit someone that did better in their plans, production and products, than they.

Thank you,
Peggy Page, 13525 N. Lon Adams Road,
Marana, Arizona 85653—520-682-4326

MTC-00011582

From: George Burch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:17pm
Subject: Microsoft—a consumer viewpoint

This is just another typical pissing away of the public's money. Microsoft has done nothing wrong. It only happens that the competition is not willing to dig into their pockets to play and the DOJ and the Congress saw it as an opportunity to look like they give a shit about the public. Fact: If I owned the concession on air, to get it you would have to pay. It is called capitalism. Press on with your inane exercise. It is why you guys work for the government. You would not last a second in the real world.

George
CC:Nightly@NBC.COM@inetgw

MTC-00011583

From: Runnerjo@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:20pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

We need to thank Bill Gates and Microsoft for what they have done for this country and technology instead of suing him. Where would we be without Microsoft and computers?

We live in America to have the freedom to innovate and make discoveries that will benefit Americans. One of our freedoms is capitalism. When a man and his company is successful, do we then sue him and try to take his rights away as an American. We need to end these lawsuits now and give Microsoft the freedom it deserves to invent new products that help us all in business and in schools.

Joanne Leonard
Hollywood, Florida

MTC-00011584

From: laura
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:20pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The consumers have not been hurt by Microsoft. The nine states pursuing the suit against Microsoft are representing competitors-not consumers. The settlement with the government should have brought this matter to close.

Paul Stout

MTC-00011585

From: Jmahamaker@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:20pm
Subject: Priorities

I urge that the government close its case against Microsoft and concentrate on matters of more importance to the American people than persecuting a company which is more responsible that most entities in this country (private or governmental) for the 90's booming economy.

Joan Hamaker

MTC-00011586

From: BranTayDes@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

With the uncertainty of the economy, the Microsoft suit demands closure so we can all get back to normal. Please move this case to a conclusion.

Robert Hines, San Diego, CA

MTC-00011587

From: Stephen Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I almost don't care how you settle this Microsoft case, but please settle it.

Seriously, this has been going on for far too long.

Stephen Quinn, Test Mgr

"The more I want to get something done, the less I call it work."—R. Bach <<http://www.ag.wastholm.net/author/Ashleigh—Brilliant>>.NET Enterprise Server, SQL Business Intelligence

Office Phone: 425.703.5351, Cell Phone: 425.829.3727

MTC-00011588

From: MaurKilleen@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I was very disappointed to learn that US District Judge J. Fredrick Motz rejected a settlement that would have resolved the class-action lawsuits filed against Microsoft.

Enough is enough! First we had an incompetent and obviously biased Judge Penfield and now this. We are still reeling from the attack of 9/11. Our country is at war, our economy in a shambles, thousands of citizens are out of work and thousands more will shortly join them. I thought Microsoft made a great offer that would have benefited the company, the country and the underprivileged but apparently there are those who are hell bent on destroying a great company, major employer and generous benefactor.

Could it be that the goal is to transfer more of our business to Asia or is it to pander to the incompetent and jealous competition here at home? In the interest of all concerned,

it is time to settle this case for once and for all.

Then we can direct all of our legal resources and skills towards salvaging the savings, pensions and jobs of the unfortunate citizens ravaged in the horrific, real and major scandal now at hand:-Enron.

Very truly yours,
Maureen J. Killeen

MTC-00011589

From: Dave Garvie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please, let's settle the Microsoft case, and let them get back to business.

Dave Garvie

MTC-00011590

From: mookie1173
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:25pm
Subject: To Whom It May Concern:

To Whom It May Concern:

I feel the lawsuit against Microsoft should not be allowed to continue. I feel the current set of measures agreed to by Microsoft and the Department of Justice are sufficient and to continue litigation will unnecessarily prolong this country's current economic problems. I feel the final outcome will be the same anyway since the current set of sanctions are fair and reasonable. I feel that this litigation has undermined this country's faith in the future of the entire technology sector. It has done much more harm than any transgressions ever made by Microsoft. I am glad that this happened, but I think it's now time to move on. I hope we will soon be able to put this situation behind us. I'm sure there are many other more constructive ways to use the court's time.

Sincerely,
Mark Hamblin

MTC-00011591

From: ESKIMOPUP@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:25pm
Subject: Microsoft

Please settle the case with Microsoft quickly and in a fair manner so that Microsoft and our economy are not hurt further.

MTC-00011592

From: Ben Trevathan Allied Worldwide
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As a Microsoft shareholder (as well as an owner of shares in most of Microsoft's major competitors), I would like to exercise my right to comment on the proposed settlement. Other than my ownership of shares and my use of Microsoft products, I derive no benefit, directly or indirectly, from Microsoft and am not employed in the technology industry.

The prior administration commenced an action against Microsoft that was not sought by the marketplace. The destructive impact of this course of action has been aptly chronicled by the evaporation of tens of billions of shareholder wealth, not just at Microsoft, but among its competitors as well.

Microsoft enjoys its current market position not because of any nefarious plot, but directly as the result of providing a valuable product that the consumer has chosen freely and often. As was the case with IBM in the 1970's, no company—especially one that is competing in an arena in which innovation today can render last year's necessity obsolete—can enjoy a monopoly without the intervention of government. It is cruel irony that it is the intervention of government which now punishes a company victorious in the free and unfettered technology marketplace in order to enrich competitors whose success came not from that marketplace but from generously opening their wallets to Washington influence.

The current administration has the opportunity to return the nation - at least in this one instance—to a path in which freedom and innovation are rewarded and success or failure are determined by the people who participate in the market, not by the purchased power of government for sale to the highest bidder. As has always been the case, the path of freedom requires courage in the face of determined opposition. For the several years that this action has been pursued, we have as a nation followed a dark and dangerous course designed to overturn a verdict rendered collectively by the people. It is a dynamic verdict that is subject to change at any moment. But it is the people, voting daily in a free marketplace, and not the government who must either affirm or cast aside that verdict. History has demonstrated repeatedly and unanimously that when governments intercede to force their will upon the marketplace, the price borne by the people is significant. The Department of Justice should support the settlement of its action against Microsoft. It is the first step back onto the correct path—a path determined anew everyday by the people, not set by the government.

Ben Trevathan
Business Executive
MBA University of Chicago

MTC-00011593

From: sdavis15@csc.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

I am sending this note to express my concern for the proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft, The provisions of the agreement are tough, reasonable, fair to all parties involved, and go beyond the findings of Court of Appeals ruling. The settlement is good for consumer and the American economy. We need to move beyond this litigation. As a country we have more important thing to deal with like national security and America economy.

I urge you to settle this case with Microsoft which is the best interest for this country at this time.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,
Stephanie Davis

MTC-00011594

From: Clyde Tatman
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 2:25pm
Subject: micosoft settlement

This has gone on long enough. I believe MS is being sued because it is large and successful. Since the Fed. has initiated a suit the states should keep their nose or collective noses out of it.

MTC-00011595

From: Minder, Stephen
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It seems that the USA needs to get the Microsoft case behind us. Please urge the parties to agree to a settlement that allows competition, but also allows one of America's most important strategic companies to continue to operate.

Stephen W. Minder

MTC-00011596

From: Bob Sanborn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to get this litigation behind us. I believe the proposed settlement is fair and just. As a citizen I would like to get this behind us for the good of the country. Please settle this as soon as possible and avoid any further litigation.

Robert W. Sanborn
5406 W. University Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75209
214-352-9630

MTC-00011597

From: H. G. Bare
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please be advised that I strenuously object to any and all further litigation against Micro\$oft in regard to delaying the proposed settlement. I especially object on the grounds that, as a Massachusetts resident, I am now forced to see my state tax dollars spent on useless pursuit of political gain for the incumbent Attorney General, who is only interested in getting free TV air time, not my best interests.

Sincerely,
Heather G. Bare
265 Braley Hill Road
Rochester, MA 02770-1907
hgbare@neaccess.net

MTC-00011598

From: BLHartzell@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:
It is time to settle the Microsoft lawsuit, and stop litigating! The litigation is hurting the economy. The only beneficiaries of the litigation are the trial lawyers.

Sincerely,
Barton L. Hartzell
836 2nd. Ave., #302
Kirkland, WA. 98033

MTC-00011599

From: RICK MARCINIAK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:26pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case even if you increase the fine 100 million. So there are 9 states against the solution. That's pretty good out of 50 states. If that was the vote in Congress or the Senate it would be a no brainer. PLEASE, let's put this behind us.

Thank You
Rick Marciniak, 1065 Gator Trail, WPB, FL. 33409

MTC-00011600

From: CABAANANTE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir:
I strongly believe that the Microsoft case should be soon settled as proposed and all additional litigation discontinued.

Sincerely,
Carlos A. Baanante

MTC-00011601

From: Cleon Seguin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:31pm
Subject: litigation

The case against Microsoft is not about anti trust it is about the freedom of interprize to get ahead in a competitive maner. The states are only after a free ride in the development of new produces. Why should Microsoft have to give up there trade secrets anymore than General Motors. As for a monopoly how about the car companys You have to buy Ford parts to fix a ford car as well as the rest of the car companys. How about Boeing , they have 100% monopoly on airplanes. Microsoft has given a huge amount of settlement offer. Tell the states to go to hell and developpe there own products.

Cleon a Seguin
7814 s,112th, st. Seattle wa.
206 772 6798
seguin3d@earthlink.net

MTC-00011602

From: jason dennis
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:29pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern.
As a software engineer by trade, I wish to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement.

I would add that I'm not an employee or contracted to Microsoft and do not have shares in the company.

Whilst Microsoft may be guilty of bad practices, I feel that the settlement is fair. The company should not be broken up, nor should it be made to give up to another company the Windows or Office product. America is built on a freedom to make money by giving something the end-users want, if the end-user wants Microsoft then let them choose. Oracle complains but it's software is only used on high-end machines, how does it know what the end-user wants.

Please let the Microsoft settlement stand. So everyone can move forward, developing in a situation where you don't know if the company who's products you are using will be around in 6 months or they are changing to something different is very disheartening.

Regards,

Jason Dennis

MTC-00011603

From: Sean Callahan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe it is now time to settle the Microsoft anti-trust lawsuit, as well as, all the civil lawsuits. The company has been found guilty. Now please pick a punishment and let's move on. By dragging on the settlement talks, the only winners are the lawyers, not the consumers, which is suppose to be the intended winners. Please just pick a punishment and stop all the legal wrangling.

Thank you,
Sean Callahan
Gilbert, AZ

MTC-00011604

From: BOB KADECHKA
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:29pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
PLEASE DROP THIS MATTER!

MTC-00011605

From: Paul Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement 1055
Doylestown Pike<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" /> Quakertown, PA
18951 January 13, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:
I have used Microsoft products for 12 years. Microsoft software is one of the few things in America that works well. It makes my job easier. All the Microsoft products work well together as it should be. As a concerned citizen of this great nation, I am writing to voice my opinions on the settlement, which has been reached in the three-year antitrust case against Microsoft. It pleases me to know that a settlement has been reached by the all of the parties involved.

Microsoft will not be getting off easy, as others would lead you to believe. The company has agreed to document and disclose for use by its competitors various interfaces that are internal to Windows operating system products. This is a first in an antitrust settlement

Also, Microsoft has agreed not to retaliate against software or hardware developers who develop or promote software that competes with Windows or that run on software that competes with Windows.

Please let Microsoft alone. It isn't broke don't try to fix them. I ask that no more action be taken on the Federal level against Microsoft. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Paul Johnston
cc: Senator Rick Santorum
Paul A. Johnston
Asplundh
Quality Assurance
Phone: 215-784-1448
Email: pjohn@asplundh.com

MTC-00011606

From: Roland Pohlman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:33pm
 Subject: microsoft needs help

Please leave Microsoft alone to innovate and design new products for all of us! They have been punished enough. Thank you

MTC-00011607

From: Diane (038) Roland Freeman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft, like Ford, in the early 1900's, has done the world a favor, by establishing a standard that was very much needed to make everyone's computer system compatible and therefore useable, at a time when there was no other compatibility between users. For this, they should be punished? Only greedy, self seeking men would attempt to punish progress in the excepted American way of freedom to create and build in this great country. Long live the Henry Fords and Bill Gates of this world. HE.OR. Freeman

MTC-00011608

From: Jack Sheehan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The purpose of this communication is to express my opinion regarding the Microsoft settlement.

I believe that the original settlement should have been sufficient to end this matter and enable all of us to go back to work without the distraction of additional politically motivated harassment of the Microsoft Corporation. I am of the opinion that Microsoft offers for sale products that are generally superior to any others on the market, and that their prices are reasonable. Further, there are alternatives to these products and anyone wishing to avail themselves of other products has the freedom to do so. Having worked it's way through the minefields created by the Federal government, Microsoft is now being hounded by State Attorneys General who no doubt have visions of another "Tobacco Settlement" bonanza dancing in their heads, another crusade to fill the State coffers on the pretext of upholding the rights of the aggrieved "victims" of yet another greedy corporation. I ask that you bring this matter to an expeditions conclusion and save all of us money that will otherwise be wasted in further litigation. In the end it is the consumer who pays.

Thank you.

John J. Sheehan
 Jack Sheehan
 45 Lenor Drive
 Harwinton, CT 06791
 860-485-1260
 JLSheehan@att.net

MTC-00011609

From: Ellen
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:35pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer I would like to submit my views to you on the Microsoft Settlement

Case. I think this case has gone on much too long and it is time to resolve it for the benefit of the American people. It is time to move on.

I have been a consumer of Microsoft products for over a decade because I prefer Microsoft products. I am well aware that there are other software products that I could choose to use instead of Microsoft, i.e. Linux operating system instead of Windows, but I prefer Windows. So do many, many other consumers.

This case should be brought to a close as soon as possible.

Ellen Warren

MTC-00011610

From: Randy Hinrichs
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:34pm
 Subject: Response

The 9 remaining constituents that want to pursue litigation against Microsoft need to wake up! It is abominable that they would use the justice system to continue down the path of getting the government to help them with their competitive strategy. It seems that they are not going to be satisfied until Microsoft is so neutered that it is impossible for it to continue doing business in a way that helps the american economy and provides very decent business processes.

We begged for someone in the 80s to consolidate the various datasets and enable/empower the end user to be able to share data, work interoperably between mainframes, and bring sublime expertise into software, so we would be much less reliant upon individual software vendors to come in with their consultants, their MIS directors, etc. to help us build a simple spreadsheet, or document management environment. So, Microsoft enters the picture and works toward consolidating a PC environment for empowering the digital worker. They did it right. They did it to the glee of the buyer, as is evidenced by the extreme popularity of the software environment. The customers simply did not suffer. In fact, being a Microsoft employee, I've never heard a customer tell me that Microsoft did them wrong. They only tell me how powerful the software is, and how it helps them get things done!

As Microsoft expanded its own knowledge of the computing environment, it looked for improved processes, improved software architectures, improved features. They innovated to the delight of the consumer, again evidenced by the popularity of the Office Products, the OS iterations both as clients and servers, then as a browser, enabling emancipated publishing to the web. Then, the web enters the picture as a huge opportunity for international global digital development and Mirosoft simply changes its focus to a new platform that would help internationalize digital business processes.

The competitors need to compete on innovative capability, not further litigation. Get back to work! This is a time we need unity and parity, not division and imbalance. These 9 constituents need to work harder to figure out how to build enabling and empowering tools for the end user, not looking for ways to dig into the Microsoft coffers that are targeted for improving

business, education and human society. We speak a lingua franca because of Microsoft and it's what we asked for, we cannot blame Microsoft for enabling us with its lingua franca and enormous capabilities to perform as businesses.

Whatever errors in judgement were made by the burgeoning, never before seen software industry with Microsoft at its helm have been addressed with a settlement put in place that accomodates for this evolution. Microsoft is not a malicious company. I moved here myself from Sun, and I find the company to be mature, principled, focused, innovative and strongly competitive. They were young kids when they started (in their 20s), and they emerged quickly, learned hard lessons, and have been focused on enabling people since then. This is not your father's Microsoft, it is a new Microsoft, and it is focused on helping people with software as never before. There are no barriers to entry. There are no monopolies preventing any company from entering this industry. In fact, Microsoft with its new .NET strategy is only going to enable more developers, and more businesses to succeed worldwide.

Let them alone. Let this settlement get us back to business of helping customers, and send a strong message back to these 9 consitutents who want to drag this out that you cannot use the government as a competitive advantage. The government is neutral, meant to make it fair for all. We cannot allow our democratic system favor one individual over another.

Randy J. Hinrichs
 Group Research Manager
 Learning Sciences and Technology
 Microsoft Research
 1 Microsoft Way
 Redmond, WA 98052
<http://www.learningwebservices.com>
 <<http://www.learningwebservices.com/>> 1-425-703-5524

MTC-00011611

From: David Davis
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have seen no benefit to the citizens of the United States by the action taken by the Department of Justice with regards to Civil Action No. 98-1232 United States vs. Microsoft Corporation. I believe it has been a complete waist of government resources and has done harm to the United States economy, the industry as a hole and the citizens of the United States. Although I personally do not agree with Department of Justice case in general, I do feel that a quick settlement would greatly benefit our county. With regards to the settlement I believe it is extreme, unwarranted and unjustified.

Sincerely
 David G. Davis

MTC-00011612

From: Carmor(a)amug.org
 To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.?@inetgw
 Date: 1/15/02 2:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice
 Microsoft Settlement Hearing
 To Whom It May Concern:

I urge the Department of Justice to settle the current litigation brought by nine states in their dispute with Microsoft. It is in the best interests of all Americans to bring this divisive litigation to a conclusion. At this point only the lawyers are profiting.

Sincerely,
Carla Moring

MTC-00011613

From: Michael S. Guillory
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For god's sake, settle this thing and let us get on with the business at hand—reviving the economy and protecting the country and our position in the world. Also, the individual litigation should be settled. The school systems would benefit and this would benefit children and the country.

Michael S. Guillory

MTC-00011614

From: KStutz1054@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Send the lawyers home.
Let Microsoft get on with their business.
Ken Stutzman

MTC-00011615

From: Marj/Ed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement as currently configured is a fair one and should go forward.

Marjorie A. Lynn

MTC-00011616

From: The1stBA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please bring this matter to a conclusion with a speedy settlement. Thank you.

B.A. Wilcoxson, a microsoft shareholder.

MTC-00011617

From: Jeffries
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:43pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

After reviewing the settlement as presented, I find the settlement best for all concerned.

MTC-00011618

From: J. Alley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case ASAP.

Jane D. Alley
19641 20th Ave. N.E.
Seattle, WA 98155

MTC-00011619

From: Kathy Beardsley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a consumer of Microsoft products, I believe they are working in the best interest

of the general public, and I believe the settlement should stand as is.

Thank you.
Mary Beardsley
CC:Mary K Beardsley

MTC-00011620

From: Marj/Ed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I agree with the settlement.
Edwin Lynn

MTC-00011621

From: ARNOLD SEIDON
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Settle now. Microsoft is very generous in their offer. Don't kill the goose that we are all dependent on.

Arnold

MTC-00011622

From: monde
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The matter needs to be settled in a way that does not end up being a boon for Microsoft. The school donation looked all warm and fuzzy but I agree with those who suggest that it is just helping Microsoft get a big chunk of the educational market. Let us not forget here that Microsoft broke the law. It just does not seem right that they should get away with it while people who break other laws (many of them victimless crimes) end up in prison. — note: my @ddress is monde@involution.org monde@thraam.com is no longer functional site unseen? see: <http://involution.org>

MTC-00011623

From: Plim1628@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

MY OPINION NOW, BASED ON THE COURTS ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF CONTINUING LITIGATION AGAINST MICROSOFT FOR THE BENEFIT OF LESS THAN 20% OF THE STATES. THESE HOLDOUT STATES ARE IMPEDING THE FINALIZATION OF THIS WHOLE PROCESS, AND IN DOING SO, IN MY PERSPECTIVE, ARE NOT DOING THE CITIZENS OF THOSE STATES THE GOOD THEY PERCEIVE. RATHER THEY ARE HOLDING THE DOJ AND MICROSOFT FOR RANSOM AT THE EXPENSE OF THE 82% OF THE NATION WHO ACCEPT THE COURTS ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL.

SINCERELY,
DAVID RICHARD
INGALLS
NAPERVILLE,(DUPAGE COUNTY)
ILLINOIS

MTC-00011624

From: dgriffith@gdhco.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I read this article that gave this email address for opinions on the Microsoft settlement. First, although irrelevant at this point, I have to say I think Microsoft has contributed more to the growth and productivity of this country than anyone else that comes to mind. With the development of Window concept, it has made the operation of personal computers available to non-computer people. Thus it has attributed greatly in making computers user friendly enough that ordinary people can use them. As a result of this development, Windows became the software of choice. I remember when everytime you bought something for the computer you had to see if it was "IBM compatible" or not. No one could focus on software development because of compatibility problems. Windows eliminated that and almost all software developers worked toward making their software compatible with Windows. Thus Windows became the universal software.

I always thought the DOJ's involvement was more for the benefit of competitors than consumers. In all industries, inferior competitors complain about being at a disadvantage. In the long run, the antitrust case against Microsoft, in my opinion, had more potential to hurt consumers than to help them. I'm not a computer geek and I can barely operate one without assistance but windows has made my life easier when it does come to using a computer.

My mother is a librarian and has been able to obtain free hardware and software from a Microsoft grant. Many people in Greenup County Kentucky has benefited by the generosity of Microsoft. Their grant was for \$50,000. Anyone in Greenup County can come to the library and use the computers and internet.

One lady downloaded a picture of her new grandchild or great grandchild (I forgot which) from a website in California. They offered internet training sessions for senior citizens. None of this possible without Microsoft. I don't see the library getting anything from Walmart (the world's largest retailer and likely the largest antitrust violator in this country!!)

Yes I think the settlement with Microsoft is acceptable and the DOJ should agree to settle the case and move on to a more important use of our tax dollars. The State AG's that are bucking the settlement, I think, want cash money for their States so they can further their individual causes. If you have any questions concerning my position you can contact me at the email address on this correspondence.

MTC-00011625

From: Dave Meltzer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

just wanted to voice my support for the proposed settlement. i've been using microsoft software for nearly two decades and have been amazed at how much value i get for the money. the settlement terms seem more than fair to consumers and the world economy needs this settled too.

MTC-00011626

From: Glenn Hyatt

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:50pm
Subject: Settle Now!

Leave Microsoft alone! Be done with it now! Don't force Microsoft to pack up and leave this land of harassment (once free). Get the government out of business and our lives!

Glenn Hyatt

MTC-00011627

From: O'Neal, Miles (038) Lola
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:50pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to stop further action against Microsoft. The settlement should be accepted. I am old enough to remember computers before Microsoft integrated programs to work together smoothly, trying to put together a working home system. I let alone a working office system. I was a nightmare. In my book they are heroes not villains. Leave them alone.

Lola O'Neal

MTC-00011628

From: Sheila Fass
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I firmly believe that the start of the downturn in the economy started with the persecution of Microsoft. The only way out of this slump is to settle this mess once and for all. Just think of the progress in communication we owe to Microsoft. With their innovations we have become one world in communication. It would have taken decades to reach this level without Microsoft. They deserve some leeway in marketing methods to have a continued impact on international distribution of knowledge.

sincerely: Sheila Fass shefass@calweb.com

MTC-00011629

From: charles jenner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:52pm

Dear Sirs, The nine states that have not agreed to the Microsoft settlement are not acting in the best interests of consumers, of which my wife and I are two, not in the best interests of the economy as a whole. I urge you not to heed their cry but to proceed to settlement. I wish that I had had the opportunity to testify on behalf of Microsoft during the trial.

Sincerely yours,
Charles R. Jenner

MTC-00011630

From: Ian Lance Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm writing to say that I think that the proposed settlement of the antitrust suit against Microsoft is weak and ineffective. While it addresses part of Microsoft's past behaviour, it does not address their past conduct with regard to squashing innovation in the computer industry. Where the settlement is appropriate, as in the disclosure of protocols, it appears to have been carefully crafted to avoid requiring disclosure to free software programmers, although free software

such as Samba is the most common case requiring protocol information, and is the most significant competitor to Microsoft today.

Please reconsider the proposed settlement, and search for a settlement which will properly address the profoundly negative impact Microsoft has had on the U.S. computer industry.

Respectfully,
Ian Taylor
103 Winfield St.
San Francisco, CA 94110
415 550-9004
ian@airs.com

MTC-00011631

From: SandBillE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,

The appropriate time and diligence has been dedicated to the Microsoft settlement and the recent settlement is both fair and tough to Microsoft. I encourage the Department of Justice to complete this settlement, as it stands, and pave the way for the US consumer, Microsoft, other software/hardware companies and American business to move forward. We certainly know that moving forward is good for our country, particularly in these difficult times.

Sincerely,
Sandra O. Myskowski
Sandra O. Myskowski, CEO
Sandbill Enterprises, Inc.
1016 Baker Road
Sinking Spring, Pa 19608
Email: SandbillE@aol.com
Phone: 610-698-7056

MTC-00011632

From: AUSSIEALLEN
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:53pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
LEAVE MICROSOFT ALONE. THANK
YOU, JEFF S. ALLEN

MTC-00011633

From: Lucien Bomar
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
lb StationeryDear Sirs:

I strongly urge you to complete the current Microsoft settlement under the currently proposed terms. It is long past time to conclude this matter.

I believe the remedy is just and substantial. It is important that we maintain a viable Microsoft. In my career (30 years), I have twice made major purges of software from my companies. The first was largely getting rid of 5.25 floppy based software and the second getting rid of software on 3.5 floppies. Each time I wondered what happened to the companies that had developed the programs that I had invested in that subsequently disappeared. I later found that most had made their Millions, cashed out their stock and moved to mountain villas like Aspen. Microsoft on the other hand has been a constant and has continued to develop new and innovative products while maintaining backward compatibility with their early

products. Their products are inexpensive and easy for my employees to use, understand and get support for during the software lifetime. For a business owner it is important to know that the company I invest in (by purchasing software) will be here in the future and will supply support for the products I invest in. Microsoft has proven itself up to the task. Microsoft continues to supply the best (by far) customer and Partner support on the planet. In addition it has created a Worldwide support group of non-Microsoft specialist that support its products.

I will continue to support Microsoft because Microsoft supports me.

Thank you,
Lucien C. Bomar
Senior Member, IEEE
lbomar@ieee.org

MTC-00011634

From: Richard Klinkner
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:57pm

Please proceed with the settlement with Microsoft; it is fair to all parties.

Richard L. Klinkner, A Consumer

MTC-00011635

From: Davar Shokoh-Alai
To: Microsoft ATR, Susan Alai
Date: 1/15/02 2:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

How I wish the government would not try to force competitive advantages for one company over another. Accept this settlement but make it more fair for Microsoft and lower the requirements placed on a pro-consumer company that has opened doors for our country in unimaginable ways. When IBM tried to stranglehold us to their mainframes and Sunw to their boxes, and Oracle to their painful overcharged and painful to deploy database offerings, it was only Microsoft that dared to take on these big guys and offer more powerful and easier to use systems for customers.

Being in the technical management side of the house for 7+ years now and with 17+ years of business management experience, I know how hard it is to discern truth from error when it comes to technical offerings and respective sales pitches; however, it has been so clear that Microsoft is always looking for a way to make it easier to add technological advantages to businesses at a much lower cost. Meanwhile, IBM, Sunw and Oracle have continued to fight them at every front in order to keep the prices at unreachable places and charge us their outrageous consulting fees to deploy their "solutions".

I can not believe how much Microsoft has agreed to give into the government just to settle this and allow our economy to move forward once again! What is even more unbelievable is that 9 of the state attorneys are trying to get more for the competitive companies in their states. Maybe it is considered politics as usual, but it needs to stop now. Settle this case but make it a lot better for Microsoft since they have gone so far in their offer to settle this case. disclosure: I have sold IBM, Microsoft and Oracle solutions and speak from across the board experience.

MTC-00011636

From: Konrad M.Kempfe
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:58pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

This is to support the settlement in the Microsoft case. The case should not continue to be litigated. It is not in the public interest to continue litigation. The settlement proposed is fair.

We do not need our own justice department and states to weaken one of America's best companies while the Europeans and the World Trade Organization are out to harm our industries. We need to protect our industries.

Respectfully
 Konrad M.Kempfe

MTC-00011637

From: Kathy Gooley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:47pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To: Judge Kollar-Kotally

I am writing to you today to express my intense disapproval of the Proposed Final Judgment announced by the Justice Department regarding the Microsoft case. Having followed the review by the Federal Courts during the past three years of the Microsoft antitrust case, in which they proclaimed that Microsoft repeatedly and forcefully violated U.S. antitrust laws and was liable for its illegal conduct, I am very much alarmed by the PFJ. I am also aware that recently a U.S. Court of Appeals ruled unanimously that Microsoft had clearly violated antitrust laws and that any government settlement with Microsoft must have three key elements: a) Terminate Microsoft's illegal monopoly, b). Deny to Microsoft the fruits of its past violations, and c). Prevent any future anticompetitive activity.

So, my question is, why has the Justice Department cut a back-room deal with Microsoft that fails to meet any of these three standards? I hope that as you review my response to the Justice Department's deal, and others like it, you will recognize the severe mistake that we would be making as a country to ignore what is right here. Please help protect public trust in our Government, the interests of the non-Microsoft developers? community, and the rights of all software users by ensuring that Microsoft is held accountable for their long-standing antitrust abuses. Thank you for taking the time to review my comments.

Sincerely,
 Kathy Gooley

MTC-00011638

From: Hackley E. Woodford, M.D.
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In view of our economy and post 911, the war, massive unemployment and recession, how could anyone feel honestly justified in holding up social and economic progress by voting against the Microsoft Settlement? Is it competition, jealousy, negativism favoritism, conspiracy, dishonesty, ignorance or What?

Microsoft is an American company. They are big and make money because they earn it.

Microsoft is not the Enemy, they are the Benefactors.

Agree to the Microsoft Settlement and watch the economy improve.

CC:Hackley E. Woodford

MTC-00011639

From: Charles Porter
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 2:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My Dear Justice:

It is very clear that no settlement with Microsoft will stop Microsoft's anti-competitive practices. Microsoft has a consistent strategy of entering markets that are not being closely watched, and of violating laws in subtle enough ways, that the motivation to stop the behavior does not become sufficient to be effective until Microsoft has effectively destroyed all competition in the target market, and erected prohibitive barriers to entry, making any constraint on the company's behavior irrelevant.

Microsoft is currently engaged in such a campaign to dominate the Internet Service Provider (ISP) Market. In addition to legitimate strategies such as buying shares in existing ISPs like ATT@home, and developing their own ISP business through the MSN.com business, they are engaged in predatory practices which create effective barriers to large numbers of consumers from doing business with any ISP other than MSN.

Microsoft has an agreement to assume all residential Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) accounts from QWest in thirteen western states. Prior to this agreement, selecting an ISP in these states was very much like selecting a long distance carrier. QWest owned the line from the house to the central office, an receives a fee for running DSL over that line. The consumer could then freely choose from at least dozens of ISP's to carry the traffic from there to the internet. One option for an ISP was QWest's own ISP service Qwest.net. If a consumer is unhappy with an ISP, Qwest would switch them to another within a day or two and for a small fee. Under the agreement with QWest, all of QWest.net customers are transferred to Microsoft. If a customer failed to opt-out before the deadline of November 30, 2001, they would be transferred to MSN. Once the account is transferred to MSN, the consumers relationship with QWest is severed. The customer of record for the DSL service is shifted from Qwest to MSN. This means that Qwest has no control over the customers line, and is unable to shift the consumer to an alternate ISP. Additionally MSN refuses to permit connection to a coveting ISP. The only available option is to "Unprovision the Line", which means to disconnect the DSL service altogether, not just from the telephone office to the internet, but from the consumers home to the central office. To make it additionally difficult, the "unprovisioning" process takes 30 days. (Changing from another ISP to MSN takes only 30 seconds via a Qwest Web page.) Allowing user to opt-out of MSN only by

unprovisioning the line is analogous to Sprint saying that the only way to change long-distance carriers is to disconnect your telephone, and then pay to have it reconnected, for the normal new service charges at the time. In fact, unprovisioning the DSL service often does include disconnecting the telephone service itself, though Qwest will claim that this is accidental.

Incidentally, at the time of making the new connection it is difficult to find any options for an ISP other than MSN.

Qwest has taken the additional step of raising the price of a new DSL connection to \$100, creating an additional barrier to changing ISP.

Since Microsoft is the majority ISP, most consumers are barred from switching away from Microsoft.

I raise this issue, not because I think the Justice department should be stopping this practice, but because it is strong evidence that Microsoft has not intention of changing its behavior. Information technology changes extremely quickly. By the time Justice is able to stop any particular anti-competitive practice, that practice is irrelevant. The only solution is to remove the power which Microsoft cannot resist abusing. As serious an issue as removing competition in the ISP market is, it is relatively small issue compared to Microsoft's stated objective: control of the internet. Under this plan, for every commercial transaction over the internet, Microsoft will be paid several times:

- once by the consumer for access to the internet, via MSN ISP service
- once by the customer for use of the windows operating system (Microsoft is moving from selling windows to selling subscriptions to windows)
- once by the vendor from whom the consumer purchases for validation of the users identification via Microsoft's passport service,.
- several times by the vendor for several licenses of the Windows server software and web-site software.
- once by the vendor for use of Microsoft financial services currently in development, for the actual transfer of funds
- and more ominously, many more times for selling the information gathered about the consumer while collecting all of the other transactions.

This is just about a simple purchase. I have left out all of the use of Microsoft products in fulfillment of the order and in marketing the product.

Attached is some background material on the QWest/Microsoft case from the Seattle Times and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

I am available to provide additional information, should you wish it.

Thanks for your attention.

Charles Porter

Appendixes:

My complaint to the Washington state attorney general:

Web Site Consumer Informal Complaint Form: Thank you for using the WUTC Web Site. Use this form to submit complaints to the Consumer Affairs Section

Statewide Toll Free: 1-800-562-6150

Local: 360-664-1120
 Hearing Impaired—TTY: 360-586-8203
 Your Name(required): Charles Porter
 Your Address: Street address: 810—30th
 Ave

(We need your City: Seattle, address in
 State: WA order to Zip: 98122 process your
 comment)

Your County: USA
 Phone Numbers: Home: 206-568-3404
 Day/Work: 425-455-7601 x231
 Your E-Mail address: charles,
 porter@computer.org
 Date: 11/30/2001

Utility or Transportation Company
 Information

Company Name: Qwest, Microsoft
 Company street Address: City _____
 State _____ Zip _____

Your Account Number: 206-568-3404 If
 you know your Account Number, be sure to
 include it. About Your Complaint Have you
 tried to resolve the dispute with your utility
 or transportation company?

(*)Yes

() No

If "yes," what was the result? no change
 Please explain your complaint in detail:
 Qwest has been providing my home with
 internet service via digital subscriber line
 (DSL). This service only connects my house
 physically to QWest's offices. In addition to
 DSL provider, it is necessary to have an
 internet service provider (ISP), that connects
 my line from Qwest to the internet. QWest
 has been providing my ISP service as well.
 Qwest informed me that I must change my
 internet provider (ISP) to Microsoft' MSN
 service by November 31, 2001, or I would be
 swithed automatically. Immediately after
 performing the switching operation via the
 Qwest web site on Sunday Oct 22, I learned
 that the MSN service had several "features"
 and requirements that are different from
 those provided by Qwest. I decided that I
 should investigate other ISP's. To faciliate
 this more considered change, within 30
 minutes of initiating the changeover to MSN,
 I tried to cancel the change both by
 contacting Qwest and MSN via email and
 several telephone numbers, including sales,
 and customer support at both organizations.
 I attempted both to restore my Qwest service
 and to change directly to another ISP. The
 upshot was that I could not cancel the
 changeover, and that I could only cancel the
 entire service with Microsoft, but canceling
 the service would take 30 to 60 days.
 Additionally the act of canceling, disconnects
 the DSL service provided by Qwest.
 Restoring the DSL service would then take
 anywhere from i0 days to 6 months,
 depending on demand in my neighborhood.

It is a far cry from equal access, when you
 consider that if my ISP were anyone other
 than Microsoft, changing ISP is as sidle as
 calling either Qwest or the new ISP and
 asking for a switch, much like the process of
 changing long distance companies.

Continuing this analogy, their policy of
 handling Microsoft is customers, would be
 like saying that to change long distance
 carriers, I must wait 2 months, have all of my
 phone service diconnected, and then wait I0
 days to 6 months for a reconnect.

What do you think the company should do
 to resolve your complaint? Qwest should

switch my ISP service to any provider I
 choose, without delay, handling the request
 with the same even-handedness that is required
 for customers long-distance I carrier choice.

From the Seattle Times: A growing number
 of consumers and Internet service providers
 co, lain that MSN Microsoft's Web
 company—is throwing up roadblocks for
 former Qwest high-speed Internet customers
 who want to quit MSN.

"It makes me feel like they're saying 'We're
 going to teach you a lesson' for wanting to
 quit them," said Larry Lomax of Des Moines,
 a former Qwest digital-subscriber-line (DSL)
 customer who switched to MSN and then
 decided he wanted to move to another
 provider.

Lomax said that MSN continually told him
 that he had been disconnected from its
 service, while Qwest insisted that according
 to its records, he still had a live DSL
 connection with MSN. The impasse lasted for
 about two months and ended earlier this
 month, when Lomax became so frustrated
 that he decided to give up on DSL altogether.
 When Qwest and MSN announced they were
 teaming up last spring, the two giants
 promoted their new alliance as a boon to
 500,000 Internet subscribers in 14 states,
 mostly in the West, who would benefit from
 Qwest technology and MSN's content.

Roughly two out of five of those
 subscribers were DSL customers who had
 chosen Qwest as their Internet service
 provider; the rest were customers who used
 dial-up modems. Under the partnership
 arrangement, all former Qwest customers
 would automatically become MSN customers
 unless they opted out. Washington state DSL
 customers say the deadline to switch has
 shifted from a date last month to Jan. 21.

Some critics maintain that MSN is
 engaging in monopolistic practices that
 deserve attention, such as forcing customers
 who want to switch away from MSN to go
 without DSL service and charging them more
 if they try to switch. They further contend
 that Qwest, which originally promised to
 treat all DSL providers equally to help spread
 the technology, now is conspiring with MSN
 to hoard such prized customers. Qwest
 insists it is not playing favorites.

MSN likewise denies the allegations, but a
 spokeswoman acknowledged it recently had
 learned of problems relating to cancellation
 orders with DSL customers. She added that
 MSN was working to correct them. It is
 difficult to gauge the scope of the problem
 because neither Qwest nor MSN will disclose
 how many DSL customers have chosen to
 switch to another provider rather than accept
 MSN.

The companies also won't say how many
 customers quit MSN after initially agreeing to
 the transfer. Even more difficult to figure out
 is the number of consumers who have given
 up trying to quit MSN because they found the
 obstacles too daunting.

"Everyone's just up in arms over this
 thing," said Darwin Hill, owner of Worldlink,
 a Shoreline-based Internet service provider
 who contends that MSN's conduct has cost
 him customers. "Consumers are amazed by
 how they can't get anything done," he said.
 Hill is among the providers and consumers
 in Washington and other states who are

particularly peeved at what they claim are
 routine waits of two weeks—during which no
 DSL service is available—to change Internet
 service providers (ISPs) .

In addition, they are concerned about
 reconnection charges of \$69 that will rise to
 \$99 on Jan. 5.

By contrast, before MSN's arrival, Qwest
 charged DSL customers \$30 to change
 providers. Also, the switch routinely got
 done overnight, or with minimal service
 interruption, according to several
 independent providers.

Charles Porter, a Seattle DSL user who
 thought better of his decision to accept MSN,
 filed a complaint with the state attorney
 general. He stated that when he tried to
 change service providers, both MSN and
 Qwest said switching could take from i0 days
 to six months. "It is a far cry from equal
 access, when you consider that if my ISP
 were anyone other than Microsoft, changing
 ISPs is as sidle as . . . changing long-
 distance companies," he wrote in his
 complaint. In an interview, Porter said,
 "Microsoft is up to their old games,"
 referring to monopolistic practices.

Jared Reimer, an executive with The River,
 a Tucson-based provider that offers DSL
 service in Arizona and Western Washington,
 alleged that the system is "rigged up so that
 it's almost impossible for the customer to
 switch."

He said that under the new arrangement,
 Qwest has made MSN the "customer of
 record" on the DSL portion of a customer's
 phone line, meaning the consumer no longer
 has the ability to switch providers at will.
 "They must get (MSN's) permission to do it,"
 he said. Lisa Gurry, an MSN product
 manager, acknowledged that under the deal
 with Qwest, MSN owns "the interaction with
 the (DSL) customer." She said the company
 "recently learned about issues on the order-
 cancellation process, primarily with DSL
 (customers). DSL is certainly more
 complicated for every provider, not just
 MSN."

She said that the majority of DSL
 customers wishing to cancel MSN were not
 having problems and that MSN and Qwest
 were working "to improve customer
 experience." Meantime, Gary Gardner,
 executive director with the Washington State
 Association of Internet Service Providers, a
 trade group for the state's independent
 providers, is asking the state Attorney
 General's Office to get involved.

A spokesman for the office said it was
 aware of the complaints and was monitoring
 the situation. Peter Lewis can be reached at
 206-464-2217 or plewis@seattletimes.com.
 Copyright (C) 2002 The Seattle Times
 Company Qwest-to-MSN switch frustrates
 many Internet customers find it difficult to
 get problems resolved Friday, November 23,
 2001

By JANE HADLEY
 SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER
 CONSUMER AFFAIRS REPORTER

The process of switching hundreds of
 thousands of Qwest Internet customers to
 Microsoft's MSN Internet service is
 experiencing some glitches, both companies
 admit. Qwest and Microsoft Corp. in April
 announced a five-year partnership under

which Qwest will close down its Internet provider service and encourage its 500,000 customers to move to MSN. Qwest will be the DSL provider for MSN customers.

The two companies are encouraging customers to switch before Nov. 30, and Qwest says its Internet provider service will close down early next year. Customers have the option of switching to an Internet provider other than MSN, but Qwest, under its agreement, has pledged to promote MSN above other providers.

But in a confusing twist, Qwest is also quietly offering customers the option of staying with Qwest under a program called StarterPak, which is aimed at small businesses, but is similar in most respects to what it had been offering to its residential customers.

The MSN transition problem has been worst for customers who had been using Qwest's DSL service, which provides fast connections to the Internet, said Lisa Gurry, an MSN product manager. Liz Conner, a Federal Way resident, said she waited 11 weeks to get DSL equipment that she was promised she would get within two weeks. "I've done everything I can think of and contacted everyone I can find," Conner said. "I tried calling Microsoft, even. They can't even tell me what department to contact or who to contact. So the bottom line is that the customer is stymied; they're left holding the bag with nowhere to go to get this problem resolved. The folks at MSN aren't solving it, and they're blaming Qwest. Qwest isn't solving it. They're blaming MSN."

How common is this problem? Unfortunately, the state Utilities and Transportation Commission does not keep track of the number of consumers who complain to them about Qwest/MSN problems.

Instead, the commission keeps track of a far smaller number: customers who don't get satisfaction after they call a special Qwest number that the commission gives to people filing complaints.

That amounts to about five people in the past two months, commission spokesman Tim Sweeney said. The Attorney General's Office has received a similar number of complaints about the Qwest/MSN transition in the last few weeks, spokesman Chris Jarvis said. But Conner said one Qwest customer service representative told her that Qwest's and MSN's computers weren't speaking to one another, and that the mess was affecting about 20,000 Qwest DSL customers.

Lisa Gurry, an MSN product manager, said the two companies are working on synchronizing their databases. "Both MSN and Qwest are two big companies," Qwest spokesman Michael Dunne said. "Making this partnership work, we're experiencing some difficulties in migrating customers from Qwest.net to MSN."

But he added, "We're working tirelessly with MSN" to solve the problems. Grace Dapar, another MSN spokeswoman, said MSN has set up a task force specifically to deal with delays in setting up accounts.

Delay is only one complaint. Others include confusion and difficulty making the switch, difficulty reaching company representatives who are knowledgeable and

follow through on their promises, and disappointment with services MSN is providing.

Conner, who said she's spent countless hours on the telephone, said Qwest representatives repeatedly made promises that weren't kept and she believed she was being lied to. "My impression is the folks at Qwest are so desperate to tell you something, and the people above aren't telling them anything."

Aleta Hoyt, a Seattle real estate agent who has Qwest DSL and Internet service, says she has found the process of "transitioning," as Qwest and MSN call it, to be confusing and difficult. Hoyt received a letter in the mail telling her she needed to transition and could qualify for a prize if she did so before next Friday.

Hoyt believed she had no choice but to switch to MSN. She typed her name into the online form to "transition," but the form told her she was "not authorized" to transition. She called Qwest and was told to reset her password and try again. Same result. She was then given a phone number to call MSN's technical support. When she called there, she was told that wasn't technical support and to call a different number. She called the second number, where she was told to call the first number she had called. She experienced problems when the form asked for her "billing phone number" yet required three extra digits added to the phone number. Also, she lost her Internet access totally when she followed the Qwest representative's suggestion to reset her password. A different Qwest tech-support person straightened that out.

But now Hoyt was confused because several of the Qwest representatives told her she could stay with Qwest after all, using the \$21.95-a-month StarterPak program. She's now mulling her options.

Meanwhile, in online forums, some customers are complaining that MSN emphasizes Hotmail, its Web-based e-mail service, which makes it impossible to subscribe to traditional Usenet news groups and means that e-mail is stored on MSN servers instead of downloaded to the user's computer.

But MSN's Gurry notes that Web-based e-mail provides the advantage of being accessible from any computer anywhere in the world. Also, MSN has its own news groups, which are "richer" than the Usenet news groups, she said. Gurry initially agreed that MSN was not supporting traditional Post Office Protocol e-mail accounts, but later corrected that and said that although MSN is pushing the Web-based e-mail, users can have access to the traditional POP type of e-mail, in which messages are downloaded to the user's computer.

One customer complained, however, that Microsoft appeared to be doing no spam filtering on its POP accounts. "The services we offer today are based on what the majority of customers have told us they do want," Gurry said. "Inevitably, we'll hear feedback requesting additional features and functionality. We continue to listen to that feedback and evaluate the prospects of including those features in future MSN releases," she said.

P-I reporter Jane Hadley can be reached at 206-448-8362 or janehadley@seattlepi.com

MTC-00011640

From: Ralph Whiteside
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It time for the government to settle the Microsoft case and get on to important issues. Such as, Enron and professional baseball restraint of trade.

MTC-00011641

From: Rhoda Elenbaas
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern: I have watched over the past several years while massive amounts of time and money have been spent on this issue. The proposed settlement pending before the court is just and equitable. It contains a component that will greatly benefit disadvantaged portions of the community and schools. Some might argue that there is hidden motivation and benefit to Microsoft. I would argue that the benefit to the students, families and communities is much greater and should be the primary area of concern because if it does not come from this source—it will not happen in the foreseeable future.

Let's be done with this issue once and for all. I am sick of hearing and reading about it and believe that to continue this matter for another moment is a gross waste of time, energy and dollars. There is a real & great evil at work in our society that is more worthy of our focus. Microsoft has taken it's lashes. Let's move on. A concerned taxpayer and voting American.

Rhoda Elenbaas

MTC-00011642

From: Metters, Bobbie J
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 3:01pm
Subject: My views

I think Microsoft is more than fair and I don't think Bill Gates should be told by we the people or the Government how to run a company. Albeit It was before my time when Standard Oil Co. was forced to break up due to the same type of situation. . . . ok that was oil this is disc but you get the idea. . . . I think Nintendo has far higher prices for it's stuff and then when you finally get one playstation they come up with a new one with higher prices yet on their cartridges and no one says a thing about that . . . and that's just my view. . . . Bobbie Metters

MTC-00011643

From: Paul Goethe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

As a small business owner I wish to state that the proposed settlement is more than fair to small business owners such as our company. Thirty years ago Microsoft developed an operating system that enabled our business to flourish. Our business being Electrical design Software. In the intervening years we have kept up with all up-grades for

what I call Very Low charges while all along receiving 1st class back-up and support from Microsoft personnel. To people like us Microsoft has been a God-Send. We feel that the proposed settlement is extremely harsh but we recommend it stands as is.

Best Regards:

Paul K. Goethe President
Optimized Program Inc.
Cleveland , Ohio 44136

MTC-00011644

From: Carl J. Clement
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:02pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I approve of the Microsoft settlement. The entire matter was caused by about 4 potential (failed)competitors who tried to use the Federal government to do their competing!
Carl J. Clement

MTC-00011645

From: Giacomo Zardetto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

Once and for all, SETTLE the Microsoft Lawsuit. The World Economy is at constant WAR. Life in itself is a war of economics. WHY DO YOU WANT TO DEFEAT ONE OF YOUR OWN? "Divide and conquer", was the motto, of an old communist; STALIN Please settle this once and for all.

Your country and millions of beneficiaries of today's technology will thank you for it.

Sincerely,

GIACOMO ZARDETTO
zardetto@rockisland.com

MTC-00011646

From: property@realtrak.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

While Microsoft probably overplayed its hand enough to get its would be competitors upset to the point of initiating this action, they have certainly done more good for the American consumer than harm. They, by innovation and standardization, have probably done immeasurable good in improving the productivity of our entire work force. I would have preferred that the Department of Justice had not gotten involved in the first place; however, they have and it sounds like the settlement worked out is fair. With respect to the 9 hold-out states that want even more, I am not sure what their game is. Do they want money as an alternative source of revenue in lieu of raising taxes because they think they can get away with it? Do they want glory and recognition? Do they want to punish Microsoft because they are jealous? Or do they really believe they and the consumers they represent have really been dealt an injustice? It certainly makes no sense to me.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

John Gridley

MTC-00011647

From: Gordon R. Martin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

Having owned and used multiple computers and many different software programs and their upgrades during the last thirty years, I can state from experience that the alternative to constant frustration from software "clichis"—is to use an integrated set of software products from a financially strong company which can be depended on to stay in business and continually upgrade its products. I look to Microsoft as being that company. I have always felt that their price of software was relatively insignificant and one of the greatest bargains in history in terms of what it can accomplish. The future of the nation is considerably dependent on having a strong, innovative, software company such as Microsoft with the ability to guarantee continued continuity and upgrading of an overall package of software products for personal computers. The courts should uphold the settlement agreements presently acceptable to the United States Department of Justice and all states should join in the acceptance for the good of the nation and computer users.

Gordon R. Martin
Gleneden Beach, Oregon

MTC-00011648

From: Kevin DeSchene
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:59pm
Subject: Class Action Suite

Hello, The proposed remedy for the class action suites are unacceptable (i.e some odd billions of dollars going to poor schools). Was this an attempt to reward MS for their shoddy business ethics or what? The customer base is the plaintiff here, not the schools. And since when has the accused been allowed to negotiate their punishment. Should we start asking murderers what their punishment should be, (not to be confused with plea bargains). U.S. antitrust law implies that the violator must be deprived of it's ill-gotten gains, as well as be fully sheared in terms of perpetrating the bad deed again in the future.

A proper set of solution:

1. Require MS to accurately publish the APIs Windows, IE, and Office programs,,, etc. . . , and offer same as storable (not automated one-time only) downloads for the public to view and study;
2. Prohibit Microsoft from entering any web services area, including .NET entirely, for 10 years. Since MS is leveraging its existing wares as a jump off to .MAKE-US-RENT-SOFTWARE-FOREVER (a.k.a. .NET), they must be denied this further attempt to profit from the initial ill-gotten gain;
3. No, don't break up Microsoft, but simply require that MS Office applications and all associated source code be declared freeware. This would effectively deny MS the fruits of its initial ill-gotten gains.
4. Fine the firm (MS) an amount equal to the dividends it hasn't paid shareholders as yet; this will prevent MS from using its cash reserves to buy its way around the above restrictions by simply inventing a new sandbox and forcing us all to play in it all over again (this is what they are already trying to do with .NET of course).
5. Their software should be supported and their licensing controlled more: i.e if they

quit supporting ANY software, then that said software should become public domain. This would control MicroSoft from forcing upgrades. Microsoft should be required to re-organize their licensing program to allow for corporations/individuals to skip upgrades without punishment.

6. Exclusionary OEM agreements should be considered violation of law and punished accordingly. OEM pricing should be published for public viewing.

7. Political monetary influence should be monitored more closely. Even though it can't be proven, MS has influenced the political regimes of this county (I'm embarrassed by what our political system has become), and policed properly.

8. Program integration should be controlled more readily. Customers should be given the option to buy Windows without any additional programs installed. Windows ONLY, no IE, no Media Player, no Notepad, no nothing, just the OS and any OS related utilities (i.e Defrag, Scandisk, etc. . .)

9. All court/litigation costs should be paid by MicroSoft for ALL litigation imposed in the past 7 years.

10. Additionally, Microsoft should be given a proposed punishment imposed in the case of further future violations of the law.

As Well,

A. Litigation for technology needs to be revamped in this country. Our laws don't move at the speed of technology. By the time the court hearings are completed, the issues are irrelevant.

B. Appeals need to be limited more. There is no other reason for the number of appeals MicroSoft litigation has produced. These appeals just costs the Taxpayers more in taxes.

Thank You!

Kevin DeSchene

MTC-00011649

From: Ann Jackson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Should be Settled

I personally use Microsoft products and think they have givenso much to people that the case should be settled.

Sincerely,

Anmn Jackson

MTC-00011650

From: Tomal, Bob
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 3:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The legal INDUSTRY is out of control. Their greed and never ending pursuit for prolonging the billing for outrageous hourly and contingency fees is unconscionable. Now they are again on the quest to extort and redistribute cash into their already bloated bank accounts. The sick thing with that sleazy mob is that they are now stealing from the American children who would benefit from this settlement. I know that you're all in the same fraternity and will just consider this a crank e-mail, but then again, you might have decency to agree that your industry has crossed over the line.

CC:'MSFIN(a)Microsoft.com'

MTC-00011651

From: Victor Pearson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The more than \$1 billion in funding, software, services and training, etc. should be accepted or the whole thing should be dropped and not brought up any more. Microsoft has been more than fair during this whole process and is still trying to create new and innovated products even when the competition is trying to win via the court of law and not with great software products. If the software competition to Microsoft would put as much effort into their software as they do into trying to bring Microsoft down in a court of law, maybe they would have software that consumers want more than they would want software from Microsoft.

Thank you,
 Victor E. Pearson

MTC-00011652

From: hd74amf2
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Comments on the Microsoft settlement.
 It is time to get this over, and to move on. I disagree that Microsoft should have ever been sued. Look at the damage that resulted in their stock price, which effected millions of people. It is a sad day when competitors of Microsoft waste their time getting the government to file lawsuits, instead of investing in research to compete. The government should have never brought the suit. Anyone that understands technology would know that just because Explorer is on the desktop, doesn't mean that you can't load Netscape.

I don't like or use Explorer, but I do not believe in government interference with private industry. Nothing will be gained by this lawsuit. The consumer will end up paying more. It is a very alarming trend in government.

I do not like most Microsoft products, but until some one comes up with something better, they are here to stay. The emphasis should be getting on with business, and competing with the rest of the world. If Microsoft will agree to the settlement, get it over. I do not think they should settle, they should fight it and win, but if they want to settle, it is time to move on.

Richard

MTC-00011653

From: LSchoenber@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:06pm
 Subject: (no subject)

i think it is time to settle the microsoft case now. there are only nine(9) states do not agree. we cant accept the case because of 9 states. we should not. Judges should have to think more. they claims it hurts consumers because microsoft is monopoly . BALONEY. WE as the consumers know for sure that we did not feel any harm of it. STOP CRYING LIKE BABIES. THAT IS WHAT I FEEL.

THANK YOU.
 Larry Schoenberg

MTC-00011654

From: Flora Donovan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:07pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I find it interesting that our state so small in population and political clout could be a leader in withdrawing from the Microsoft litigation. New Mexico acknowledged some time ago that a continuance of said litigation was not helpful to the people of New Mexico considering the cost to taxpayers as well as the cost to the country as a whole.

Let us put all this behind us Massachusetts and Utah and others. Perhaps the present recession could be helped to an end by a more friendly business environment.

Flora L. Donovan
 A proud New Mexican

MTC-00011655

From: Anne Proffitt
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this suit! Microsoft has done more than they should have had to in order to satisfy the DOJ, the court and the competitors. The other nine states also need to look at the larger picture and co-operate by joining the settlement agreement.

Anne Proffitt
 1900 Shore Avenue
 Freeland, WA 98249
 DAProffitt@hotmail.com

MTC-00011656

From: Prem Dhawan
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:07pm
 Subject: Settlement

We should settle microsoft lawsuit and move on. It serves no purpose to drag it on.

Best Regards,
 PremDhawan
 @WWFfinancialResolutions.com
 Advisor to Banks & Businesses
 Bankruptcy Trustee
 Tele: (707) 747-6000
 You are invited to visit our website at:
 <<http://www.wwffinancialresolutions.com>>

MTC-00011657

From: Gilbert Claborn
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:
 Please allow the settlement of the Microsoft case so that the company can get on with its development and production of products at reasonable costs, without inflated costs arising from protracted litigation, and so that my tax money can stop being spent frivolously and without end of needless extensions of the DOJ litigation.

Gilbert L. Claborn
 268 Stonebridge Road
 Birmingham, AL 35210
 (205) 956-1413

MTC-00011658

From: brian mcconnell
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:09pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the proposed case against Microsoft, the proposed settlement appears to be fair and just, and is definitely in the best interest of the consuming public, and therefore should be allowed to proceed.

I want the case closed.

Thanks so much,
 Bryan McConnell
 1405 Autumn Chase Sq.
 Bedford, TX 76022

MTC-00011659

From: W R Hutchison
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:11pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement of the suit.
 W.R. Hutchison

MTC-00011660

From: BETTY BOUSHEE
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:12pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

Please settle the Microsoft case as soon as possible under the term reached with Microsoft and the Department of Justice. This case has gone on far too long and should never have gone as far as it did just because some companies wanted to punish Microsoft's success in stead of competing.

Betty Boushee

MTC-00011661

From: MORRIS KAY
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:12pm
 Subject: Settlement of Microsoft Action

Litigation is time and money consuming. . . . In my opinion, the settlement proposal by Microsoft, which some states accepted, and others did not, is fair and equitable. Let's get this problem behind us.

Morris Kay

MTC-00011662

From: Eric Wanono
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:11pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

Firstly, I am sorry about my English, but I am French (nobody is perfect).

I am very surprised by this judgement and all aspects of them. It seems to be much more a concurrence driving process than a legal judgement. I think that it will be great for Microsoft to go in France, because freedom is more really here than in USA. Nobody can tell you that you don't be better ore more efficient than another company. I'm not sure that in case of another company the impact would be the same. My personal vision of this case is that it seems to be a "hunting sorcery". I not happy to don't have in France company like Microsoft but I think that U.S. government won't be happy to have this attitude when this judgement will be view by an "history" point of view. And I am not sure that other company who will take advantage of this situation are more "customer oriented" than Microsoft.

Eric Wanono
 France

MTC-00011663

From: B(038)B Cody
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:12pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sirs:

We are of the opinion that enough has been done to Microsoft re: its problems with the Department of Justice. There has been a fair settlement upon which dedicated men have agreed after a most lengthy process. Surely now is the time for the remaining states to agree to come together and begin to serve the public in its wishes for an end to this matter. Further litigation will only serve to disrupt consumer confidence and our economy, and cost many more thousands and thousands of dollars (most likely in the millions, actually). Kindly put a stop to this and ask the remaining entities to agree to that which has gone before. Thank you.

Barbara Cody

MTC-00011664

From: m cochran
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:13pm
 Subject: Viewpoint

Are these other nine (9) states hungry for money? May be these other nine (9) should remove their Microsoft software programs from state's computers and make there own system. Then give back to Microsoft their software and promise never to use Microsoft's software again or Microsoft can take each one of those states to court for using Microsoft's software.

Mel. Cochran
 Riverside,CA

MTC-00011665

From: Dicklaframboise@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:14pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I feel the country and the economy will be better off with the current settlement than to drag it through further litigation. It does appear Microsoft was guilty of some antitrust violations but it also appears the current settlement addresses that adequately. I feel we must also recall the good the innovations of Microsoft have done for the country as a whole as well as the good it has done for the economy of each state. For the record: I am neither a Microsoft employee nor a stockholder.

Richard LaFramboise
 Yakima, Washington

MTC-00011666

From: John Wilder
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:14pm
 Subject: Comments

The government should get out of the watch dog business when there is no apparent reason to bother Microsoft. I see no difference between what the government is doing to Microsoft and what Microsoft is doing to the public. All businesses have to protect themselves from crooks and thieves but the Government cannot sit by and let well enough alone. You pick on Microsoft and let Enron slide until the public is hurt. Give it up and let Microsoft get on with business.

John Wilder

MTC-00011667

From: JLynch3D
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:13pm
 Subject: comment on MS

I'd like to comment on the Microsoft antitrust situation and lawsuit. I am not an employee of MS or have any dealings with them in business. In my opinion, the problems that MS had have been brought to light, and corrections have already been made. The most notable of them being public awareness. Why do I think this is the most important correction against MS? For two reasons:

1. A company's reputation is the most important asset they own. Obviously, MS has taken quite a blow here. This can be evidenced by the slowdown in their business and the rise to power of newer power players in the technology industry. Foremost of these are AOL/Time Warner, which owns the internet business lock, stock, and barrel. Linux is another product that has come to power as an OS. And as well as the handheld Palm products, and the cell phones which have gone to other OS's. If anything, in these competitive technology markets, MS may end up finding themselves squeezed into an area of selling products into the slowing and mature PC market, and being out run by newer companies in new innovative areas of technology.

2. Awareness is important because consumers and business owners need to constantly be aware that they are responsible for the decisions and choices they make. . . and that there are choices. This strikes at the heart of what America is—responsibility for our actions, and for freedom. People who do not like MS can buy an Apple OS computer, or a Linux OS computer, or other alternatives like a Be based OS and computer.

Personally, I use an MS based computer. I do not think it is the best OS or browser in the world and it has a lot of faults. But so do all technology products in these complex areas. However, I am thankful that MS is a company that has unified the computer industry by giving it a platform that people can communicate with, and this may be the one single factor that has led to all the innovation and productivity of this country in the last ten years.

In summary, I do not think MS should be penalized further. It is time to move on—the technology world is not where it was five years ago. It's also time to be thankful and hopeful that MS remains a vital and strong part of American industry. Without it I believe our entire economy would suffer. And God help us if another foreign company rises to power and supplants MS.

Regards,
 Jim Lynch

MTC-00011668

From: ROBERTTF28@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:14pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a retired citizen, using MS Windows 98, I would like to say I wish our Justice

Department would stop any further action against Microsoft. I am very pleased with the company and in no way feel injured by Microsoft. On the contrary I feel they have helped me by making their products available. I have many friends who feel the same way and it is apparent to me that most of the objections to Microsoft are from their competitors rather than their customers. Success in the market place should be encouraged by our government, not hindered. When will our government officials stop petty projects and concentrate on the issues of real importance to the nation's citizens? If Mr. Gates had contributed huge sums to our political parties and candidates, would the situation be the same? If Microsoft were located in Mass or Utah would their politician's opposition to Microsoft be as strong? I think not. I see this as a political game and object strenuously.

Robert T. Fellows
 Tucson AZ

MTC-00011669

From: Dick Boulanger
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:17pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

Our household is unanimous in the opinion that the Microsoft settlement is sufficient and the case should be concluded ASAP. Our economy has sustained enough damage. It is high time to start healing the wounds and let Microsoft and competitor's management get back to growing the industry instead of trying to wreck it with Justice Department help. The nine dissenting states should get in line with the majority for the good of the country.

Respectfully submitted,
 Richard J. and Mary Ann Boulanger
 8117 N 12th St.
 Tacoma, WA 98406

MTC-00011670

From: Alex Brubaker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:17pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Your Honor,

I am a Stanford MBA who has been working in Silicon Valley for several years, some of those in the high tech industry. It is my view that Microsoft has repeatedly out-muscled its competition, wielding its operating system as a big stick, and falling on the wrong side of this nation's anti-trust laws.

The Proposed Final Judgment lets Microsoft off too easy and hardly constitutes a deterrent to future anti-trust violators. Furthermore, it doesn't eliminate the critical components that have enabled them to engage in this illegal behavior.

I strongly urge you to impose heavier penalties on Microsoft that will restore competition and force them to play by the rules like everyone else.

Sincerely,
 Alex Brubaker
 San Jose, CA

MTC-00011671

From: WP/MH
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

This absurdity has gone on long enough, it is time to settle and stop wasting the public's money, time and energy—the latter items would be better spent on real 'energy' and accountancy crooks, who are screwing the consumer and their own employees.

PE

MTC-00011672

From: Gerald Gaumer
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:19pm
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-00011673

From: Ken Horowitz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the settlement proposed by the Department of Justice is far too lenient—it is a mere slap on the wrist to Microsoft, a confirmed monopolist. The settlement as proposed SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED. Instead, the federal government should push ahead along the lines of the other states who have not caved in the Microsoft. The DoJ settlement will accomplish nothing, and will leave Microsoft free to continue its monopolistic ways. Please push for a tougher settlement that will more effectively restrict Microsoft.

Ken Horowitz
kenh@panix.com
203-637-4910
3 Cherry Lane, Old Greenwich, CT 06870

MTC-00011674

From: DONALD J. RESTLY
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

See attached file in support of the settlement.

9436 Wildwood Drive
Chardon, Ohio 44024
January 15, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I want to take a moment to give my support for the settlement negotiated between Microsoft and the Justice Department last year. I feel this is a good agreement for both sides and gives everyone the opportunity to move forward.

The settlement is comprehensive and mandates significant concessions from Microsoft in order to remain in compliance. Microsoft has agreed to grant computer broad new rights to configure Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs that compete with programs included within Windows. And Microsoft must not retaliate against any computer maker who ships software that competes with anything in the Windows operating system. Microsoft must also subject themselves to monitoring by a Technical Committee to assure compliance with the settlement.

At a time of difficult circumstances for our economy, this agreement could provide a small boost. The settlement will also give each side the chance to focus on other issues. For Microsoft, that means developing new software and for the government it means fighting the current recession.

Sincerely,
Donald J. Restly

MTC-00011675

From: dave cannon
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:20pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I want the US Justice Dept to stop persecuting MSFT for moving America ahead. If you want to end this recession to end drop this lawsuit and settle with MSFT today. This suit is hurting our economy.

MTC-00011676

From: Francie Hanks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:22pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
I BELIEVE THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR AND THE LITIGATION HAS GONE ON WAY TOO LONG. I STRONGLY URGE THE NINE STATES WHO HAVEN'T JOINED IN THE SETTLEMENT TO DO SO. IT'S TIME TO MOVE ON!

MTC-00011677

From: dwwrayti
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:22pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
Let's settle this now!!! Dragging this out hinders any recovery effort in the tech area. It's like killing the goose that laid the golden egg!!

Don Wray
Carpe Diem!!!

MTC-00011678

From: McCrosson1@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I understand you are seeking public comment on the proposed antitrust settlement with the 9 states and Microsoft, and that the District Court will consider these comments when it determines whether the settlement is indeed in the public interest. I believe the settlement is very much in the public interest and should be finalized immediately.

Over a year and a half ago, on May 7, 2000, I wrote my representative and two senators to express my concern about the Justice Department's handling of the Microsoft matter. At that time the DOJ was presenting its case to Judge Jackson, who appeared to be inclined to break up Microsoft. I recalled how in the 1970s and 80s all attention was on the successes of Japan; U.S. companies seemingly could do nothing right. One company that changed all that was Microsoft, which became a leader of the U.S. technology surge. We all benefited from this leadership. On the way home from our good paying jobs we could stop off at a Starbucks and have an expensive cup of coffee. Why not? We Americans were doing well in the 90s; unemployment was at all time lows. Much of the litigation initiated by the Justice Department and opportunists like Barksdale was misdirected. Surely Microsoft did wrong, but the current proposed settlement addresses that. The current holdouts to the settlement have an agenda of their own, which is not in the best interest of America. To achieve their ends, they would have us become a society that eats its young! This case against Microsoft has gone on too long. Let's get back to work.

Very truly yours,
F. Joseph McCrosson

MTC-00011679

From: Earl Johnston
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

If the government would pay more attention to companies like Enron and less on Microsoft, the country would be much healthier. The Microsoft cow has been milked long enough.

Sincerely,
Earl Johnston

MTC-00011680

From: Jack Hansen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:26pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I urge the respective state to accept the current settlement agreement. It is fair and equitable for all parties concerned.

MTC-00011681

From: ED SAVCHENKO
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
US Justice Dept.

I believe that the Microsoft case should be settled now. It seems that the only ones who win in a situation like this is the attorney's.

Ed Savchenko

MTC-00011682

From: John Dean
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My name is John Holmes Dean III and I am a 25 year old computer engineer. I have been programming since I was ten on a wide variety of computers; Apple IIe, Commodore Amiga, Macintoshes and IBM-PCs. The purpose of this letter is to highlight the technical inefficiencies of early Microsoft software and come to the conclusion that given a level playing field, no informed consumer would pick Microsoft's products based on quality. I will then talk about the time that Microsoft took over one hundred dollars from me in exchange for nothing in a move that stifled competition in a education setting (similar to the settlement Microsoft has currently proposed).

Between the years of 1987 and 1996, I was an active user and programmer of Commodore Amigas. The Amiga, which never achieved more than a low single-digit market share, occupies an interesting niche in computer history. Released in 1985 (one year after the ubiquitous Macintosh) to great fanfare, the Amiga was the first true "multimedia" computer. At a time when PCs had EGA (16 colors) and Macintoshes were black & white, the Amiga was capable of 4096 colors on screen. The Amiga had 4 channel 8-bit digital stereo sound when the PC had internal speakers and the Macintosh had 1 channel. The Commodore Amiga shipped with Workbench 1.0 which was a pre-emptive multitasking, graphical user interface operating system.

I spent my teenage years engrossed with my Amiga. Because Workbench could do pre-emptive multitasking (a form of running multiple programs where the operating system gives and takes processor time away from the individual programs), I would commonly use my computer to download files over my modem, listen to digital music files and play games at the same time. During this time, Microsoft's flagship operating system was Windows 3.X. Windows 3.X used a form of multitasking called cooperative multitasking. Each program had the responsibility to relinquish control of the processor to the next program. Cooperative multitasking is the same form of multitasking used on Macintoshes before Mac OS X and is considered an inferior method. It was hard to impossible to get multiple program to run correctly at the same time on early version of windows. When it was possible, the systems requirements were far greater. Windows 95 had a limited form of pre-emptive multitasking that was a mix between pre-emptive and cooperative. Windows uses a single letter for drive names. Windows uses the 8.3 naming convention. Windows, to this day, can not really name a file more than 8 letters long. "Long" file names are stored in the "information" field, which no longer exists, obviously. Windows 3.X involved 3 steps to make a disk or CD-ROM appear on the screen, whereas you only had to stick the disk in on the Amiga/Macintosh to have it appear on the screen. Windows 95 and

greater still requires one step because after you insert a floppy or CD-ROM, you must still double-click on 'My Computer' to see it.

'Plug-n-Pray' is a term used to describe Microsoft's 'Plug-n-Play' system. The DOS command line was inferior to Workbench's CLI (Workbench had a command line as well) because you couldn't copy and paste. there was no history and no command pipe. I can nit-pick forever when it comes to Windows, however I will admit that most of Window's problems are related to its MS-DOS ancestry and the many, many shortcomings of the IBM-PC architecture.

My other hobby was being a "troll." In internet terminology, a troll posts highly controversial statements to illicit as much feedback as possible (called "feeding the troll"). The term troll had not yet been invented, but I took great pleasure in posting messages to IBM-PC and Microsoft electronic bulletin board systems explaining how inferior IBM-PCs and Microsoft Windows really was. I would of course receive tens if not hundreds of responses, all of which I would respond to— beginning debates which would last for years. I convinced no less than a dozen people of the truth, all of which purchased Amigas and some of which are still life-long friends.

To this day, I have not purchased Microsoft software with one exception. When I was earning my Electrical Engineering degree at the University of Texas, Microsoft signed a deal with the University to provide copies of Microsoft software at \$5 a CD. The cost to the university was 100 million dollars which was added to each student's "Computer Fees." In that respect, Microsoft stole nearly \$25 a semester from me for five semesters so that I could have the honor of buying Microsoft software for \$5 a CD. I hated and despised this move by Microsoft because Microsoft knew that this was the only way to get a college student like me to pay for their software in the first place. Furthermore, because students could get Microsoft Visual Studio for \$25 (5 CDs) all programming classes began using Visual Studio because other compilers such as Borland and Metrowerks (where I can currently employed) could no longer compete, even with student pricing. I watched the programming classes at UT go from Metrowerks only to Visual Studio only in the course of two years.

Microsoft's settlement will allow Microsoft to achieve the same goal in the secondary and high school education market. By giving out Microsoft software for free, students will learn and become accustomed to Microsoft software and not made aware of the alternatives. The proposed Microsoft settlement amounts to nothing more than an exclusive advertisement contract between education and Microsoft.

In conclusion, I have personally seen the negative effects of Microsoft and IBM-PCs on the computer market. Microsoft took ten years to produce a product that (almost) met the capabilities of Workbench. Furthermore, Microsoft signed a deal that forced me to give them money just to continue my education. I now work for a Microsoft competitor where I will do my part to bring the giant down. I hope the Department of Justice does theirs.

John Holmes Dean III

MTC-00011683

From: Cynthiasdesigns@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:30pm
Subject: I am against any more of the

allegations re: Microsoft
They have done so much for the entire world, that there is just no action other than to be grateful to them for all that they have given, the "Quantum leap for mankind."

Cynthia's Designs
cynthiasdesigns@aol.com

MTC-00011684

From: The Unrein Family
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am writing to register my support for the settlement terms reached by the Department of Justice and Microsoft regarding the antitrust dispute on November 2. I feel that ending the litigation will be beneficial to the economy, and the federal government made the right choice.

Competition is extremely healthy, and every company needs to do business as they see fit. Let's let businesses worry about business, and government worry about government issues. There is no need for unnecessary regulation. Now, more than ever, it is imperative that the market prospers. Agreeing to the terms of the settlement will allow the market to do just that.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Please settle this matter and allow Microsoft to get back to business as usual.

Sincerely,
Annette Unrein
annieu@infowest.com
435-674-9816
P. O. Box 1003,
St. George, UT 84771

MTC-00011685

From: Michael Jaszewski
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:31pm
Subject: anti trust lawsuit

I think what Microsoft did was ok. No one was hurt by it. Microsoft single handedly created a industry in our country possible the world over. It's no different what I see everyday business's doing business.

Example—I go to taco bell I can't buy coke, only pepsi why is that isn't that like a monopoly same with computers I buy a comp it's got aol on it not earthlink why is that.

MTC-00011686

From: Pats413@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Various States Should End Their Lawsuit and begin to let the USA economy begin to heal. Consumers have not been hurt by Microsoft in fact we have all benefited from low prices of software and millions of 401K's have seen only profits because of Microsoft. End this immediately and lets stop wasting millions of dollars of our taxed income.

The Stillman Family

Pepper Pike, OH

MTC-00011687

From: Tom Gottshalk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the DOJ,

The real issue before you is: Now much money do the non-settling states want before they settle their anti-trust cases with Microsoft? This case is no longer about justice for the PC user, it not about the injustice of a monopoly, it is not about justice for the violation of federal law, but it is about nine states attorney generals trying to get extra money for their state's budgets. The case is about money and political power for politicians not about that Microsoft charged too much for the Windows operating system, which is ridiculous and has never been proven publicly. For all of the state officials if they get money out of Microsoft and it helps their political careers so much the better, right.

Regards,

Tom Gottshalk
344 Remington Dr.
Oviedo, FL 32765

MTC-00011688

From: Chirrip@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:39pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's end this harazment once & for all.
Close out per the latest agreement.

George Chironis,
Melville, N.Y. 11747

MTC-00011689

From: JP Altier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am deeply concerned at the way our government has pursued the destruction of Microsoft, one of the most productive and beneficial companies in our world. In a truly free society, where property rights are vigorously protected, there is absolutely no need for antitrust laws. Microsoft, in fact, is a prime example of the concept that a company can sustain a dominant market position if and only if it provides a markedly superior product than any of its competitors. The very nature of the fact that Microsoft's products are inexpensive and ubiquitous has benefited this world immeasurably. Microsoft, therefore, deserves the market position and profits it has reaped in exchange for the products it has produced.

The fact that Microsoft negotiated vigorously with its customers and competitors should not be a crime. Microsoft did not deprive other companies or consumers of their property rights. Nor did Microsoft obtain its will by deception or physical force. Every company no matter how large or small should have the right to control the destiny of their own products and the right to determine the terms and conditions of their business relationships so long as their practices never include deception or physical force. For a court to have retroactively declared that Microsoft was a monopoly some time in the past and

that all of its otherwise legal actions are now criminal acts goes against our most basic instincts of fairness and justice. I strongly urge all parties involved in this case to mitigate the harm to Microsoft and our economy that will result from the enforcement of our misguided antitrust laws. At the very least, I urge the Department of Justice and States Attorney Generals to cease litigation in this matter and I urge the presiding judge to accept the Stipulation and Revised Final Judgment dated November 6th, 2001.

Sincerely,
Joseph P. Altier
CC:msfin@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00011690

From: Larry M. Johnson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:38pm
Subject: settle this thing!

Millions of Americans have had their 401K plans turned totally upside down by this drawn out suit. Settle this thing once and for all!! The fact of the matter is without Bill Gates inventing Windows I couldn't even run a computer nor couple most other Americans that use them every day.

Sincerely
Larry Johnson

MTC-00011691

From: Mark Reed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I am a supporter of you and President Bush as well as Microsoft Corp. I believe the current settlement is the best course of action at this time. I don't believe the case should have been pursued in the first place, but since the damage has been done can we please put it to rest right away.

I work in the technical industry as a computer programmer. I am not employed (nor ever have been) by Microsoft, but I am a firm believer that they have done an enourmous amount of good in the industry. Their servers and development environment have enabled me to be a successful professional. I am grateful to them—and feel they have been unjustly "picked on". I understand the market is extremely competitive and unsavory practices occur. However, these unsavory practices are done by all parties—if IBM, Sun or Oracle were in Microsoft's shoes—they would have done the same things. Hopefully I would be consistent in wanting an end to those cases as well—were they brought up.

Please put the case to rest.

Sincerely,
Mark Reed
Mark M. Reed
Senior Systems Engineer
(972) 728-8161
mreed@mh2.com

MTC-00011692

From: Dick H.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

despite the stubbornness of our Atty.
General Blumenthal here in CT. it is obvious

that it is in everyone's best interest that this problem be settled and solved and put behind us. please do it!!

MTC-00011693

From: GRIZ1000@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:46pm
Subject: Anti-Trust Case against Microsoft
If Microsoft broke the law punish them but don't reorganize the Company or tell them what they can include in their products.
GRIZ1000@aol.com

MTC-00011694

From: Erratadata@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen, I wish to urge you to finalize and settle this matter immediately. Prolonging litigation is not in the best interest of the American economy in general and the American people specifically. Getting this matter settled NOW will enable Microsoft as well as any and all other companies concerned to get on with the innovation and product development that has marked the progress and growth of this industry for the past two decades.

Sincerely,
Gary Prickett
Mission Viejo, CA

MTC-00011695

From: Sightsaver@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlment

It is high time for this case to be settled, especially in light of the events of 9/11 and the recent Enron debacle. A few publicity-seeking, self-righteous AGs, supported by Microsoft's competitors should not be allowed to derail what is in this country's best interest. Tracey Linden DO

MTC-00011696

From: fitz—stewart@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this case. It's in the best interests of the economy, the technology sector, and the entire country.

Regards,
Fitz Stewart
13544 Tabscott Drive
Chantilly, VA 20151
CC:fitz—stewart@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC-00011697

From: Wilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:48pm
Subject: enough!!!

This settlement should never have even been a question, but now that it has been agreed to, the vendetta against Microsoft needs to end. It should never have begun. Just because they invented a better mousetrap, they have been victimized by our government. I am ashamed of this.

Sincerely,
Veta Wilson
HCR 76 Box 66
Coleman, Texas 76834

MTC-00011698

From: Don Hall
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:46pm
 Subject: Microsoft Case Settlement

Dear Justices,
 As a citizen of the United States I would like to express my opinion on the settlement issue of the Microsoft case. I feel the offer Microsoft has given is fair and in the best interest of the public. I urge all states to accept this settlement and end the case as soon as possible.

Any further suites or punishment of Microsoft is not in the best interest of the general public and will only harm and impair Microsoft's future ability to continue delivering cutting edge software at reasonable prices. Many if not most of the nation rely on Microsoft's quality software every day for our livelihood. If you try to cripple or punish Microsoft further than has already been proposed will be detrimental to the public who rely on their software.

Any further larger fines will simply make the software more expensive for the end users and all of the general public will be harmed. Please come to a reasonable settlement as quickly as possible.

Thank you.
 Don Hall, DrPH
 Clackamas, Oregon

MTC-00011699

From: LeeAndrews@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I support the DOJ's proposed antitrust settlement with 9 states and Microsoft. It's time for the litigation to end.

Lee Andrews
 Richardson, TX

MTC-00011700

From: Stanley Shoeman
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

Let's make a settlement and get this behind us. We have more important things to settle at this point.

Stan Shoeman
 2983 Old Bridgeport Way
 San Diego CA 92111

MTC-00011701

From: B.J. Fornadley
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:51pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please, let's not waste any more Government money in this case. The proposed settlement is more than fair to all parties.

Thank you
 B. J. Fornadley

MTC-00011702

From: James Scheil
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:53pm
 Subject: Class Action Suit

Those nine states should settle the Microsoft class action as proposed. Thanks-Ken & Charline Scheil

MTC-00011703

From: finked@kirtland.cc.mi.us@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:53pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

i am in favor of upholding the agreement reached between the u.s. department of justice and the microsoft corporation. while it will not satisfy some folks, particularly those who tend to see microsoft as a villain to be severely punished at every opportunity, it seems fair to me. microsoft's culpability is proven, but is not, i believe, as serious as the dissenting states' attorneys general claim. and i see no reason to continue the litigation process. the immediate installation of a court-appointed overseer is more appropriate—if we are most interested in protecting the consumer. detmar h. finke
 CC:finked@kirtland.cc.mi.us@inetgw

MTC-00011704

From: Rolygrace@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Although I am not a lawyer I have followed the antitrust litigation in connection with Microsoft and hereby submit my opinion to the effect that I agree that settlement is good for the consumer and the american economy, which right now needs all the help it can get. Grace Larrinua from rolygrace

MTC-00011705

From: CWO Mel Estes USMC(Ret.)
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:55pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

. Dear USDOJ, I would hope that this settlement is the end of the this long ordeal of stifling the economy and the technology sector. In my opinion it has been a witch hunt from the beginning. MS first established the computer industry years ago, caused the tech revolution, and thus has caused a reason for many of their competitors to even exist. It is easy to see that they are gaining up on them now. Please end this mess.

Respectfully, Mel Estes

MTC-00011706

From: Bruce Rocheleau
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:56pm
 Subject: comments on Microsoft case

I hope that the case is settled quickly. I think that the settlement is fair and provides the basis for rapid technological advances in the near and longer term future. I know that people like myself who use computer technology as part of their jobs look forward to having this uncertainty solved quickly.

Sincerely,
 Bruce Rocheleau

MTC-00011707

From: Brian Satterfield
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear DOJ,
 It all comes down to choices.

I am a software engineer and have worked with computers for the last 6 years. My parents have recently started using

computers and it has become obvious to me just how strong the Micro\$oft hold is on the industry.

It is my belief that the proposed settlement will do nothing to curtail Micro\$oft's actions, growth or domination of the industry and market. I believe that Micro\$oft will easily find ways to skirt the edges of the settlement and still be in accordance. They will integrate their applications more closely with the OS so that they are indistinguishable and therefore impossible to separate. I agree with Attorney General Thomas F. Reilly "Five minutes after any agreement is signed with Microsoft, they'll be thinking of how to violate the agreement. They're predators. They crush their competition. They crush new ideas. They stifle innovation. That's what they do."

I agree heavily with Matthew Szulik's comments to the Senate and feel that the government needs to step in and stop the wave of Micro\$oft domination. One way would be to ban all use of commercial operating systems on government resources. Another would be to mandate that for the next so many years they will spend money on hardware for every school district in the nation.

Red Hat software corporation has made the following offer (amendments to the DOJ PFJ) and I agree with it completely: Microsoft redirects the value of their proposed software donation to the purchase of additional hardware for the school districts. This would increase the number of computers available under the original proposal from 200,000 to more than one million, and would increase the number of systems per school from approximately 14 to at least 70. Red Hat, Inc. will provide free of charge the open-source Red Hat Linux operating system, office applications and associated capabilities to any school system in the United States. Red Hat will provide online support for the software through the Red Hat Network.

Unlike the Microsoft proposal, which has a five-year time limit at which point schools would have to pay Microsoft to renew their licenses and upgrade the software, the Red Hat proposal has no time limit. Red Hat will provide software upgrades through the Red Hat Network online distribution channel.

I hope the DOJ can see that the injustice done to Micro\$oft's competition and to the Open Source community needs to be dealt with in a heavy manner.

Brian Satterfield
 Engineer—Lockheed Martin —

MTC-00011708

From: hicktest@hotmail.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 3:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Kollar-Kotelly,

I urge the court to bless the DOJ/Microsoft settlement. It's impossible to please everyone with a settlement (including Microsoft biggest competitors). Both sides seem happy with the compromise. I think the courts dictating which features are allowed in a product will spell disaster for our economy. It's time to forget this mess and stop destroying one of America's best corporations.

Sincerely,
Matt Hickey
Glastonbury, CT

MTC-00011709

From: Rpellet1@aol.com@ inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the matter of the Microsoft settlement, I am convinced that it is in the best interests of consumers and our economy that it be accepted by all parties.

Much time, effort and money has already been wasted on this effort to discredit and humble one of this country's finest companies. More people use Microsoft products because they satisfy. Get over it.

Robert Pellet
Edison, New Jersey

MTC-00011710

From: Tina.Chan@Fluor.com@ inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 12:54pm
Subject: Fw: Microsoft Settlement

Please, let's not waste any more Government money in this case. The proposed settlement is more than fair to all parties.

Sincerely
Tina Chan

MTC-00011711

From: Phiss@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to settle this nonsense the government has imposed upon us by constantly attacking Microsoft. Am I the only citizen who noticed that with the first court actions against Microsoft, the stock market nosedived and has never come back?

Competition is just that—competition. Instead of whining about Microsoft, why don't these equally wealthy competitors go do something better than Microsoft?

If we ever want this country back on it's feet—and as a business owner—I certainly do, then we need to settle and end thisSurely, we have more to do with our time than attack the major companies in this country—which, if you haven't noticed—are having enough problems.

With this settlement, I believe our financial markets will be revived.

Phyllis G. Schaul
Scottsdale, Arizona

MTC-00011712

From: jim.e.althoff@ssa.gov@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this painful, government sponsored targeting of Microsoft. The innovation that has been stopped as a result of this harassment and the destruction to our economy is out of line with the already imposed penalties. No longer can justice be the banner for pursuing Microsoft, now it is simply financial greed, fed by biased legal teams.

CC:jim.e.althoff@ssa.gov@inetgw

MTC-00011713

From: david.j.oakley
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 2:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear sirs:

With respect to the comments on the proposed action, I am opposed to the Government's Action. From my point of view, having a multitude of operating systems, would be akin to moving from one universal language which all understand, to multiple languages, to which few understand more than one or two.

The resulting catastrophic incompatibility between operating systems would destroy the usefulness of communications between computers in different locations.

Respectfully
David J. Oakley

MTC-00011714

From: david—perdue@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I fully support the proposed settlement and urge its approval. I am a professional software developer and a consumer of software. As both, I do not feel I have been harmed by Microsoft in any way.

Approve this settlement and put an end to Microsoft competitors using the courts to fight their business battles.

Sincerely,
David Perdue
Houston, TX

MTC-00011715

From: Phcutch@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We feel that business has the right to research, develop, promote and sell new ideas and products. That's what the American way is all about—freedom, now more than ever. We encourage the government to end the litigation process against Microsoft and carry out the settlement that has been reached. It will eventually be best for consumers—prices will be kept down and new products will be available more readily if the costs of litigation, etc. are kept to a minimum and the company can spend resources on research and development and getting products to market.

Phyllis and Hal Cutcher
Tucson, Az
phcutch@aol.com

MTC-00011716

From: Paul Holsted
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen, I have only a limited knowledge of computers but it is very apparent that Microsoft has been a very important figure in the advancement of our national growth which has been astounding and would not have reached this high level were it not for such firms as Microsoft. I feel that it is downright unfair to penalize Microsoft for its creative genius. The

agreement between the Department of Justice and the nine states and Microsoft appears to be fair and any further litigation by the Attorneys General of the nine states which have not agreed to the DoJ/Microsoft agreement may be based on ulterior motives in pushing for heavier penalties. Therefore I urge the Department of Justice to not line up with the arguments of these states but instead to push for final resolution of this litigation so that Microsoft and the rest of our economy can move ahead. I feel that this issue has had a negative effect on the economy and so let's get the nation moving ahead and get this matter settled as soon as possible.

Paul G. Holsted,
9871 Mammoth Drive,
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

MTC-00011717

From: Sherm Grossman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

[Text body exceeds maximum size of message body (8192 bytes). It has been converted to attachment.]

CC:webmaster@ago.state.ma.us@inetgw
Dear Sir or Madam:

These comments are in opposition to Massachusetts Attorney General Tom Reilly's position on the Microsoft settlement as stated in the January 15, 2002, Boston Globe Public Forum piece, "Microsoft case key to tech's future," [http://boston.com/dailyglobe2/O15/business/Microsoft case—key—to—tech—to—future+.shtml](http://boston.com/dailyglobe2/O15/business/Microsoft%20case—key—to—tech—to—future+.shtml) In this article, Attorney General Reilly makes suggestions to pursue remedies against Microsoft. In my opinion, that may result in the collapse of one of the world's foremost technology providers and the PC systems it makes work.

Microsoft develops two distinct software product lines: an Operating System (Windows), which acts to assign priorities to internal PC operations and hardware and is rarely seen or worked on by the typical PC user, and applications, which perform specific tasks for the PC user like word processing, spread sheet manipulation and presentation preparation (MS Word, Excel, Power Point).

The product at the core of Mr. Reilly's objections is the Operating System (OS). Developers of applications need to structure their software to function within the parameters specified by an OS. They have to do this for any OS, and many may do so for more than one: like Windows and Linux, for example. However, there is such a thing as optimization: making the applications run efficiently. Most application vendors want to have their product run as fast as possible on as many PCs as possible, so they optimize their product for Windows, the most used OS.

Now, even if additional OSs are introduced just because Federal and State Governments believe that will lead to more and better products (it didn't with IBM's OS2), applications will still be optimized for just one, but not all OSs. This will result in a PC having its installed OS being able to run efficiently some, but not all, applications because application developers will not get enough return on their investment to

optimize their products for multiple OSs. Good business strategy says that the version of the product that should be most heavily optimized is the one that will be used on the PCs that have the most frequently installed OS. For now, that's Windows.

This is not a restriction on emerging technologies. It is a fact of business, and contradicts Mr. Reilly's objective to have "computer users . . . have a full choice of programs," and to ". . . have [computer users have] the freedom to customize their systems with the programs and software they want." To have the full choice of optimized, efficient and fast-executing software, there should be one prevalent operating system in the same way there is and for years has been, essentially, one prevalent PC hardware architecture based on the original IBM PC. (Before you go there, based on sales and available applications, Apple is really a non-player despite Microsoft providing a version of Office that runs efficiently on Apple systems. Notice how it takes a company the size of Microsoft to provide its flagship application optimized for more than one OS and hardware architecture.)

The chaos surrounding creating competing hardware architectures would be akin to forcing into existence a second personal transportation system in which vehicles would run on tracks. What would be the cost of developing a second infrastructure? What would be the response of the vehicle manufacturers? Would there be as many? Would we still see the same vehicle quality? Would we still have as much vehicle innovation? Would there be as many vehicle choices? What would the vehicles cost?

The same chaos would occur if Windows were gutted so that was no longer the prevalent OS. Windows may devolve in the future, but to force it would be disastrous. Technology evolution and user acceptance is generally based on rules similar to natural biological selection. Windows may fall into disfavor and be replaced by another OS, but Microsoft may be the company that creates that successor. Why try to artificially prevent that?

Look what has happened with forcing High Definition TV into existence. Local TV program producers for all but the largest markets don't want to invest in HDTV production equipment until broadcasters invest in the new transmission equipment. Networks are reluctant to invest in HDTV equipment because there are insufficient local affiliates that can carry HDTV transmissions. TV set manufacturers don't want to invest in building HDTV sets until broadcasters transmit HDTV programs. Cable service providers don't want to invest in HDTV cable systems until there are HDTV programs in their markets and there are HDTV sets to receive them. Buyers don't want to pay exorbitant prices for HDTV sets and/or HDTV tuners and receiving antennas until there are enough programs being broadcast to make it worthwhile. (The only reason that there are any HDTV sets around is DVDs, and even those sets don't include HDTV tuners.) So, we're in a stand-off situation with the conversion process taking much longer than the Federal Government wanted.

But, the real problem is not HDTV technology, but the decisions that broadcasters need to make about which one of the many picture quality options to transmit. This is contributing to the TV set manufacturers' reluctance to invest in sets that are optimized around one methodology and is keeping the variety of HDTV sets small and their price high.

This sounds similar to the problems that would develop if multiple OSs were edicted into existence or if Microsoft were forced to relinquish their pre-eminent OS-developer position. The PC world would wind up with either fewer applications or the ones that were optimized for all OSs would become considerably more expensive.

In fact, there is more than one OS currently available. The second OS that's most often noted is Linux. Now, how many popular applications are there currently for this OS? Who's stopping software developers from creating them?

As to computer makers not having control of their systems' desktops, Mr. Reilly and the Department of Justice should realize that "computer makers" build hardware, not software, and that ultimately, the user controls what's on the desktop—not the hardware manufacturer, not the software manufacturer, but the user.

And, it's not clear what an "unbundled" version of Windows does for anyone. What application is Mr. Reilly suggesting is now bundled? A browser? Well, it really is possible to install and use a browser other than Internet Explorer (like Netscape); it really is possible to install and use Lotus Smartsuite rather than Microsoft Office (neither of which is bundled with Windows). So what's the issue here?

Here's another similar situation. Think of an automobile dashboard as being like a PC OS and the car radio as an application. At the moment, it's not usually possible to buy a car without some kind of vehicle manufacturers' radio pre-installed. Will the Federal Government and the States require automobile manufacturers to offer all cars without radios so purchasers can buy their own from either the vehicle manufacturer or some other vendor?

Well, right now many cars owners can have their OEM radio replaced with an after-market one. However, not all auto manufacturers' radios have the same dimensions. And, if one examines the choices carefully, one finds that the variety of replacement radios available for Daimler-Chrysler and GM vehicles is far smaller than those available for cars using DIN dimensional standards. (Remember, too, the radio with the oval-shaped front panel used in the Ford Taurus? There don't seem to be any after-market products available for direct replacement.)

Daimler-Chrysler and GM radios happen to be pretty good. But will the Federal Government and the States want a common form factor legislated that may diminish the quality, ease-of-use and feature flexibility of Daimler-Chrysler, GM and Ford radios?

Mr. Reilly also contradicts his objective when he tries to make his point about ". . . Microsoft disclos[ing] the necessary technical information so that handheld

devices, servers and networks can work with Windows. . . ." If Federal and State Governments want this, won't there be more software development for the Windows OS than there is now rather than less? Doesn't this create more products and business for Microsoft? (And, in point of fact, there is more than one OS for handhelds already, and they and servers and networks can work with Windows.)

Finally, perhaps it's wishful thinking, but one seriously doubts that the 3,200 software companies and 200,000 high-tech workers in Massachusetts would ever see any benefit from what Mr.

Reilly wants to do to Microsoft.

Sherman H. Grossman Needham, MA

MTC-00011718

From: james.althoff@verizon.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please end this pitiful, state government sponsored targeting of Microsoft. The innovation that has been stopped as a result of this harassment and the destruction to our economy is way out of line with the already imposed penalties. No longer can justice be the banner for pursuing Microsoft, now it is simply financial greed on the part of the states. CC:james.althoff@verizon.net@inetgw

MTC-00011719

From: Boopster2626@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

Please let this end once and for all, I believe that Microsoft has been very cooperative, etc. At least they didn't loose any records like Anderson or Enron., or try to hid anything. Go after the real crooks like Enron, who left many middle class citizens without any money in their 401K, funny how bigshots could take money out but workers who save for retirement could not. I believe you have a much bigger problem than Microsoft and Bill Gates.

MTC-00011720

From: Diane Nice
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Diane Nice
429 Morwood Road
Telford, PA 18969
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Diane

MTC-00011721

From: Randall Page
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Randall Page
348 Freya Drive
Solvang, ca 93463
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Randall S. Page

MTC-00011722

From: C. B. Goff
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
C. B. Goff
2416 Denise Street
Benton, AR 72015-2624
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
C. B. Goff

MTC-00011723

From: Kelly Baker
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kelly Baker
12337 Jones Road
Houston, TX 77070
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kelly Baker

MTC-00011724

From: Joseph W Pfahnl
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joseph W Pfahnl
2197 Glenkirk Dr
San Jose, CA 95124
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Joseph W Pfahnl

MTC-00011725

From: Andrea Palmer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Andrea Palmer
225 Capstan Drive
Placida, FL 33946-2221
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Andrea Palmer

MTC-00011726

From: Thomas Dill
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Thomas Dill
2325 Browning Drive
Janesville, WI 53546-1143
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Thomas Dill

MTC-00011727

From: Amy Hanson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Amy Hanson
6868 North Overhill #3
Chicago, IL 60631
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Amy Hanson

MTC-00011728

From: Sally Arnold
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please settle this litigation. It's time to move on. Microsoft has greatly benefitted consumers throughout the world. This mission of punishment is only costly taxpayers and Microsoft excessive expense. Please settle.

Sally A. Arnold, CPCU, ARM, ARe
Risk Management Consultant
Self-Insurance Specialists, Inc.

MTC-00011729

From: James Coombs
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
James Coombs
11127 Oviatt Road
Honor, MI 49640
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James Coombs

MTC-00011730

From: Kathy Sparks
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kathy Sparks
692 Cobble Dr.
Montrose, CO 81401
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kathy Sparks

MTC-00011731

From: Richard Rizzo
To: Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice
Date: 1/15/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Richard Rizzo
218 west noble ave.
bushnell, fl 33513-5414
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice,

Dear Microsoft Settlement U.S. Department of Justice:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Richard Rizzo

MTC-00011732

From: Deborah Eaton
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Deborah Eaton
100 Hickory Lane
Scottsville, KY 42164
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Deborah Eaton

MTC-00011733

From: Charles Palmer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Palmer
225 Capstan Drive
Placida, FL 33946-2221
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles Palmer

MTC-00011734

From: Rosaline VanNess
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Rosaline VanNess
8505 Hanford Drive
Richmond, VA 23229-4719
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Rosaline B VanNess

MTC-00011735

From: Laurie Grizzard
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Laurie Grizzard
2967 Mt. Pleasant Rd.
Franklin, GA 30217
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tim and Laurie Grizzard

MTC-00011736

From: Norm Donaldson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Norm Donaldson
697 Carr Ave
Aromas, CA 95004
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Norm Donaldson

MTC-00011737

From: Wyonia R Farner
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wyonia R Farner
8426 Sunview Drive
El Cajon, Ca 92021-1627
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create

new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Wyonia R Farner

MTC-00011738

From: ANTHONY THOMPSON
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
ANTHONY THOMPSON
4801 ASHLEY TERRACE
MIDDLETOWN, OH 45042
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY E. THOMPSON

MTC-00011739

From: Sandi Fowler
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sandi Fowler
6437 Longmont tr;
Fort Worth, TX 76179-3715
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Sandi Fowler

MTC-00011740

From: Wendy Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wendy Johnson
7875 Valencia Court
Highland, CA 92346-5753
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Wendy L. Johnson

MTC-00011741

From: T. Mack Jennings
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
T. Mack Jennings
408 Lee St.

Sulphur Springs, TX 75482-4349
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

T. Mack Jennings

MTC-00011742

From: Jocelynn Bailey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jocelynn Bailey
13309 Sturno Drive
Clifton, VA 20124-0957
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With

the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Jocelynn Bailey

MTC-00011743

From: Tamey Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tamey Johnson
4230 County Road 633
Clanton, AL 35045
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Tamey Johnson

MTC-00011744

From: Connie Marthinsen
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Connie Marthinsen
202 Sarazen Meadow Way
Cary, NC 27513
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the

courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Connie Marthinsen

MTC-00011745

From: stanley kimmel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is anti-American that you took action against Microsoft for their ability to do an excellent job of developing and selling their products. You should make every effort to settle and go about your business of prosecuting law breakers.

Stanley Kimmel

Box 23093

Anchorage, KY 40223

MTC-00011746

From: William E. Gabel
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William E. Gabel
2140 North Parkway Drive
Upper Arlington, OH 43221
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick

the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
William E. Gabel

MTC-00011747

From: Francis M. Perry
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Francis M. Perry
2005 S. Berry's Chapel Road
Franklin, TN 37069
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Francis M. Perry

MTC-00011748

From: Linda Schlange
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Linda Schlange
27395 Cypress Street
Highland, CA 92346-3715
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition

in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Linda L. Schlange

MTC-00011749

From: Emilia Neudorff
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Emilia Neudorff
7806 Jason Ave.
West Hills, CA 91304-4434
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Emilia Neudorff

MTC-00011750

From: user@openai.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
DOJ,

Please count my opinion as being in support of Matthew Szulik, CEO of Red Hat. I have looked over the PFJ and feel it is seriously lacking in action against one of the richest, sleaziest corporations in the world.

I would very much like to see the further actions that Mathew has proposed be taken into consideration and integrated into the Final Judgement. I believe that Microsoft should fund the advancement of alternative software and other operating systems (Macintosh and Linux) for a period of time to convey the message that you cannot use illegal methods to hold down your competition and suffocate free speech and free code.

Sincerely,
A concerned computer user.

MTC-00011751

From: Rdmandalay@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is my opinion that Microsoft Corporation is a first rate, first class company and the courts and justice system should stop penalizing it. They have been most generous in their settlement offers and contributions to schools. If other companies can't compete, it is not the fault of Microsoft. They can stop whining. The remaining states in litigation are just trying to grab some "free" money and this should be discouraged. America should be proud of Microsoft and free it of all the legal entanglements! It stands for what USA capitalism is all about!

Ann Mitcham
(not connected in any way with Microsoft Corp.—don't even own any stock.)
CC:MSFIN@microsoft.com@inetgw

MTC-00011752

From: Jack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:08pm
Subject: Settlement agreement

Please see the attached letter regarding the pending Microsoft agreement.

John I. Schuler
269 Glenbrook Drive
Pittsburgh, PA 15237-5303
15 January 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft,

After three long years of legal wrangling the Microsoft antitrust case has finally seen an opportunity for resolution in the settlement reached last November. A continuation of litigation, such that Microsoft's competitors are now strongly lobbying for, will simply not benefit anyone but their competition, and thus will prove to be counter-productive for America.

The current settlement offers much of which that the government and competing companies should be satisfied. It allows free access to Microsoft's source code and interfaces that are internal to Windows operating system products. Additionally, Microsoft is obligated to design future versions of Windows to make it easier on consumers, manufacturers, and software developers to promote non-Microsoft

applications. This, in addition to many other restrictions and obligations, will be verified by a Technical Committee to ensure Microsoft's compliance.

It appears to me that this settlement is the best way to put an end to this matter once and for all. I strongly urge to work towards the immediate resolution of this case. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
John J. Schuler
John J. Schuler
CC: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00011753

From: Jean Smith
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
I think it is about time that this gets settled for the good of the country and all its citizens. I feel that who ever it is that is trying to do this to a good and inovative country is just plain stupid. Without Microsoft I hat to think where we would be. It is a terriable thing to think that someone wants to destroy a good thing. Just because they have some smart inovative people that are capable of doing such things should make us proud not want to destroy what is good.

Sincerely,
Jean N. Smith

MTC-00011754

From: Joan Nims Cook
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:09pm
Subject: litigation

considering the damage already done to the economy it is extremely doubtful that further pursuit of litigation benefits anyone with the possible exception of a few who hope to gain political advantage. Isn't it long since time to stop the foolishness and get on with the work of this country.

MTC-00011755

From: JHart60@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

After reviewing the settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft, I am of the opinion that this should move forward. It is not in the best interest of all parties to have this drag out any further. The settlement is Reasonable and Fair to all parties.

There appears to bigger issues that the Department needs to address at this time.

Thank you for your attention on this matter.

J. C. Hart
10821 East 25 Ave.
Spokane WA 99206

MTC-00011756

From: Rexasoras@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:12pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT IS CLEAR TO ALL EXCEPT WANNABE POLITICOS IN THE PERSON OF STATE ATTY GENS (9) THAT THIS CASE SHOULD BE SETTLED PROMPTLY. THE DAMAGE DONE TO THE ECONOMY IN THE QUEST TO PUNISH SUCCESS MUST BE CURBED.

DO JUSTICE FOR THE NATION AND SETTLE THIS CASE THAT SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT IN THE FIRST PLACE.

REX R. MALSON
189 SHERWOOD DR
BRANSON, MO 65616

MTC-00011757

From: yoooperup@hotmail.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that this settlement is fair and just, for a couple of reasons.

1. I do not believe this trial should have gone as far as it has. Every business and person has the choice of Operating system. I could get a Macintosh, I could load Unix or I could use a free version of Linux. The reason Microsoft has such a hold on the Computer OS and Software industry is because they come out with not necessarily the best OS, but the best OS as a package, including support, the amount of Software available, and people knowledgeable in the product.

2. This settlement will bring new technology to schools that currently have 3 year old computers and Software

Sincerely,
Terry L. Read
CC:yoooperup@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC-00011758

From: Betsy Brinson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I am Josephine Average Consumer and a taxpayer. To date, I still don't understand why my tax dollars are being spent to sue a legitimate business for being successful. I further don't understand why once a settlement is proposed nine states can hold up the process of getting on with life. I have sat back in awe and watched the tobacco growers being subsidized by the government to grow a produce which is then sold to the tobacco companies to produce a legal product that is sold to folks, with a huge tax collected by the government, and then having the government sue the tobacco companies because people choose to use a legal product that is not good for their health. The frosting on the cake is where the government then turns around and takes the money from the tobacco companies and uses it for general fund purposes, not related to health issues stemming from the use of tobacco. I am having a strong sense of deja vue with the Microsoft case. Undoubtedly the fact that some of my retirement is tied up in Microsoft stock biases my view. However, as I see it, the case needs to be settled so that Microsoft can get back to creating more innovations that do nothing but improve my life and as I understand it from the general media the proposed settlement seems to meet everyone's needs.

Betty Brinson, J.D.
W.S.B.A. #12190
1811 "C" Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

MTC-00011759

From: Mary Ann Censky
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:59pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

I would like to encourage all parties involved in the settlement negotiations to do everything in their power to come to full agreement on all remaining issues. I personally feel the downturn in the economy, which started declining about the time the government started their antitrust proceedings, is in large part due to the uncertainty created by the Government's pursuit of Microsoft over the last couple of years. Microsoft has done tremendous good for individual consumers, for business and for our overall economy. Claims that the consumer has been hurt are ludicrous—I believe there are very few consumers who believe this. If Microsoft's competitors developed comparable products and marketed them in the outstanding manner Microsoft has, then these antitrust pursuits would not have been necessary. I applaud the Federal Government's efforts in reaching a settlement and hope the remaining few states will see the wisdom in reaching a quick resolution of all remaining issues.

Please everyone, let's put our Government resources where most needed—fighting domestic and international terrorism and bringing our economy out of the recession—and let Microsoft keep developing their great products that allow individual consumers and small and large business to succeed in their endeavors. It's appalling to think about how much money has been spent on these legal proceedings—let's end it now. If I were a taxpayer in the remaining states that haven't settled, I would be beyond furious.

Thank you for your consideration of my feelings on this subject.

Mary Ann Censky
2731—77th Avenue SE—# 206
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Phone: 206-624-1695
Fax: 206-624-1795

MTC-00011760

From: Duane Dier
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 3:58pm
Subject: Doj

The department of Justice should immediately settle the Microsoft case, that never really was a case anyway, but rather, a governmental vendetta, birthed by greedy jealous competitors, and picked up by opportunistic politicians looking for the next corporation to raid. Remember the old saying "when you rob peter to pay Paul, Paul is always on your side". This is what this amounts to political extortion of a company that has helped free the world. Go Microsoft, and I do not own stock, and No one I know works for the company.

Duane Dier,
Seattle, Wa

MTC-00011761

From: Bob Quinn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Yes, please settle the lawsuit with Microsoft. I agree with the current terms

agreed upon by the parties involved. I believe that it is to this country's interest to allow Microsoft to focus on its core business instead of wasting money and resources on lawsuits such as this.

Thank you.
Bob Quinn
The VB Applications Group
25038 SE 40th Drive
Issaquah, WA
<mailto:bob@vbapplications.com>
bob@vbapplications.com
(425) 313-1013

MTC-00011762

From: Mr1031@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:14pm
Subject: Settle it

As far as I am concerned the states that are holding out are doing it in either career enhancement on the part of the attorney generals there or they are function more as lobbyists for their in state high tech corporations and probably should have withdrawn themselves because of their bias. I don't feel ANYTHING put on the table would satisfy them short of Microsoft relinquishing total control of itself to them. This ends up being more like reverse monopoly stuff like reverse discrimination!

Ron Walken
Seattle, Wa

MTC-00011763

From: Jack Henderson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think that the current Microsoft Settlement is fair and appropriate. I think that it would be a HUGE mistake to punish further this company.

As someone who travels a great deal, I find it tremendously helpful to sit down at a computer in whatever country I'm in and find a Windows environment with which I am comfortable and which I can immediately use. Any settlement that reduces Microsoft's influence in maintaining consistency in worldwide computer operating systems would be a serious blow to international business and education.

Jack Henderson
Phippsburg, Maine

MTC-00011764

From: Jurg3720@cs.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:15pm
Subject: RE: Microsoft Settlement

My opinion is, to settle the Action as soon as possible. This will be good to our Economy and provide more Stability to the Market. We do not need war within our Country.

Juergen Brunke

MTC-00011765

From: wright—1997@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft settlement is fair and should be approved. Microsoft is a great company and should be allowed to continue without

having this case going on forever. This is good for the economy and for America.

As a consumer I am happy with this settlement and with most of Microsoft products. If I like another product Microsoft does not keep me from using it.

Thank You
CC:wright—1997@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00011766

From: Woody Tweed
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:16pm
Subject: opinion

Lets put this behind us and let the economy go forward. The whole case should have been thrown out of court.

Woody Tweed
Linn Creek Mo. 65052

MTC-00011767

From: 432kabl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Dept. of Justice:

It is long past time to end the government attacks on Microsoft. The dominance of the computer industry that Microsoft has unquestionably attained is primarily the result of serving the needs of computer users better than any other company. Microsoft has made immense contributions to the rising productivity that is the primary source of our exceptional prosperity in recent years. That kind of innovation is the main hope for restoring prosperity after the current recession.

The last thing our government should be doing is attacking and penalizing innovation. In the interest of all computer users, please just find a graceful way to bring all of the threatened litigation and regulatory harrassment to an early conclusion. This would send a strong message that creativity and resourcefulness are still encouraged in the United States; not punished.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,
Brad Naegle
(Small business owner)

MTC-00011768

From: Jerry Stump
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Leave Microsoft alone.
I so much appreciate their software; Microsoft is my friend. I despise Apple.
Let us get on with other more important items and let this great company Microsoft continue to innovate.

Jerry Stump
1109 20th Street
Belleville, KS 66935

MTC-00011769

From: gbdesign@pop-server.new.rr.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:16pm
Subject: Breakup the Monopoly —

I feel MS should be made an example of for it's arrogance. Knowing they could fund a longer court battle than most foreign governments, the delays and non-disclosure

of meetings with Federal officials clearly shows the reason for the court's rejection of the proposed settlement.

MS should be fined with the largest fine in US history, after all they are the richest US company in history. They should also be required to allow the operating systems that are pre-installed in retail machines to be the choice of the computer manufacturer. So if Compaq wants to run Linux, UNIX, or even Apple Computer's Mac OS in their machines.

Nor should pre-bundled software packages be the choice of the software providers. Consumers who ultimately use these softwares, on any platform, should be able to choose from a bare-bones configuration to a fully installed complete suite of softwares, and from the software manufacturers of OUR choice.

We aren't required to use a certain brand of gasoline in our cars, nor should we be required to use only one brand of software in a computer. In example; MS Windows 2000 costs over \$500 in Green Bay, WI and the current MacOS offering has two complete operating systems for only \$130.

This company has shown too many times it's cavalier attitude about what it can and cannot do, and the victims are the creative people, the educators and the business users of personal computers. We are forced to buy computer systems filled with overpriced softwares that 90% of users will never take advantage of.

So I hope the courts decision will consider the damage caused our social structure because of this monopolistic practice.

MTC-00011770

From: GhassemL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Department of Justice

Sirs, To my opinion the settlement agreed between the parties is reasonable and will benefit the economy of the country and consumers are happy that such a great organization is backed by people and the government. This encourages the scientists to further innovations without fear of government's unnecessary restrictions.

Ghassem Ladjevardi
Tucson AZ

MTC-00011771

From: Anthony Macaluso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:19pm
Subject: action

WHEN IS OUR TRUSTED GOVERNMENT GOING TO OPEN IT'S EYE'S? AND SEE THAT WE HAVE GONE DOWN HILL EVER SINCE THEY HAVE UNDERTAKEN THIS ACTION AGAINST ONE OF OUR GREATEST COMPANY'S, THAT HAS COME ALONG IN MANY YEARS. OUR ECONOMY NEEDS A BOOST NOT A KICK IN THE PANTS AS THEY HAVE DONE. WHAT A REWARD MR. GATES HAS RECEIVED FOR ALL HIS EFFORTS TO BRING US AHEAD IN THE WORLD ECONOMY. I HOPE WE LEARNED A LESSON, THAT PUNISHING A COMPANY OR PERSON'S FOR DOING GOOD WILL NOT GET US ANY PLACE FAST. PLEASE STOP THIS NEEDLESS

WASTE OF TAX PAYER MONEY. YOU HAVE SPEND MORE TIME AND MONEY TRYING TO BRING THIS COMPANY TO IT'S KNEES, AND LOOK WHAT IT HAS DONE TO US.

MR. ANTHONY MACALUSO

MTC-00011772

From: minhue—lu@yahoo.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:20pm

Subject: Settlements For Microsoft

Dear Attorney General John Ashcroft:

Microsoft was a treasure of this country for the twenty century, and will also be for the next century. Without the Microsoft's high tech contributions during the last twenty years, this country could well be behind Japan, Britain in the competition of the computer technologies. Consumers benefit from the Microsoft's products.

The settlement between DOJ and Microsoft should be done as soon as possible. Otherwise, our economy will continues to suffer.

Those nine states want to continue litigation are not the public best interests nor good for the economy. They should also accept the terms of settlements that agree between DOJ and Microsoft.

Thank you for your time>

Sincerely,

Min Hue Lu

Computer Scientist

MTC-00011773

From: Louis DeVito

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Litigation

I think it is time for everyone to wake up and stop trying to beat a dead horse. The amount of money and time spent on trying to squeeze another dollar out of Microsoft is just so stupid. There is a reasonable settlement on the table, a settlement that was put together by some very wise people with very sincere motives who wanted to move on rather than spend the rest of their lives litigating. Courts are to resolve problems, not find a way for simpletons to waste their lives on de minimus petty schemes. The courts should force a settlement which for all intensive purposes appears reasonable.

MTC-00011774

From: Mary Browning

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am sending this message to register my strong opinion that the Microsoft case should be settled now and that no more public time, energy or money should be expended in the pursuit of the case.

As a resident of Connecticut I especially deplore the dogged efforts of the Attorney General of Connecticut to depict Microsoft and Bill Gates as Public Enemy Number One.

Surely he and the other attorneys general must have true criminals to pursue. Innovation and energetic enterprise like that of Gates/Microsoft are part of what has made this country the power it is.

"Enough already!"

Mary-Leggett Browning Waterford, CT

MTC-00011775

From: K Ward

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:21pm

Subject: Department of Justice seeks public comment

The Microsoft law suit is dragging on when a fair settlement has been negotiated. It seems that states just want more money. Let's get it over with. This is not good for the country.

Kevin Ward

MTC-00011776

From: Mark Jorgensen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:22pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I think it is important to end the law suit and get on with life. Enough is enough. The Attorney Generals pursuing this case are self serving.

Thank you for reading this.

Mark Jorgensen

MTC-00011777

From: RVANDRT@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think the anti trust case with Microsoft should be settled. I believe the unsettled case is a negative on our economy.

Ralph Trimble

Findlay, OH

MTC-00011778

From: Susan Barbetti

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:25pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir,

Please, settle the Microsoft case as is. It should not go into futher litigation. The Settlement is fair and very generous and it will help thousands of children. Those that don't want to see this case settled are furthering a case of "sour grapes".

Thank you for accepting my comments.

Susan Barbetti

30120 N. 65th St.

Cave Creek, AZ 85331

MTC-00011779

From: TDavis3433@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:25pm

Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

IT IS TIME TO GET OFF MICROSOFT'S BACK. THIS STARTED BACK WHEN BILL CLINTON WAS TRYING ANYTHING TO GET THE ATTENTION OFF OF HIM, SINCE THEN THE STOCK MARKET AND THE ECONOMY HAS BEEN IN DECLINE.

THIS WILL PROBABLY END UP LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE THE GOVERNMENT HAS TRIED TO FIX THAT WASN'T BROKEN, SUCH AS THE DEREGULATION OF THE TELEPHONE AND ELECTRIC SERVICE. WE ALL KNOW THAT THE TELEPHONE COSTS HAVE GONE UP QUITE A BIT SINCE THE SO CALLED FIX AND CALIFORNIA HAD A ROUGH TIME WITH POWER SINCE THAT "FIX" WAS PUT IN.

MICROSOFT PRODUCTS HAVE ALWAYS HAD A REASONABLE PRICE AND ARE

SOME OF THE BEST ON THE MARKET. THE STATES THAT DON'T WANT TO SETTLE ARE ONLY LOOKING OUT FOR COMPANIES THAT ARE IN THEIR STATES THAT CAN'T MAKE IT ON THEIR OWN WITHOUT HELP AND THESE COMPANIES ARE PROBABLY KICKING IN A LOT OF MONEY TO THE CAMPAIGN FUNDS OF THESE POLITICIANS.

I ALWAYS THOUGHT THAT EVERYBODY WAS TRYING TO "BUILD A BETTER MOUSETRAP", APPARENTLY THESE OTHER COMPANIES WANTED TO WAIT FOR MICROSOFT TO BUILD IT AND THEN TRY TO STEAL IT WITH THE HELP OF THE GOVERNMENT.

MTC-00011780

From: haichen—cheng@hotmail.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:27pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The whole case was mainly initiated by some companies can not effectively compete in market. Every actions Microsoft is accused of, such as give away products, bundle products, discount for volumn venders, are common practice of IT industry. All other businesses, including those joined in the case in suing MS(Netscape, Sun, Oracle, AOL), have taken those actions, the only difference is they could not do it better.

It is time to close this case, let government get out of the marketplace, and let consumers to vote with their own money. In long run, if MS is guilty, the marketplace will punish it.

CC:haichen—cheng@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC-00011781

From: PMConnaugh@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 4:27pm

Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement with the States' Attornies General.

January 15, 2002

Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to express my opinion on the settlement of the Microsoft case. It's inappropriate that these proceedings are continued. As a user of Microsoft at not only at home but also at work. I can do my daily tasks with a great deal of concentration on the task at hand versus having to worrying through the "how to do" feat.

My wife had taught many Unemployed persons as an Adjunct Professor at Drexel University for a few years. The money was put into this activity, with the intent of preparing the Student to have the necessary Software to qualify for a job. Most Students had little trouble learning the MS Word, Excel, Access, and Outlook.

The fact that most of the American (and possibly most of the World's) Commerce run so profitably and easily is that there is a commonality of Software Tools, made possible by Microsoft. The ease of operation has allowed these Students, the Unemployed, to get those jobs in that they came with the necessary tools which permitted them to begin earning their keep. They had the

confidence to spend their time over several months at 2-3 nights a week knowing that their efforts were not in vain. Why? American employers run on Microsoft! And they were prepared. high time that this case be ended.

This lawsuit has dragged on and wasted a great deal of time and (our Taxpayer) money in the process. Microsoft has changed the entire computer industry, giving consumers and businesses superior products. Their operating system enabled a great compatibility that has not been offered by any other company. Why would anyone want to switch to another system and other software that doesn't even work with one another?

I worked for five major companies as an Electrical Engineer and Manager/Vice President, using Microsoft in some way or another in all of my jobs. Microsoft products allowed me to concentrate on "What", not "How". Microsoft is being punished for creating innovative technologies that have changed our computer industry, our business practices, our economic practices and even our methods of government forever. Just look at the simplification that the IRS has enjoyed now that Tax Returns can and are filed electronically (45 Million 2000 Federal returns at last count). Microsoft's efforts should be rewarded, not penalized.

.Think about how difficult it would be for you and those in your family to surf the Net, send Letters to the Editor, check their Bank Statement, pay their Bills, and even check the Weather without a ubiquitous and uniform means of communication. Just trying to change from Apple (Java) to an IBM, or other (Microsoft) computer. It's a waste.

This is analogous to the early problems of selecting between a Beta or a VCS Videotape system. We all use the VCS now. There was no government intervention. The people, the Buyers chose the better system. Did that selection prevent other bright Engineers from now offering CD's and DVD players? No! That's progress.

The proposed settlement is quite equitable for all parties. As I understand: Microsoft is conceding a great deal in order to move on. They are giving away some of their coding and interface design to competing software developers, as well as protocols for their server systems. They have also agreed not to enter into any contracts obligating third party distribution of Windows. Should any problems arise, the Technical Oversight Committee would make sure that Microsoft complies with the terms of the settlement, further ensuring fair competition. I for one, urge that the proposed settlement be upheld.

God Bless America and protect our Troops!
Sincerely,
Phillip M.Connaught
1409 Chancellor Circle
Bensalem, Pennsylvania 19020
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00011782

From: SteveGertsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hello,

I think the case should be settled the way the DOJ and Microsoft agreed upon. Get it done and let us get back to our business.

Steve Gertsch
sgertsch@pindersoft.com
http://www.pindersoft.com

MTC-00011783

From: Steve Chittenden
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sirs,

Thank-you for requesting input from citizens of this country. I believe that Microsoft has paid the price of any misgivings they have done. It is time that all states and Department of Justice settle this matter and get on with the work at hand. Thank-you again for the opportunity to respond. In His Service,
Steve Chittenden

MTC-00011784

From: Swauger, Fred
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft anti trust suit

Agreed settlement is more than fair where would we be w/o windows the cosumer was not harmed who did the suit protect?

Frederic Swauger
(503) 639-2311, (503) 639-2312(Fax)

MTC-00011785

From: RON LITTLE
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement this needs to be settled now !!

MTC-00011786

From: larry novak
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft law suit

Dear Sirs;
I believe we have held this company up in the air not allowing microsoft to do what it does best, give us next products that will move this economy forward.

The entire country is on hold waiting for these state lawyers to cut up the pie for their state and most of all for their own gain. . Enough, get this ended and send the beggars out of the chambers.

Lawrence Novak

MTC-00011787

From: Jun Zhang
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:31pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I oppose the settlement because I don't believe it is in the public interest to do so. The monopoly power of Microsoft will not change, nor will its practice, given their strategy of always moving one step ahead and rendering court judgment irrelevant due to the lag introduced by litigation.

Jun Zhang
Associate Professor
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

MTC-00011788

From: Kayani, Dr. Sohail
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov.'

Date: 1/15/02 4:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir,

The purpose of a settlement should be fair to parties concerned and this settlement is in line with that. However, certain states that primarily include Microsoft's competitors, will like to use the opportunity to do as much harm as they can in the name of an open platform. If their products are good, the market would embrace them. It seems a proxy fight for Sun, Apple and Oracle that these states are trying to fight. The intention of the Attorney General of these states would be considered neutral if they had publicly disclosed the absence of any financial backing by these companies to their election campaign.

Sohail Kayani, MD
322 Saybrook Road
Orange, CT 06477

MTC-00011789

From: Doris J. Lafferty
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please settle and end litigation . It has been too long and too destructive.

Doris J. Lafferty and Walter E. Lafferty

MTC-00011790

From: mdstoffel@mmm.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear DOJ,

Microsoft has done more than any other company to grow the computer industry. Before Microsoft computers were marketed to large institutions. Microsoft has brought the computer into homes world wide. They have done this by making computers easy to use for the general population and marketing products that we want. Microsoft has done their homework and they have received an A+. This is not according to me but according to the consumers who have purchased their products.

For the good of the industry, settle the lawsuit and allow the computer market to grow again. When Microsoft starts making products that the public doesn't want or makes products that don't work, the market will run from Microsoft. When other companies start making better products than Microsoft, the market will run to them. IBM was once the computer leader but they didn't have the vision or the product line that the general public wanted. Today, Dell is capturing the market share of the the PC market. Dell is getting it by making an affordable, reliable product. Microsoft has done the same thing, they created a good product and made it affordable. They need to take their lumps but let the market give it to them.

Settle the lawsuit.
Mick Stoffel

MTC-00011791

From: bearflat(a)jps.net
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:32pm
Subject: (no subject)
please settle in microsoft's favor.
shirley ross

MTC-00011792

From: Stu Sjouwerman
 To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 4:40pm
 Subject: "Microsoft Settlement"

It's time to get this over with! The U.S. government should not be used as a competitive weapon.

Warm regards,

MTC-00011793

From: Bob Long
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft DOJ Settlement

I am in favor of the settlement reached with Microsoft in the Anti-Trust case. Please stop wasting taxpayer money. Consumers were not harmed.

Sincerely
 Robert Longariello
 Taxpayer and Citizen
 blongari@home.com

MTC-00011794

From: fred@ensuredmail.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:34pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please move forward with the Microsoft settlement. The lack of a settlement is destructive to all of our businesses. When you think of the legal wrangling and the lack of focus inherent in a situation such as this, it is apparent that the real losers are the smaller companies and consumers.

As a business owner, I want Microsoft, Oracle, Sun, etc. . concentrating on improving their products and services rather than attending to legal needs that ultimately help no one other than the legal profession.

Thank you,
 Fred West
 CC:fred@ensuredmail.com@inetgw

MTC-00011795

From: Frank/Chris Pizzeri
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have reviewed the anti trust settlement and both my wife and I believe it is just. Please conclude this action now. Continuing the pursuit of this matter will be unlikely to serve justice. Those who would be served by furtherance may achieve some small gains for their cause at the expense of the vast majority of Americans.

The law of "unintended consequences" has had a great negative affect on the american public through a lack of confidence.

So "ENOUGH ALREADY!!!!!"
 Frank & Chris Pizzeri
 Stuart, Fl

MTC-00011796

From: BChanceLtd@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the Microsoft settlement as proposed earlier. Let's stop fooling around and get down to business.

Leo Hohnicki

MTC-00011797

From: Potter, Bob Ext.1411
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 4:42pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I'm begging you—Please get of Microsoft's back. You have had your viewpoint skewed by competitors of Microsoft that could not win in the market place so they are using you to get their way. Don't be used. The business world is not a philanthropic organization. It is market driven. Microsoft has won in the market place. Lets get on with life!!!

Regards,
 Bob Potter
 (831) 796-1411
 www.co.monterey.ca.us

MTC-00011798

From: grego@equilibrium.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:36pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's end this and stop wasting more taxpayer dollars. The computer industry changes so fast that Microsoft will have to adapt, or be left in the cold. Please accept the recent setelement, and let's get back to work.

Greg Olson
 CC:grego@equilibrium.com@inetgw

MTC-00011799

From: THCBC@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:37pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets have a settlement ASAP and get on with life.

MTC-00011800

From: Tjack1931
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/14/02 10:56pm
 Subject: Re Antitrust Microsoft

Dear Justice Department I would like to voice my Opinion on the Antitrust settlement with Microsoft. I think as a Taxpayer and Voter it is about time that this nonsense suit is put to sleep. The people that Originally brought this suit in the first place are expanding and Monopolizing more than Microsoft ever has.(AOL-Time Warner) Sun Microsystems) etc.I think that Microsoft has done so much for us beginner computer users, and still do.

Sincerely
 Helga Jackson
 4318 So 325th St.
 Auburn, WA 98001
 Tjack1931@msn.com

MTC-00011801

From: James Plummer
 To: mailto:microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov@inetgw
 Date: 1/15/02 4:39pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My input to this long delayed settlement, is to accept the plan which was and is acceptable to so large a percentage of the population. Let's get it settled as part of the country's effort to get the economy going.

Thankyou,
 James W. Plummer,
 2129 Quail Point Ct.
 Medford, Or 97504

MTC-00011802

From: kenneth goff
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:39pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Lets get this settled, Microsoft has done more for the computer than anyone. They don't deserve this kind of treatment.

MTC-00011803

From: Edens, Jim
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 4:41pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough. Any further modification of this settlement is just an attempt by inept competitors to gain an advantage in the marketplace. If Microsoft's products were not valuable the market would not reward Microsoft with business. Those states that are opting out of the settlement and working to pursue their own lawsuits are spending the public's money unwisely and are looking for a scapegoat and a free handout.

Jim Edens
 jedens@nespower.com
 <mailto:jedens@nespower.com>
 - QUOTE OF THE DAY - "The true meaning of life is to plant trees, under whose shade you do not expect to sit."—Nelson Henderson

MTC-00011804

From: Lee and Helen DeGroff
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:40pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I feel the settlement is fair and equitable and the states that have not accepted it are not being fair to us, the consumer. Please let my voice be heard. Helen B. DeGroff

MTC-00011805

From: Charles, Robert F
 To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 4:43pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:
 I say "Enough is enough is enough!" I feel Microsoft has endured more than any company has endured for this Antitrust litigation. As I stated in an earlier EMAIL to your office, these Anti Trust laws were designed to protect consumers—NOT COMPETITORS! After all, look who has brought Microsoft's alleged misgivings to light. Competitors!

I do thank the DOJ for looking out for my best interests; however, I have yet to hear a consumer say anything derogatory about the products that Microsoft sells. Please give Microsoft a fair ruling. . . .

Enough is enough is enough. Let Microsoft get back what it does best; serving the customer/consumer with new innovative exciting products that make the world a better place—not stepping aside so that second rate products can cheapen the American way of life. Please rule in favor of Microsoft.

Sincerely, Rob Charles
 Robert F. Charles
 Global Automotive Americas North
 RF Project Reliability Engineer
 tyco Electronics /AMP Incorporated

*(336) 727-5847 *(336) 727-5068
 *rfcharles@tycoelectronics.com
 *Mail Stop 079-12
 PO Box 55
 3800 Reidsville Road
 Winston-Salem, NC 27102-0055

MTC-00011806

From: DrFlick@iHi.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:44pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The original reasons driving the settlement no longer are valid. The industry and the forces driving it have changed too much. We slapped Microsoft's hands and they listened. I believe, of all of the companies that will be watched and scrutinized, Microsoft is at the top. They can not afford to mess up. They have their mandate and I firmly believe they will stick by it.

I have been dealing with Microsoft for over a decade and have given them more personal information than any other company. It never has been abused and I trust them explicitly when they say it will not be given out or sold. Granted, they were bullish five or so years ago. They absolutely have changed and are sincere in their efforts to remedy how they conduct business. I like what they have to offer and it would hurt my business dramatically if they had to break up or stop making their products. Breaking up the company would hurt the American economy more than it would resolve anything. Think of the impact on the thousands of other companies that rely on the Microsoft platform for what they do and how they live. Microsoft is one of the few innovators left in the industry. I like that. That is why they spend billions of dollars in research each year ? to bring us new and creative solutions that keep our economy flowing. There also is no technical way that providing source code would work. It changes too fast and it would do more harm than good for the world to make broken derivatives from it. They provide more pre-release documentation, technology strategies, sample code, training, and seminars than any other company out there. The only reason competitors want their source is because they cannot figure out how to do it themselves.

Stop wasting our money and get on with spending it on more important things. The only people that care are the press, media, and politicians that want to get re elected. There are too many other problems facing the nation right now and this just drains the scarce resources we don't have. Microsoft can afford to keep those states tied up for longer than they can afford to keep plugging away on a losing battle going. Take Microsoft's offer and run with it. It all will work out in the end because we will not let it happen any other way.

CC:DrFlick@iHi.com@inetgw

MTC-00011807

From: Paul Lingham
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:46pm
 Paul Lingham
 47 Bird Grove
 Stokes Valley
 Lower Hutt

Wellington
 Phone 049735747
 Mobile 0212586580

MTC-00011807-0001

I'd like to think that this is a good middle-of-the-road set of suggestions. I don't side with ABMers much like I don't side with NMBers. I just want a better computing environment.

Here's what I'd like:

1. Force Microsoft to adopt a file format for all Office applications and PUBLISH their spec. Note that I am not asking for the publication of the source code of Office, simply the description of the file formats used.

This way, people can use other Office suites (PerfectOffice, SmartSuite, StarOffice) without wondering if the files created will load properly in Word, Excel, Powerpoint, etc. . . . Just this would open up some competition in the Office Suite market.

2. Force Microsoft to publish every single API in Windows. Again, I am not asking for the publication of the windows source code, but simply to the Application Programming Interface. This would have two benefits: It would make sure that every service, every facility is clearly exposed for use while at the same time, removing the cloud of suspicion that Microsoft has some secret APIs that make their applications work better than others.

3. Muzzle the Microsoft FUD division. This is by far the most irritating aspect of Microsoft as a business entity. They generate FUD and make believe that other competing products are not good while it's far from the case. Feel free to select your example, there are tons of them out there.

4. Forbid them to use the words "innovate" and "innovation" unless they can specifically show that they are the first-movers for the particular product they are advertising. Again, there are tons of examples out there where Microsoft has been only an "adapter" as opposed to an "innovator"

5. Offer a striped-down version of Windows. Just the bare bones and a text-based browser (like Lynx) for initial download of the browser of choice. Nothing else built-in, nothing else cobbled together. A base install should not be more than 20 Megabytes and should scream on Pentium-class machines.

6. Word the requirements that hefty fines will be leveraged for non-compliance. Hopefully, this way, we'll have more competition and a better computing environment. As well, if Microsoft is still dominant after this, it'll be because they have earned it the good old-fashioned way and we'll have little if anything to complain about.

MTC-00011808

From: Carnes Chapin P GS-13 AFOTEC/TSS
 To: 'microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov'
 Date: 1/15/02 4:44pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

As a consumer, I want the government to settle now. Microsoft has top notch products at ever decreasing prices. Stop wasting my tax dollars on this insane case. Send a message to the cry babies like Oracle, Sun

etc—if you can't win in the market place—go find another business to get in.

Patrick Carnes

MTC-00011809

From: robin—maffeo@hotmail.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am pleased to be given the opportunity to comment on the settlement under the Tunney Act.

Given that both Microsoft and the DOJ have agreed upon terms that address the concerns of the original complaint, I am all in favor of proceeding with the settlement.

In all honesty, I never felt Microsoft has harmed consumers, even though deemed a monopoly. Microsoft has been a key force in driving the computer industry, and enabled numerous companies (media, hardware, and software) to grow and thrive. Enough time and money has been spent on this litigation. Proceed with the settlement.

Robin Maffeo

CC:robin—maffeo@hotmail.com@inetgw

MTC-00011810

From: wally rasmussen
 To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.?@inetgw
 Date: 1/15/02 4:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please no further litigation. Settle NOW.

MTC-00011811

From: Steve Parker
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:53pm
 Subject: anti-trust suit

To Whom It May Concern: Enough already. The liberals have attacked the economy on several fronts, and the result is the bad economy we have now and the weak economy we have had for 6 or more years. Continue with the Microsoft witch hunt and not only is this an action that does not represent the publics interest at large, but the NASDAQ and the technology industry as a whole will continue to suffer! We all can see what the results of that are, but it could get much worse. Microsoft as a company is not an angel, and they are not totally innocent. But the settlement is more than fair. More would be, in my opinion, mean and vindictive. And ultimately very damaging to everyone except those that might benefit from a shift in political power, or who might get some gratification for tearing down someone else's achievement which they envy. End this travesty of justice now and help the American People get back to work.

Thanks.

Steve Parker
 rsparker@ameritech.net

MTC-00011812

From: Gary(u)Withrow
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:51pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

I vote for Microsoft in this issue.

MTC-00011813

From: Arlena-Ann B. Neff
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 4:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft controversey

I strongly feel that this matter has gone on long enough and it's time to reach a settlement. Furthermore, I feel that the terms offered by Microsoft are more than adequate and should be accepted by the courts and contesting states. It's time to move forward and have everyone put their efforts in a more fruitful direction, instead of beating this issue endlessly to death. Let's accept Microsoft's offer and let the technology world move forward in other more positive areas.

Arlena Neffl

MTC-00011814

From: JMcg654550@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:52pm

Subject: Anti-trust lawsuit by various states
The States Attorneys General who involved themselves in the Justice Dept. lawsuit against Microsoft bring nothing to the table. They are in it for the publicity and because they have nothing to lose. They are still giddy from the windfall they got from their tobacco settlement and hope to extort money from Microsoft. I am a consumer and I have benefitted enormously from the products that Microsoft has created. These greedy attorneys general should be thrown out of court. They are contemptible extortionists who deserve no credibility.

Sincerely,
James A. McGrath

MTC-00011815

From: Robert And Vivian Weber
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:55pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Hello,
We would like to express our support for immediate settlement of the Microsoft case. We think that the marketplace has proven that Microsoft is an example of a company that we should support. Their innovative ways of providing consumers with the best-possible software choices work. No more litigation!!

Thanks for listening,
Vivian and Robert Weber

MTC-00011816

From: VEstaba@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:56pm
Subject: Settlement

We fully support Microsoft for a fair settlement which primarily will benefit consumers maintaining the integrity of an institution which on the other hand is one of the strongest pillars of the economy of the United States of America.

Respectfully,
Victor Estaba, M.D. & Carmen Estaba

MTC-00011817

From: Wayne/Eileen Grove
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:57pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Settle now. without delay.

MTC-00011818

From: beverly wakeland
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

THE MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT WAS FAIR AND JUST. BUSINESS'S SHOULD HAVE THE FREEDOM TO INNOVATE. THE NINE STATES OPPOSING THE SETTLEMENT ARE COMPETITORS. MICROSOFT PROVIDES JOBS FOR THOUSANDS. IT IS TIME YOU SETTLE AND LET ALL INVOLVED MOVE ON.

MTC-00011819

From: JOHN (038) Mary McLaughlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft

Many of us are quite upset that the justice system has not declared a mis-trial in the case against Microsoft who was found guilty by a judge (Jackson) who has publicly acknowledged that he is bias when it comes to Microsoft or Bill Gates.

MTC-00011820

From: MRourke555@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:00pm
Subject: Mark Rourke

Microsoft is a company that has added immeasurably to the ability of a nonprofit agency, like mine, to keep costs down and do more with our limited resources. I oppose and measures that would stifle the success and generosity of Microsoft. I am continually disheartened at the penalties implemented by the US Justice Department.

Mark Rourke
Director
Bement Camp and Conference Center

MTC-00011821

From: EMIL (038) BONNIE KELLER
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:
I believe that the present arrangement for settlement of the Microsoft case is fair and should be accepted. We do not need more litigation.

Emil Keller
11909 Bayswater Rd
Gaithersburg, Md. 20878

MTC-00011823

From: Kenneth
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft Antitrust Proposal Comments
Comments on settlement proposal <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9400/9495.htm>
Under Prohibited conduct: Section D: First paragraph.

In the case of a new major version of Microsoft Middleware, the disclosures required by this Section III.D shall occur no later than the last major beta test release of that Microsoft Middleware.

The phrase major beta test seems overly vague. I suggest restating it to read: "shall occur no later than the last test release released to over 20% of licensees who normally receive test releases from Microsoft."

(Commentary: Microsoft could quite easily move from an Alpha/Beta test cycle to an extended Alpha cycle or simply introduce an Alpha/Beta/Gamma or some new totally

orthogonal process which would render the entire paragraph useless.)

Section G: Third paragraph, that prohibits such entity from competing with the object of the joint venture or other arrangement for a reasonable period of time. The phrase "for a reasonable period of time." seems vague. I suggest restating it to read:

"for a time period consistent with industry practices."

Section H: Says "provided that the technical reasons are described in a reasonably prompt manner to any ISV that requests them."

This phrase appears to allow Microsoft to develop hidden APIs and features, release them and then claim that no one else supports them and then only provide the documentation to an ISV that specifically requests it etc.

I suggest restating it to read: "provided that the technical reasons are clearly described in existing documentation released under the guidelines of this order"

Section J: "disclosure of which would compromise the security" As all of the products described are security products and as the term security is continually mis and reinterpreted (Microsoft itself being a large infractor).

I suggest restating it to read: "disclosure of which would compromise the effectiveness"

Kenneth Kron (CTO)
Last modified: Tue Jan 15 13:59:37 PST 2002

MTC-00011824

From: John Garrison, Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 4:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I retired three years ago after over 40 years in the information technology field with the last 32 years in a variety of mid and upper level management positions. While I personally preferred the UNIX operating system, I found the Microsoft Windows operating system was preferred by most of my technical staff and non technical users as it was easily learned and offered tremendous capability at a very reasonable price. Based on this experience, I feel it has been indeed an injustice to Microsoft and the American people that unworthy competitors has used the political process in an effort to survive. It is interesting to note that the nine states that have not agreed to the settlement are states that are home to some of the companies that simply cannot compete on their own merit. Request the settlement as agreed to by all but nine states be finalized as is. I believe the settlement is more than fair to the public interest.

Respectfully submitted:
John E. Garrison, Sr.
mailto:johnhg@sun-usa.com

MTC-00011825

From: jd107778@sr-ungw03-01.Central.Sun.COM@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:01pm

Subject: Proposed Microsoft Settlement
To whom it may concern,

The proposed settlement proposed by the US Department of Justice and nine states is,

in my opinion, inadequate because it doesn't address the problems that made Microsoft a monopoly in the first place and the enforcement procedures proposed are insipid.

Microsoft is currently a monopoly because they've engaged in a repeated practice of bundling "feature" software with their Windows operating system. Since the Windows OS is a monopolistic operating system, bundling these features is, in effect, predatory pricing because it drives the other vendors of the feature software out of business because they can't compete with the features offered by Microsoft for "free". Any remedy intended to fix the antitrust practices of Microsoft has to address this issue.

Furthermore, having any agreed-upon remedies enforced by a "Technical Committee" comprised of members that Microsoft partially chooses is tantamount to having "the fox guard the hen house." I believe that if the current settlement is agreed upon it may lead to certain short-term benefits for consumers, vendors involved with Microsoft and certain macroeconomic forces in the world, but I strongly believe that the far more important long-term benefits of software innovation and real consumer competition in the computer software, computer security and computer hardware industries will suffer consequences far greater than any short-term benefits if the remedies aren't reworked to be effective.

Thank you,
Respectfully,
Jim Dixon
Staff Software Engineer
Enterprise Services
Sun Microsystems, Inc.
9800 Mt. Pyramid Ct. Suite 300
Englewood, CO 80112
Phone: 720/895-3041
Fax: 720/895-1607
E-Mail:
jim.dixon@central.sun.com

MTC-00011826

From: Bertha Keogh
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Bertha Keogh
12114 Brookside Ave
Port Charlotte, FL 33981-6727
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Bertha Keogh

MTC-00011827

From: David Carr
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust Settlement
David Carr
2700 Kent Avenue
West Lafayette, IN 47906
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial was a tremendous waste of taxpayer money and a impediment to the development of the computer technology sector of the American economy. It is time to let the companies innovate and develop new products to meet peoples' needs.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Carr

MTC-00011828

From: Janet Kirk
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Janet Kirk
2589 Washington Rd.
Pittsburgh, PA 15241
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of

corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Janet F. Kirk

MTC-00011829

From: Gary McVey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gary McVey
10715 Hillview Dr.
Evansville, IN 47720
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gary P. McVey

MTC-00011830

From: Greg OLSEN
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Greg OLSEN
9415 Friendsville Road
Seville, OH 44273-9121
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the

wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Greg OLSEN

MTC-00011831

From: Joanne Ames
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joanne Ames
R.R.#2 Box 515
Gillett, PA 16925
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Joanne Ames

MTC-00011832

From: Wayne Mieth

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wayne Mieth
1050 Merritt Lane
El Cajon, CA 92020
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Wayne Mieth

MTC-00011833

From: Kathy Casteel
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kathy Casteel
4502 State Road E
Auxvasse, MO 65231
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of

stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kathy Casteel

MTC-00011834

From: JSteele76@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Government Persons

My comments on the Microsoft Settlement issue is, I'm afraid, only pointing out the obvious, however, the fact that the issue is still in doubt suggests my views should be expressed.

I own no Microsoft stock and don't work for microsoft. I have no close friends or relations that work for microsoft. I am using an apple Computer to send this through AOL Internet access. I do use Microsoft programs.

The fact that two of the states not accepting the settlement are California and Massachusetts seems to, in itself, show why the issue is purely political. These two states alone contain many major Microsoft competitors who have lost business because Microsoft was just better than they were. Success in our economy should be based on free market, not on government decree. Microsoft's products have been better accepted by the free market. Bundled products are indeed better than a bunch of incompatible products. Apple, Linux, Unix, etc.s systems are there as options but more people freely choose Microsoft.

Gerald Steele
506 Susana Ave.
Redondo Beach Ca.
90277

MTC-00011835

From: Paul Burke
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Paul Burke
5569 Turnbull Circle
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Paul Burke

MTC-00011836

From: Sandra Weber
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sandra Weber
148 Main St.
Sullivan, WI 53178
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sandra Weber

MTC-00011837

From: Charles Guest
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Guest
1506 Clarence
Bossier, La 71111
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles E. Guest

MTC-00011838

From: Nathan Leon
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Nathan Leon
2905 Colorado Ave
Turlock, CA 95382
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Nathan Leon

MTC-00011839

From: Craig Balter
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Craig Balter
220 Chapman
Placentia, Ca 92870
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Craig Balter

MTC-00011840

From: Charles Fisher
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Fisher
7307 N. 13th. St.
Tampa, Fl 33604
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles Fisher

MTC-00011841

From: Edward Poole
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Edward Poole
29 River Bend Park
Lancaster, Pa 17602
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Edward H Poole

MTC-00011842

From: Rex Maxey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Rex Maxey
3171 Highway 946
Ezel, KY 41425
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Rex Maxey

MTC-00011843

From: User166160@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:03pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

The settlement with Microsoft is fair & in the best interests of the country. All of the remaining state sponsored law suits should be dropped. It is bad for Microsoft & the USA for them to continue.

R. Di Benedetto

MTC-00011844

From: Dale Best
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dale Best
4156 Ridgeway Drive
Indianapolis, IN 46221-3442
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dale Best

MTC-00011845

From: Joe Orlick
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joe Orlick
3406A S. Brust Ave
Milwaukee, WI 53207
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Joe Orlick

MTC-00011846

From: Keith Fouts
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Keith Fouts
108 N Parkview
Coffeyville, KS 67337-1237
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Keith A. Fouts

MTC-00011848

From: N broidy
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

N Broidy
1621 114th
Bellevue, WA 98004
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Neal A. Broidy

MTC-00011849

From: Geof Foster
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I agree with the proposed settlement, which in my opinion is indeed in the public interest. Furthermore, I commend Microsoft for all that it has done in providing world leadership for this technology and for essentially creating a world wide standard (or highway on which every one can drive) on which we are all able to communicate so effectively. This is very much different than when microprocessors were commercialized where one companies system could not communicate with other companies systems causing enormous cost and inefficiencies and the loss of US technological leadership.

Microsoft's world leadership has financially benefited the United States and all of its citizens to a far greater degree than the so called costs outlined by its competitors in the lawsuit.

Lets stop litigating and recommence innovation and advance the US leadership and dominance of technologies.

Sincerely,
Geoffrey M. Foster.

MTC-00011850

From: Eugene Denbow
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Eugene Denbow
8739 Amador Ave
Yucca Valley, Ca 92283
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Eugene & Dorothy Denbow

MTC-00011851

From: Cameron Davis
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Cameron Davis
123 South Garfield
Junction City, KS 66441
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Cameron E. Davis

MTC-00011852

From: David Mackey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Mackey
1205 North 57th Place
Fort Smith, AR 72904
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Mackey

MTC-00011853

From: Carol Benton
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Carol Benton
619 S. Sunshine Ave.
El Cajon, CA 92020-5126
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Carol Benton

MTC-00011854

From: Athena Reizakis
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Athena Reizakis
1920 L St NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Athena Reizakis

MTC-00011855

From: Donald Shaw
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Donald Shaw
10816 LaQuinta Dr.
New Port Richey, FL 34654
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create

new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,—Don
Donald W. Shaw

MTC-00011856

From: Keith Farthing
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Keith Farthing
1343 Wyoming St
Dayton, OH 45410
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Keith E Farthing

MTC-00011857

From: Marsha McIntosh
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Marsha McIntosh
7330 Bock Ave
Stanton, CA 90680-2117
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Marsha McIntosh

MTC-00011858

From: William Wright
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William Wright
2509 Thomas Lane
Harlingen, TX 78550
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
William Wright

MTC-00011859

From: Fredda Shutes
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Fredda Shutes
2117 Island Lake Cr.

Panama City, FL 32405
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Fredda B. Shutes

MTC-00011860

From: Demetris Papageorgiou
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Demetris Papageorgiou
4739 Yuma Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With

the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Demetris Papageorgiou

MTC-00011861

From: karen richards
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Karen Richards
9036 Tarrington Ln
Franklin, TN 37029
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Karen Richards

MTC-00011862

From: Marla Lewis Oliver
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Marla Lewis Oliver
561 Tuscany Valley Court, Unit 3
Crestview Hills, KY 41017
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the

courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Marla Lewis Oliver

MTC-00011863

From: David Fedders
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Fedders
5106 carpenter drive
crestwood, ky 40014
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

David G. Fedders

MTC-00011864

From: Alissa Jesle
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Alissa Jesle
1911 Camino De La Costa, #402
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Alissa Jesle

MTC-00011865

From: Theodore E. Caldwell
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Theodore E. Caldwell
1129 Blackburn Ln
Virginia Beach, VA 23454-1941
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than

bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Theodore E. Caldwell

MTC-00011866

From: Patrick Heslin
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Patrick Heslin
2009 Meadow lark Rd
Spring Hill, FL 34608
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Heslin

MTC-00011867

From: Robert Montgomery
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 3:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Montgomery
PO Box 1561
Charlottesville, VA 22902-1561
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be

over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert D. Montgomery II

MTC-00011868

From: Carole Sigtermans
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Carole Sigtermans
105 Schrempf Lane Ext.
Pine Bush, NY 12566
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Carole Sigtermans

MTC-00011869

From: Mario Villanueva
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:23pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mario Villanueva
1529 Lassen Way
Frazier Park, Ca 93222-5323
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mario M. Villanueva

MTC-00011870

From: Rebecca Groves
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Rebecca Groves
7506 STONE PINE LANE
HOUSTON, TX 77041-1527
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of

corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Groves

MTC-00011871

From: Gail Waechter
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gail Waechter
5768 US Hwy 77A North
Yoakum, TX 77995-2431
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tim & Gail Waechter

MTC-00011872

From: George Humberson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George Humberson
12722 Newbrook
Houston, TX 77072-3815
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the

wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
G. Hollis Humberson

MTC-00011873

From: Sheron Willingham
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement—
Sheron Willingham
P. O. Box 3430
Pahrump, NV 89041-3430
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered too much of our taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sheron M. Willingham

MTC-00011874

From: Tina Miltner

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tina Miltner
700 Airport Blvd. #300
Burlingame, CA 94010-1937
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tina Miltner

MTC-00011875

From: BobGFitz@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:07pm
Subject: (no subject)

Dear sirs. I feel it is time for the DOJ to settle the Microsoft case. Bob Fitzsimmons

MTC-00011876

From: buck@nfdc.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The monopoly laws state that harm to the consumer must be proven. With all that I have read and drawing from my personal experience (6 years as a CTO), this was NOT proven. The only ones complaining about Microsoft are those that Microsoft leapfrogged (not always technologically, but always in mind/market share).

If Microsoft really did use bully-boy tactics in the licensing practices, I believe they deserve to be slapped down big time. This in no way implies that the federal government should be overseeing Microsoft or any other area as to product development, R&D, etc.

Apply appropriate measures for anything illegal Microsoft may have done, but do not punish the rest of the computing world in the same stroke.

MTC-00011877

From: Stan Casteel
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Stan Casteel
4502 State Road E
Auxvasse, MO 65231
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

I would add that many of us don't appreciate the fact that because most of our 403b accounts contain Microsoft, we are being robbed of our retirement by the trial lawyers. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Stan W. Casteel, DVM, PhD

MTC-00011878

From: Marco DiBiase
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:13pm
Subject: comments

Bill Gattres mistake was in not making contributions to the Democrats and Clinton. Therefore, they unleashed the Justice Dept on them. This provides work for the lawyers. The customers get screwed because the cost of litigation has to be reflected in the price of the products. This was a politically motivated suit. Throw it out and move on! Don't kill the goose that lays the golden egg!
mdibiase@parrett.net

MTC-00011879

From: Bryce Buchanan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To: Justice Department
Re: Microsoft Settlement

We are writing to let you know that we are strongly in favor of Microsoft's position on the proposed antitrust settlement. It is in the

best interest of the country and the economy to resolve this matter now.

The action of some of the state Attorneys General have resembled extortion much more than they resemble a reasonable approach to the issue.

The more the government throttles the rapidly changing high-tech industries the worse it will be for everyone.

Sincerely,
Dr. Bryce Buchanan
Diana Buchanan
18962 Barton Road
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97034

MTC-00011880

From: STAUBOFFLO@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:15pm
Subject: Settlement of suit

It is about time this suit was settled. I sincerely hope Microsoft will continue to provide the best as it always has in the past.

Attorney General Blumenthal must cast away his bitterness and join in supporting the settlement that has been proposed.

Sincerely,
Bob Stauffer

MTC-00011881

From: John.Davis@Home.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I hope that common sense and reason are used here. The settlement should be accepted and let the free market do its job. This trial has been counter productive against the interest of anyone with a computer.

Sincerely,
John Davis
CC:John.Davis@Home.com@inetgw

MTC-00011882

From: stephen.macdonald@gte.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft has contributed significantly to the increase in productivity enjoyed the world over. That said the only way Microsoft can continue to grow is through planned operating system obsolescence and the cannibalization of niche software applications.

Microsoft is doing both. It's time to extract the operating system/business from Microsoft and force it to stand on its own. Publish the source code of all Windows X O/S's. Therefore providing open competition and equal access to the latest planned feature enhancements of Windows X O/S.

Forcing Microsoft to donate \$1B worth of WinTel product only further cements Microsofts' grip on the US economy and the minds of our children. If you plan to penalize Microsoft financially—get cash from Microsoft with no strings attached. Invest the money in business development within the affected states.

However, if the states are not willing to force the separation of Microsofts' O/S and application business. It's obvious that they are just in it for a quick revenue hit. Just like the smoking settlement. What ever the outcome, the buyer of Microsoft products is sure to eat the cost of litigation and settlement.

CC:stephen.macdonald@gte.net@inetgw

MTC-00011883

From: Ronald Soussa
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:17pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that the terms of the proposed Microsoft settlement are in the public's interest and should be approved. Get on with the settlement and end the litigation.

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-00011884

From: Elaine Rearden
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Case

This case should be settled as quickly as possible. . . it's a diversion to the day by day work and innovation of Microsoft and is adverse to the well-being of customers who use computers and computer products. I urge you to get it behind you and get on with the bright future we have with regard to computer technology.

Elaine Rearden

MTC-00011885

From: MWeber7766@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:18pm
Subject: (no subject)

Please end the litigation against Microsoft. It's been long enough and I believe that justice has prevailed. Thank you.

MWeber

MTC-00011886

From: rfdpe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have no complaints against Microsoft and I feel their proposed settlement was more than fair and should be accepted.

Richard F Donovan
Columbia SC

MTC-00011887

From: chuckbeatie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please, leave Microsoft alone, and let them get back to business! Tell those states and the companies that are crying, that if Microsoft's competition want to catch-up and get ahead that they need to spend their time writing better code, not crying about how Microsoft is cornering the market.

This is a free society, and Microsoft's competition can get in there and compete, quit the crying!

Chuck

MTC-00011888

From: smithersx3@yahoo.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:24pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am extremely interested in having the anti-trust case against Microsoft resolved immediately. It appears to me that the main impetus for this whole matter is based on politics rather than market dynamics.

Specifically, the states that seem to be resisting settlement are ones who host some of Microsoft's main competitors. While I believe that Microsoft has indeed engaged in anti-competitive acts, namely in the area of restrictive licensing agreements, I fail to see how Microsoft is a monopoly. The public has always had other options regarding personal computer operating systems in the form of SCO Xenix, SCO Unix, MacOS, Geos, and Linux. All of these are viable operating systems. Microsoft should be rewarded for providing the product that the vast majority of users want to use, not punished for it. No one is forced to use Microsoft products. The market has spoken and it has chosen Microsoft Windows. It seems that the bulk of the anti-trust case is sour grapes of Microsoft's competitors.

CC:smithersx3@yahoo.com@inetgw

MTC-00011889

From: Charles Chambers Sr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

when will the government get out of the way and let tech companies innovate? I am for the settlement as it now exists. The governments actions to date in perusing this case against Microsoft has just added to the collapse in the economy. It will be technology that will bring us out of the poor economy if the government will just settle this case.

Charles R. Chambers, Sr.

MTC-00011890

From: BOBDIXIEPEARCE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:25pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Lawyers:

Please accept the present offer to settle this and lets get the markets going in a positive direction. We feel that without an immediate settlement the markets will go further down and the recession will last longer.

Sincerely Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Pearce
5404 Via Maria,
Yorba Linda, Ca
92886
e-mail: bobbixiepearce@aol.com

MTC-00011891

From: DSchen2835@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:26pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

WE URGE THE US DOJ TO RESOLVE THIS CASE AGAINST MICROSOFT AND GET ON WITH THE MORE SERIOUS MATTERS SUCH AS ENRON. AT NO TIME AND IN NO WAY HAS MICROSOFT CREATED PROBLEMS FOR THE COMPUTER INDUSTRY. WITHOUT MICROSOFT, WHERE WOULD THE INDUSTRY BE? INSTEAD OF PENALIZING A FORWARD THINKING, CREATIVE COMPANY LIKE MICROSOFT, ENCOURAGE THEIR COMPETENCE! AS

USERS, WE FEEL THEIR PRODUCTS TO BE SUPERIOR IN EVERY WAY—THIS KIND OF BUSINESS SHOULD BE REWARDED, NOT HARASSED. SO, WE REQUEST THAT THIS MATTER BE RESOLVED QUICKLY AND FINALLY AND LET MICROSOFT DO WHAT IS DOES BEST AND LET THE DOJ DO WHAT IT DOES BEST AND THAT IS TO GO AFTER REALLY ABUSIVE COMPANIES LIKE ENRON. BEVERLY AND DALE SCHENDEL

MTC-00011892

From: Ruth Silveira
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:24pm
Subject: Back Off

Finally they think they have justly done what they set out to do. God knows why this was an issue anyway!

Aren't we living in a free country where inventors of all shapes, sizes, inventions et. make millions every year? We even have foreign inventors putting their ideas on our consumers.

It seems to me that we could have spent all this time looking for aliens and the money would have been better spent.

re: The WTC bombing.

Get real go after the bad guys not an American who happened to enter the market at the right time!

BACK OFF LEAVE MICROSOFT AND BILL GATES ALONE!!!

If it weren't for Microsoft I never would have been able to learn my computer by myself and send this e-mail!

Thanks,
Ruth Silveira

MTC-00011893

From: GSta227586@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:28pm
Subject: (no subject)

Settle the matter and stop further waste of money. . . .
GS

MTC-00011894

From: Bud Howe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is my firm opinion that the US Gov't should accept Judge T. P. Jackson's ruling in this case in regard to the education donations. Further suit against Microsoft is counter productive to the best interests of the people of the USA & the software using world at large. Rejection of this proposed settlement is not in my opinion in the best interest of the software world.

Thank you for reconsideration of this matter,
Allen C. Howe II

MTC-00011895

From: Elwin, Michael J
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

To Whom It May Concern,

The initial settlement that Microsoft made for the schools is very fair. Alot of those schools have Black students attending and they have no computers or what they have

are very old. As a Black man from the West Indies living in the United States since 1968 I am fully aware of what is going on. The administrators in those schools rejecting the offer just want the money to spend on other things that will NOT help the students. Also the Apple Computer Company which has a strong monopoly in the public schools is part of the rejection process. For once can we stop playing games and do what is BEST for the students/children. Microsoft is not ripping off the consumer. I know because I am a consumer of their products. Stop playing around and let Microsoft help turn the economy around. Thanks for listening.

Best regards,
Michael J Elwin
Import/Export Compliance
Worldwide Site Operations
Phone:425-957-5729 Fax 425-865-4305
Pager:206-797-0694
M/S 7M-TJ "Apres Bon Dieu C'est La Terre" Commonwealth of Dominica.

MTC-00011896

From: Martin Schentes
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:33pm
Subject: Settlement

I would like to see this case settled as quickly as possible. It is taking up too much of the Justice Department's resources for what appears to be a dubious outcome that will benefit no one. The Justice Department could then have time for the real criminals at Enron.

Martin Schentes
1672 Applefield St
Thousand Oaks, CA 91320

MTC-00011897

From: Judi Gibbons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Lawsuit
STOP THE LAWSUIT, SETTLE THE ACTION AS PER THE LAST COURT AND GET ON WITH LIFE.

MTC-00011898

From: Gerald W. Cusack
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement—DOJ
Dear Sir:

It is time for these nine state Attorney Generals to agree with the DOJ. Further confusion, and litigation only adds to an unsettled business climate and to our current recession. The fact that the federal government and the other states thought it fair should be enough. Stop the politics and get the issue resolved. People need jobs.

Mary and Gerald Cusack

MTC-00011899

From: ALPHONSLARUE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:34pm
Subject: (no subject)

It is time to get on with normal activities in the new computer world. Things have changed and we can no longer judge today's business with the conditions of the past.

The proposed settlement between the plaintiff and microsoft is a fair one and the

government should embrace it and move out of the way.

This segment of the business world is fast and changing.

Move On

MTC-00011900

From: kay in arizona
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.?@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 5:35pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

We do not understand why the government hasn't put a stop to this suit. There has been thousands of dollars spent on litigation by both parties.

The government is spending our tax money to sue one of the most successful companies in our nation, who has contributed so much to the economy here. The suit is based on other technology companies who are unhappy with the success of Microsoft.

We are involved in a manufacturing business and we do not divulge how our product is manufactured, allowing other companies to make the same thing.

Please allow Microsoft to be the inovative company they have always been.

Thank you.

Howard & Kay Worden

MTC-00011901

From: Carolyn Emery
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is in the best interest of United States citizens to accept the Microsoft Settlement as outlined by the Department of Justice.

Carolyn Jill Emery
1124 Garden Circle
Fircrest, WA 98466

MTC-00011902

From: Gary Rosen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi,

For your information I just received the following email from ACT. I am sure that Microsoft is funding ACT. As a small software company who has worked closely with Microsoft and as a consumer in my opinion Microsoft has been guilty of any number of illegal activities related to price fixing and illegal trade practices.

Gary Rosen

It's time to get back to work: Your comments can encourage approval of the proposed settlement in the Microsoft case.

Your opinion on the proposed settlement between Microsoft, the federal government, and nine states is due by January 28, 2002.

Click here to find out more!

<<http://www.actonline.org/action/settlement.asp>>
<http://www.actonline.org/action/settlement.asp>

Under the Tunney Act, a law that encourages public comment on a proposed settlement, the trial judge reviews comments to help determine whether this settlement is in the public interest. All comments submitted will become part of the public record.

Helpful information for developing your comments:

<<http://www.actonline.org/press-room/releases/110501.asp>> ACT's analysis of the proposed settlement
<<http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm#submit>> Information from the U.S. Department of Justice
<<http://www.actonline.org/press-room/releases/Senate%20testimony.pdf>> ACT's testimony to U.S. Senate

Three ways to submit your comments to Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly:

1. Send a fax to: 1-202-307-1454 or 1-202-616-9937
2. Mail a letter. Please note, however, that the Justice Department strongly encourages that comments be submitted via e-mail or fax, given recent mail delivery interruptions in Washington. Letter mail should be addressed to:

Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice

601 D. Street NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530-0001

3. Send an email. If you send the email on your own, please address to <mailto:Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov> and use "Microsoft Settlement" as your subject line. Or, see

<<http://www.actonline.org/action/settlement.asp>>
<http://www.actonline.org/action/settlement.asp> for on-line form to send your email.

Sincerely,
Jonathan Zuck
President
ACT

MTC-00011903

From: Richard Lowenthal
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Honorable Judge in Microsoft Monopoly Suit:

Sir: I am just sharing the thoughts of a very senior citizen.

Respectfully,
Richard Lowenthal

Date: Mon, 14 Jan 2002 14:15:50-0500

From: Richard Blumenthal
<attorney.general@po.state.ct.us> X-
Accept-Language: en

To: Richard Lowenthal <rlowe@coslink.net>

Subject: Re: Microsoft, the monopolist

Richard Lowenthal wrote:
Honorable Gentlemen,

I wish to indicate my support for your position in the case of Microsoft, the Monopolist. I truly feel, as a very senior citizen, that I have been taken advantage of, many times because of Microsoft's position. I have been forced to buy version upgrades, at exorbitant prices, when the "upgrade" is little more than a "beta" version given out to the public for money, and it is the public's job to find the glitches and notify Microsoft so they can make changes and sell another upgrade. In reality, they should have been doing the research and after getting a good product, then making it available to the public.

How can any of the other Attorneys General resolve this case when Microsoft is

a convicted monopolist? It is my hope that you will see this case through the courts until justice is done and a suitable resolution is found in the courts. I want all to be equal. I just do not want Microsoft to be MORE EQUAL THAN ANYONE ELSE. KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK.

CORDIALLY,
Richard Lowenthal
Frankfort, MI.

Dear Mr. Lowenthal:

Thank you for your recent thoughtful correspondence concerning the Microsoft antitrust case. As you know, on November 6, 2001, the United States Department of Justice and Microsoft filed a proposed settlement. I did not join that settlement because I do not believe it would accomplish the goals we set when we filed the case. Nor would it accomplish the remedial goals set by the U.S. Court of Appeals: (1) to prohibit the illegal conduct and similar conduct in the future, (2) to spark competition in this industry; and (3) to deprive Microsoft of its illegal gains.

You may also express your opinion to the judge of the federal trial court considering this settlement by filing written comments with the United States Department of Justice by January 28, 2002, as follows:

Mail: Renata B. Hesse
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW
Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20530-0001

Given recent mail delivery interruptions in Washington, DC, and current uncertainties involving the resumption of timely mail service, the Department of Justice strongly encourages that comments be submitted via e-mail or fax.]

E-mail: 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

Please keep me informed of your opinions on the case.

Thank you again for contacting me.

Sincerely,
Richard Blumenthal
Attorney General

MTC-00011904

From: Mauijpn@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:41pm

Subject: Microsoft case should be settled

Dept. of Justice. In my opinion the Microsoft case should be settled asap. Competitors seem to be dragging it out to their advantage. The longer it goes the more it hurts the economy. Please settle!

Jim Nieu Kirk.

<mauijpn@aol.com>

MTC-00011905

From: JLMDOUG@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:43pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

it is blatantly obvious that this suit should end now. the nine attorney's general, who are holding out, are only doing this to force an extreme payoff. one, that i feel they have absolutley no right to expect. ending this travesty now would help the markets to go forward.

thank you,
jayne mcgarey
chattanooga, tn.

MTC-00011906

From: cmendenhall

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:43pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a longtime user of Microsoft products beginning with the early dos program on the Radio Shack TRSDOS machines available before the floppy was perfected, I feel strongly that the government should settle the matter with and disallow the continuing harassment of rogue states. It is obvious that these states want to continue to keep the computer business environment in a state of upset. Lets settle the thing and get on with things.

C Mendenhall

MTC-00011907

From: LWTeerling@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:42pm

Subject: Put an end to the litigating

Why are we trying to ruin a company just because they happen to excel? I think the all the states should join in the settlement and lets move forward. Hasn't Microsoft been penalized enough? Do we want to crush them entirely? Where would our economy be without the vision of Microsoft?

Let's settle and move on.

Lois Teerling
Concerned consumer

MTC-00011908

From: sandra willis

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:45pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can not believe our government is still trying to 'punish' Bill Gates and his company. The man has given more to charity than all the politicians I've ever heard of, combined. He wants to Give to so many schools now, I'm sorry, I just have no patience with the ignorance of our government.

MTC-00011909

From: Sandra Bailey

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:46pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

It is time this Microsoft Antitrust suit is settled. As part of the general public I feel that it has taken up enough time and we should get on with other items that need work done on them. Believe me there is enough to keep your Department busy.

As a customer I did not believe that the antitrust suit should have ever happened. Microsoft provided it customers with a great product at fair value. It is my understanding that the general public did not believe in this antitrust suit and that it was done solely to benefit some Millionaires who could not keep up with Microsoft.

Please add my opinion that it is time to get this settled and move on.

Sincerely,
Sandra Kaye Bailey

MTC-00011910

From: PetkoPapcha@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:47pm
 Subject: (no subject)

As a shareholder of Microsoft and an avid user of Microsoft products I would like to see that the case be settled as quickly as possible. For the sake of the faltering economy I can see no reason to prolong litigation, stifle essential technological progress and handcuff an industry which the world relies upon. A reasonable solution to the perceived problems that Microsoft had caused in the past has already been reached. . . let's get on with it.

Enough is enough!!
 Alice Petko

MTC-00011911

From: Steve Bryant
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:48pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

The case should be settled now!
 The Bryant Design Group & Steve Bryant
 Const.
 P. O. Box 502
 Denison, Texas 75021
 <<http://house-plans-and-more.com>>

MTC-00011912

From: Leh1314@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:49pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:
 The proposed settlement of the DOJ case against Microsoft should be accepted by all parties. The benefits accrued by the public as a result of Microsoft software integration far exceeds any problems that may have resulted from Microsoft actions. The actions taken against Microsoft appear to be largely based on the fact that other companies could not compete effectively with products that were provided by Microsoft. Actions taken against Microsoft to date appear to be far more concerned with the perceived harm of a few large companies than on any harm caused to the public. In fact, the public has significantly benefited from the actions of Microsoft through the availability of integrated software application programs at a reasonable cost.

Please accept the Microsoft/DOJ proposed settlement without further delay.

Leo Hansen

MTC-00011913

From: H Tavassolie
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:51pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement.

I would like the Department of justice settle the current agreement ,and not to drug on this conflict for the sake of a few unhappy states,since we as a majority of united state citizens believe that continuation of this conflict is against the public interest.

Sincerely,

MTC-00011914

From: Ron Merchant
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:51pm

Subject: Settle the Case

It is imperative that the case against Microsoft be settled within the framework of the DOJ guidelines. It is apparent that the nine states are not interested in the economy, shareholders, or the utilization of governmental resources, paid for by taxpayers, that would be far better utilized in other venues.

Settle
 this now.
 Ron Merchant

MTC-00011915

From: Ronald S. Frantz
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:52pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Gentlemen;

As a consumer of Microsoft products, I believe that all actions against the company should be settled as expeditiously as possible.

I have not been harmed by the company in any way.

Sincerely,
 Ronald S. Frantz
 872 Porterville Road
 East Aurora, New York 14052

MTC-00011916

From: Rick Lauder
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:54pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let Microsoft do it's business! It is helping to shape the world.

MTC-00011917

From: Michael@MichaelMoore.net@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case is a ridiculous. Microsoft's so called monopoly is based on technical merits not market manipulation. Without Microsoft's vision and highly integrated products the whole computer revolution would not have happened.

Give them a break—too many of us owe our livelihoods to them.

CC:Michael@MichaelMoore.net@inetgw

MTC-00011918

From: AMEINTJES@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement

It is time to bring all litigation against Microsoft to an end without any further legal proceedings. The courts have ruled in the case against Microsoft and that ruling should stand. Our tax dollars, the time of the courts and the U. S. economy can all be best served by putting this matter behind us. As a user of Microsoft's software I have never felt that I was being forced to deal with a monopolist, overcharged for the products I bought or deprived of the opportunity to purchase something better because Microsoft had stifled innovation by others.

Sincerely
 John A. Meintjes.

MTC-00011919

From: john hickman
 To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 5:58pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

I own no Microsoft stock. I get upset with Microsoft at times just as many others do, but this settlement should not be overturned.

First, I believe the intrusions of politically driven solutions into settlements other than those of typical "case law" suits, ie. land problems, immigration, the right of political entities the right to and necessity of taxation as examples will diminish clarity within the courts. Second, I feel an overturn will continue to punish the concept of commercial knowledge ownership and that has great peril for innovation and advancement into the technical future of our nation.

Thank you
 John Hickman
 2266 E. Montrose Canyon Drive
 Tucson, Az. 85737

MTC-00011920

From: Cynthia Olson
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Speaking as a stockholder of Microsoft and middleclass American worker— Teacher— I have been dumbfounded about the course of this procedure— Please settle this case in favor of Microsoft— let innovation ,of all kinds, have the freedom it deserves to create advances in technology. Thank you,

Cynthia Olson

MTC-00011921

From: benright@alventive.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

For me personally as a Internet Software product manager, it would be better that Microsoft WAS a monopoly. That way, I do not have to insure that my products run in Netscape on Unix Clients and I do not have to worry about J2EE zelots insisting that I rewrite my products to suit their IT knowledge base. The weaker you make Microsoft, the harder my job is. :)

CC:benright@alventive.com@inetgw

MTC-00011922

From: Lynn Walton
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:59pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotelly,
 I was very disappointed when I first heard the results of the settlement that the DOJ agreed to with regard to the Microsoft Antitrust case, because I believe that it does not really prevent Microsoft from continuing in the same unethical business practices that they have been found to have engaged in for years. I was likewise very pleased that at least nine of the states did not agree and continued to push for a settlement that, in my opinion, would more appropriately fit the charges for which Microsoft was found guilty.

I am a Software Developer in the Internet industry. At first, I was not in favor of the Anti-trust suit at all, feeling that Microsoft (or any successful company) shouldn't be punished for being successful. But even when I felt that way, I still believed that they

engaged in unethical business practices regarding dealing with OEM's, etc. And for that I believed they should be tried and if found guilty punished in enough of a way that it would stop them from doing it in the future.

However, as I've studied both sides of the issues I have concluded that it isn't in the best interest of the people of the United States for Microsoft to continue to be allowed to maintain it's monopoly hold. Microsoft's patterns of behavior ultimately harm the consumer because they stifle competition from those who might otherwise make more reliable, quality products. Microsoft hasn't ceased in these harmful behaviors even when under the threat of the Anti-trust lawsuit. I do not believe they will change these patterns without a much stricter settlement that FORCES them to do so.

I hope you will find that the Proposed Final Judgement is NOT in the best interest of the people and will give more consideration to the settlement proposed by the remaining nine states. In fact, in many ways I think that Microsoft gets off so easy in the Proposed Final Judgement that they make the DOJ look like a JOKE because Microsoft's legal team out smarted them. Microsoft barely get's a slap on the wrist, they get to continue to use the same unfair business practices they always have, and they even gain some protection for their bad practices.

Thank you for your consideration,
Lynn Walton
Director of Internet Services Franklin University

(These views do not necessarily represent those of my employer.)

MTC-00011923

From:

murat.divringi@cacheflow.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement Honorable Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly,

I am an IT Professional (Vice President of Product Development) at CacheFlow—an Internet infrastructure company not affiliated with Microsoft.

After reviewing the documents published by DOJ on the matter of the "Microsoft Settlement" as well as arguments pro and con from supporters/opponents, it is my belief that this settlement reaches a good balance of keeping Microsoft "in line" regarding their business practices without imposing undue restraint to hinder innovation from Microsoft or any other technology company. I also find the punitive measures sufficient and simple.

I hope you will find the settlement satisfactory and not give in to critics whose sole purpose is to keep the case unsettled and in some cases, extort financial or competitive gain from delaying the settlement.

Sincerely,
Murat Divringi
Vice President of Product Development
CacheFlow Inc.
CC: murat.divringi@cacheflow.com@inetgw

MTC-00011924

From: Joy Ulskey

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 5:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As a concerned citizen I want to see the Microsoft case settled. 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 I'm sure was tough, but seems reasonable and fair to all parties involved.

Consumers overwhelmingly agree that settlement is good for them, the industry and the American economy. The last thing the American economy needs is more litigation that benefits only a few wealthy competitors and lawyers and stifles innovation. Don't let these special interests defeat the public interest. Settle now so we, The United States, can move on. Haven't we endured enough setbacks with Sept 11th?

CC: joyul@email.msn.com@inetgw

MTC-00011925

From: Dennis Battrick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

I really think that it's time for you folks to settle this issue. We've forgotten what the issue was anyway so now you all look like even bigger money wasting fools. As a consumer, I was never convinced that this was ever anything more than a money grab by certain influential individuals who were unable to design and produce software that anyone wanted. Have you noticed that nothing really new has been produced lately? Let the market take care of itself and quit trying to protect your special interests under the guise of "protecting the public from the big bad corporation". Enough is enough!

Sincerely,
Dennis T. Battrick

MTC-00011926

From: Alex Ray
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alex Ray
31830 Bittorf Lane
Cordova, MD 21625
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

First the Clinton Justice Department and now President Bush's legal beagles are trying to damage the one company that is directly responsible for this nation's economic boom in the 90's and our world leadership in technology.

Fine them if they broke the law, but get on with it. No company should endure the hoops that Justice Department forced on Microsoft.

I thought this Administration supported entrepreneurship, no matter how tough one of the competitors might be.

Sincerely,

Alex Ray

MTC-00011927

From: Cheryl Shirk
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Cheryl Shirk
2420 Rollins Ave.
Panama City, FL 32405
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Cheryl L. Shirk

MTC-00011928

From: Erika Gifford
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 4:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Erika Gifford
14431 Greencastle Dr #10
Chesterfield, MO 63017
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Erika T. Gifford

MTC-00011929

From: george m kousaleos
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:03pm
Subject: Microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov. January 15, 2002

Dear Sir,

I have very little to gain by a settlement, but I Had 800 shares of microsoft as the investment climbed in the past all of a sudden a fellow graduate SunMicrosystems convinced everybody he was the injured party. For 4 months I had stock in SunMicrosystems as recommended by JBOH. I held it and never made a trade. After transfer to First Union I still hadn't been able to trade for a profet it was only after Microsoft got in trouble, and long after I sold my shares in SunMicrosystems did SunMicrosysems stock move.

After changing my account to Fidelity Instead of buying Intel I bought Microsoft and for two years Microsoft only did good for those of us investors.

The courts made an unfavorable ruling and the entire USA and world economy has been suffering. People like me that have a stock that's climbing invest in other stocks by margin spending.

I can tell you from experience that when Microsoft dropped I could no longer acquire stocks that I was investing in because my portfolio didn't have any winners left.

I don't even have 50 shares of Microsoft.

I have 300 Ford

“““Juniper

I “300 Xerox

I hope Microsoft can reclaim their leadership. I wish I could be rich or at least get some shares on margin.

Last year I had 540,000 shares of a certain stock which reverse split 1:50 and then 1:40 leaving me with 450 shares

I sold 400 shares for \$4000. which I also lost .

People Like Bill Gates I liked spending the money he was making me. I would like to do it over and be a soft spoken and generous as he is generous. I would like to have confidence that can make a man so soft spoken.

I hope this letter affirms that I want the market to go up, not down, and Bill Gates and company are past and have the potential to be future leaders. All businesses have like sports have outstanding contributors. Microsoft is one company even my parents liked and encouraged my owning stocks.

With Respest,
George M. Kousaleos
P.S. I do not own any Microsoft today but I would risk some money if the economy picks me up.

MTC-00011930

From: Larry Gribble
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Larry Gribble
11408 W 112thTerr
Overland Park., KS 66210
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Larry Gribble

MTC-00011931

From: Timothy Aden
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Timothy Aden
21289 Iverson Avenue North
Forest Lake, MN 55025-7902
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tim Aden

MTC-00011932

From: Earl H. Conrad
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Earl H. Conrad
720 West Main Street
Waynesboro, Pa 17268
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Earl H. Conrad

MTC-00011933

From: Dianna Gibson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dianna Gibson
7000 E. 47th Avenue Drive, Suite 100
Denver, Co 80216
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dianna S. Gibson

MTC-00011934

From: Myron Schreiner
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Myron Schreiner
215 Belmont Dr
Reeds Spring, MO 65737
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create

new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Myron M Schreiner

MTC-00011935

From: Barbara Wiot
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barbara Wiot
1001 Main Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Barbara Wiot

MTC-00011936

From: Sharon Robie
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sharon Robie
1986 Pickering Trail
Lancaster, PA 17601
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sharon Robie

MTC-00011937

From: Kris Pitcairn
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kris Pitcairn
po box 233
Bryn Athyn, PA 19009-0233
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kris H. Pitcairn

MTC-00011938

From: CHRISTINE WILLHAUCK
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
CHRISTINE WILLHAUCK
PO. BOX 1100 PMB 277

GASTONIA, NC 28053-1100

January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE L. WILLHAUCK

MTC-00011939

From: Carol Bourgeois

To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/15/02 5:06pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Carol Bourgeois

4013 Manchaca Road #6

Austin, TX 78704

January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial spent taxpayers' dollars wisely while creating cutting edge case law to govern the high tech industry. To place the burden of such a litigation onto smaller companies would have been a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial to be over, however, patience is a virtue, often forgotten in litigation.

Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, guided by new and applicable interpretations of our precedential law, rather than flailing about in the courtroom, reinventing the wheel. And the consumers who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief, with some reassurance that the expensive hunk of plastic on their desks will continue to function, however imperfectly.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. Of course, most of those Americans had absolutely no idea how much

the Microsoft litigation benefitted them in terms of establishing the ground rules under which E-Commerce is conducted.

Once the case is finally over, high tech companies can get into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation with the 3000 pound gorilla that is Microsoft.

True competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. Microsoft can serve by example.

Should our current government consider getting out of the business of stifling product litigation and tying the hands of consumers in pursuing their options- (ahem, "tort reform") American consumers will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street.

With the benefits of the Microsoft litigation; a usable body of precedential law, the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to return to creating new and competitive products and technologies like they did in the Clinton administration, rather than hoping they can buy access and favors. (Like Enron?)

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Carol Bourgeois

MTC-00011940

From: Stu

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 6:06pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle this litigation immediately.

Nine states wishing to continue litigation are not enough out of 50 states, to justify to continued the expense of litigation.

Sincerely,

Stuart B. Stephens, Jr.

Stu Stephens, Assoc. Broker, CRS, ABR,

GRI

RE/MAX Island Properties

PO Box 1449 or 199 Main St., Eastsound

WA 98245

800 551-1677, 360 376-2599; fax: 360 376-

6211

<www.orcas-stephens.com>

<www.stu-patsy-stephens.com>

<www.orcasislandonline.com>

mailto:stu@orcasislandonline.com

For a tour of Orcas, click

<www.visualtour.com/show.asp?T=12655>

MTC-00011941

From: William D Fowble

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 6:05pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

January 15, 2002

We have a free enterprise system in this Country. Perhaps it would be a monopoly for Microsoft to give it's products out in this settlement, BUT perhaps the 1 billion would allow disadvantaged schools to make a "choice", as to whose products they would prefer to use and renovating their license practices would be a plus. Not being a computer geek, I like using software from other companies, as well as the Microsoft products. It's pertinent for the Court to come up with a reasonable solution to this problem and "Let's move on"!!! I think some people/

States are playing "hardball" on this issue and "milking the cow" for all it's worth!! Let's not have happen in this settlement, like in the tobacco settlement, that the money/products from Microsoft gets short changed for the purpose for which it is intended.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Fowble

Lynnwood, WA.

MTC-00011942

From: Patterons

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:16pm

Subject: Ref:Microsoft Suit

I personally feel that the Government should drop the whole thing as soon as possible, before the DOJ looks anymore foolish. I think that the "Software" companies that complained about Microsoft's supposed unfair practices used you folks at DOJ on a "witchhunt" against Microsoft because these other "Software" Company's have inferior products and can't compete unless it cries to the DOJ that Microsoft isn't playing fair!!!!!! And then tangle everybody up in a asinine lawsuit. The "States" of course have to get on the band-wagon because they smell "Big Cash Settlements". So the States, who really don't give a real shit about they're consumers, are just in it to try and line their state coffers with Corporate money. (Just look at the Tobacco Suits, none to those settlements went to prevent or stop smoking, in most cases I read about it went to the "States" General funds. The Tobacco Companies paid out the money for the Anti-Smoking Ads.

The States still want the TAX Money from the Tobacco.) So as usual its the American people who get screwed by this kind of B.S. Suit against a Company who just makes a better product. The DOJ could do us all a favor and try not to protect us so much. If there is a product out there that doesn't work or if we don't like it, guess what, we the consumer don't have to buy it!!!! Gee what a novel concept, I think its called Capitalism.

So please stop wasting tax payers funds and go after some real criminals, maybe Terrorists Money Laundering Operations, Organized crime, etc. I'm sure these problems haven't gone away since DOJ devoted so much time to the Microsoft case.

Thank you for your time.

S.L.Patterson,

Okanogan, WA.

MTC-00011943

From: Jane F Chi

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 6:09pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please let Microsoft free because you didn't do any good for consumers!!!!!!

MTC-00011944

From: RICHDUX@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 6:10pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This case should have been settled long ago. It is wasting tax payers money. Microsoft, Intel and other technology companies are the architects of the Untied States current prosperity. We should be

thanking them for making all of lives better than they would have been without them. Don't allow Microsoft's competitors to use our tax dollars for their benefit. Settle the case NOW!

Richard J. Dux
8509 Trumbull
Skokie, IL 60076

MTC-00011945

From: Everett Snelson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:10pm

Gentlemen: The public does not want to hamper future innovation at Microsoft. Please settle this now!

Everett Snelson

MTC-00011946

From: mark scheel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As private citizens and shareholders of Microsoft, we would like to state emphatically that we believe this matter should be settled now and all further litigation terminated. It's in the best interests of the country as a whole to move on. Thank you.

Mark Scheel and Dee Snook

MTC-00011947

From: ArlenPar@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the Justice Dept. should take the necessary course of action to swiftly resolve the cases pending against Microsoft. Enough is Enough! From my viewpoint the entire anti trust affair was instigated by Senators and Congressmen sympathetic to Microsoft's competitors. These elected officials have just been carrying on a vendetta for the companies that are in competition with Microsoft, with no regard for the consumer's interest. The competing software companies should expend their efforts towards making software that is competitive and usefull in the marketplace, instead of trying to stifle software and systems that the public needs and desires.

Lets get on with the future.

Arlen Paranto
P.O.Box 304
Eatonville, Wash. 98328

MTC-00011948

From: The Lamoses
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

My vote is for Microsoft. This has always been a ridiculous battle between Microsoft's competitors and Microsoft, and a bunch of money-hungry politically-motivated Attorneys Generals. Shouldn't this be about consumers? How can anyone honestly say that consumers have been shafted or gotten a raw deal, from a company that practically invented personal computing, enabled the popularization of the Internet, and all of the benefits and wealth they have brought to this country?!

My biggest concern is that you're not going to hear from the majority of the citizens, who are very happy and satisfied with Microsoft and their contributions to the technology industry and this country's economy. Instead, you'll hear the beating of drums from their competitors (who have accumulated and perfected their anti-Microsoft rhetoric producing machinery and anti-Microsoft lobbying tactics), and who stand to gain a lot from the debilitation of Microsoft. It's a sad day in America when competitors and AGs use the justice system to further their own agendas, instead of doing their jobs and allowing companies to compete in the open market.

Thanks

MTC-00011949

From: Tom Freeman (Salt Lake City)
To: 'Microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 5:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not encourage you to pursue the private settlement proposed by Microsoft. It would, in my opinion, create even more of a monopoly than they already have. There has to be some cost to a company that has done what Microsoft has done. Justice. These opinions are my own and in no way reflect the position of my company.

Thanks,

Tom Freeman
Citrix Systems, Inc.
tom.freeman@citrix.com
801.816.3309

MTC-00011950

From: Jeff Gillings
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have 15 years experience in software engineering and a B.S. in business. The Revised Final Judgement addresses a number of important points; good job on those.

However, it does not address the following:

- 1) Punishment to Microsoft for past monopolistic behavior, specifically, destroying Netscape.
- 2) Microsoft predatory pricing. This should be a major piece of the settlement. After the development costs are paid for, sales of software are almost all profit; allowing Microsoft (or any company which can license software to hundreds of millions of customers) to reap huge profits. How are you going to keep Microsoft from using that money to price competition out of the market.

Microsoft has a strong history of this behavior; Internet Explorer was given away. I don't see anything in the Final Judgement that addresses this very important point.

MTC-00011951

From: Rices21@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft is convicted of having overcharged for a product which people bought of their own free will because it was better than any other. Now Microsoft has made a tremendously generous offer to give it away, but a judge says it isn't enough, and would help to popularize Microsoft products,

which the public already prefer. The government seeks to discourage excellence, and condemns businesses which give the public what they want, while protecting businesses which offer less popular products. Socialists in government penalizes successful businesses, even though they pay huge taxes, because socialists want success to be dependent on government, rather than private initiative, regardless of consequent loss to the consumer. Socialists seek government power, not social prosperity.
Houston Rice

MTC-00011952

From: Stephen Heaton
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think Microsoft will never change. I think the government is too slow to react to the largest computer software maker in the world. They have a lock on the desktop, you still cannot buy Linux preloaded from Dell, HP etc. Money is NOT the answer, if you cannot break them up, why spend all my tax dollars?? It all seems like another mass waste of my tax dollars (again).

Break them up in 3 parts, but since the "new" group of public servants decided not to seek that, Microsoft should have refund to us, over 100 bucks each, to any one who has bought a software package from them that cost 100 dollars or more In the last 3 years. The end user needs a large refund, if money is the only thing they understand.

Thanks for reading this!

MTC-00011953

From: Jon Roberts
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly,
I am an information technology professional with 8 years of extensive experience in software engineering, systems administration, data design, coding, and testing. I have a broad background, but my core competencies are in web systems. While serving as a commissioned officer in the US Air Force, I installed, administered, and developed with my first web server in 1994, at the advent of the world wide web. In my career, I have worked with a variety of operating systems, including flavors of Unix and versions of Microsoft Windows. I've also used an array of open standards, including HTML, CSS, Http, LDAP, CGI, XML, and Java. Very recently, I moved an entire internet and intranet infrastructure for a large academic medical center from a Unix (Sun Solaris) hosted environment to one using Microsoft based servers. Currently, I work independently as a developer and consultant. As such, I feel I have relevant insight into Microsoft's technology and business practices. I favor a best of breed approach to system development, so I also believe I represent an objective point of view. I regularly use Microsoft software at work and home, and continue to do so where I deem appropriate; I am writing this message in Microsoft Outlook, for instance. I also use other operating systems and recommend their use in circumstances where I judge there is a better alternative.

Throughout my career, my ability to provide value to my employers or customers has been adversely affected by Microsoft's technology and business practices. The software they deliver, particularly new software, is typically far less efficient, stable, or secure than alternative approaches. Their products are usually designed with dependencies that require you to use other Microsoft products and sabotage the concurrent use of non-Microsoft approaches. Many of their offerings do not uninstall properly, and leave a permanent presence on the hosting system. Because they write the operating system too, some of their applications make use of capabilities that are not available to non-Microsoft developers. Their licensing practices are mercenary and anti-competitive, using vehicles like sole-source relationships to build inordinate market share. Once Microsoft gains control of a market, they begin raising prices at a rate faster than the industry in general. Most importantly, Microsoft has repeatedly undermined and perverted open standards to serve their own ends, including every one I listed above.

I know that business is competitive by nature, but I agree with the Justice Department's repeated findings that Microsoft's business practices crossed the line and were illegal. Further, I believe that Microsoft created a situation for itself that is bad for the industry and the economy at large over the long term. While I will concede that many dot-coms burned capital on irresponsible business models and implementations, I attest that Microsoft has some amount of personal responsibility for the bursting of the bubble economy and the current economic woes of the information technology industry and the country. The cost of developing on the web should not be as high as it is now, but who knew in the early days of e-commerce the momentum of progress in open standards could be stymied so effectively by one player. Microsoft is in direct conflict with the cooperative culture that brought us the internet, and their long term strategies will exacerbate this problem: where Microsoft succeeds, all others will bleed. History will not be kind if we will have to address the same issues again because of an ineffectual remedy.

If the terms of the anti-trust settlement can be realized, then it may make some difference. However, I don't have faith that Microsoft will adhere to the spirit of the settlement, I have even less confidence in the Justice Department's ability to enforce the terms of the settlement expediently (especially given how long this initial anti-trust process has dragged on), and I believe the problem is larger than middleware. In particular, I don't believe anything short of making Windows open source would prevent Microsoft from taking advantage of the ambiguous nature of a "middleware interface" to continue to constrain consumers and developers. Don't forget that in addition to the operating system and productivity application markets, Microsoft has a big stake in development tools; a hook into middleware functionality doesn't mean much to me if I have to use another Microsoft product to implement it. And I've read some

of Microsoft's published information on its software in the few instances where it doesn't directly involve one of their development tools, and it still didn't enable me to communicate cleanly with the Windows operating system or their middleware (even when it's supposed to). At best, they're support staff has pleaded incompetence. I'll buy it, too; they have no history of successfully supporting cooperative development outside of Microsoft tools. Microsoft's entire oeuvre has a tendency to be black box. To achieve its aims, this settlement would have to completely reverse Microsoft's closed corporate and development culture. I'm skeptical that this settlement will lead to anything more than continued legal squabbling.

On a separate note, the recent class action settlement is too plainly a vehicle for Microsoft to broaden its market share while simultaneously getting good press. I view it less as ineffectual and more as a disgrace to our legal system.

This message is a general statement of perspective. If you want more insight, specific examples, or verification of my credentials feel free to contact me.

Jon
Jon Roberts
jon@jonanddeb.net

MTC-00011954

From: g-igold@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We in the state of New Mexico were the first to recognize the futility of constant attacks on Microsoft Corporation. I urge you to settle the lawsuits once and for all. While Apple corporation postures about being shut out of the schools by Microsoft, I don't see them giving away an equivalent dollar amount of computer hardware and software. . . .

The political interests of several states should not hold up the settlement.

Gerald N. Gold, MD

MTC-00011955

From: PWoodbery@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This is to register my approval of the microsoft-DOJ settlement. Only nine states refuse endorsement; the other nine states, the DOJ, and Microsoft all agree that the settlement makes retribution for Microsoft's anti-trust wrongs and provides safeguards against future violations. Not only is the remedy of the nine refusing states unfairly draconian, it could well be a harm to the technology economy. Originally, anti-trust laws were to protect the consumer, not advantage competitors.

I fear that one thing motivating the recalcitrant states is serving the special interest of competitors located in their respective states. Microsoft should not be allowed to squelch competition, but competitors should win because their product satisfies consumers and not through legal machinations.

Sincerely yours,

W. Potter Woodbery, Ph.D.
PWoodbey@aol.com

MTC-00011956

From: Bidwellmoore@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the interest of stabilizing America's wavering economy, I earnestly urge an end to this long running attack on Microsoft. The recently proposed settlement among the defedant and the majority of the plaintiffs appears to be more than just for all parties. To have a minority contingent holding out for more damages is dragging the country down in the hope that the minority may benefit at the expense of the well being of all Americans.

Bidwell Moore

MTC-00011957

From: David R Hill
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To the Honorable Judge Kollar-Kotally:

I am writing to express my concern that Microsoft is getting off the hook for its illegal monopolistic activities. The current Proposed Final Judgment announced by the Justice Department fails to deal with the illegal activities pointed out by past court investigations and rulings. It would be wrong and bad for the public well-being to allow this to happen. I hope that you will take action to do what is lawful, just, and in the public interest, not what is in the interest of Microsoft. When every personal computer sold in America, apart from Apple computers, carries Microsoft software as its primary mode of operation, it is apparent that they have totally cornored the market. This was the finding of the latest court decision. Therefore, Microsoft's illegal hold on the market should be broken and Microsoft should be denied the fruits of its past violations, just as the Apellate court ruled. I hope that you will uphold this ruling and take appropriate action.

Finally, I hope you will make it impossible for Microsoft to carry on any future anticompetitive activity. I have friends who work in the computer industry, and they have verified that Microsoft indeed engages in this type of activity, much to their dismay. Our country and economy thrive on competition and the freedom to develop and market new products. Microsoft has the money and power to squelch all competition and to continue to further their own interests at everyone else's expense.

Therefore, you are really the last hope of doing something to stop them. Please do so. This is a huge and incredibly important decision. Please do all that you can to end this monopoly. I appeal to you as a public servant to indeed do that which is in the interest of the citizens whom you serve. Illegal activity should be ended, not pandered to and empowered to continue.

Sincerely yours,
David R. Hill
66 Hobson St.,
Brighton, MA 02135

MTC-00011958

From: Clayton Harrington
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:30pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby express my approval for the settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. I am saddened and angry that nine states refuse to accept the settlement and are forcing more litigation. I sincerely hope they lose. I believe it is past time to settle this case and for everyone to move on.

MTC-00011959

From: DavidGuidos@MSN.Com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:31pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please accept the settlement. Microsoft has always acted in the best interest of the software industry. Their active encouragement of industry-wide standards has made us all winners, even those companies and states now claiming foul, and they have promoted the rise and success of an entire new industry. Even though they had the capability to do so, Microsoft has never acted as a monopoly. They have kept the cost of their systems and programs very reasonable, and by doing so, they made incredibly advanced information processing capabilities available to nearly everyone in our country.

Thank you.

CC:DavidGuidos@MSN.Com@inetgw

MTC-00011960

From: Rogers536@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:31pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Microsoft has made a good offer. Lets settle this and get on with business. We have enough other problems without trying to break up a business.

Russ Rogers

MTC-00011961

From: Carter, Mark
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:32pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This litigation continues to leave uncertainty for both customers and the market.

Please get this case closed ASAP.

Mark L. Carter

* (205)967-9330

7 Fax (205)967-0120

* mailto:MarkCarter@ACP-Inc.com

http://www.ACP-Inc.com <http://

www.acp-inc.com/>

MTC-00011962

From: Earl Hoveland
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:49pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

I consider Microsoft's settlement offer to be more than fair. I have purchased Microsoft products for ten years and have never felt they should be penalized for making an honest dollar. Their prices have been fair and to penalize them in order to put dollars in

the pockets of their competitors smacks of socialism and over regulation. Obviously the states that are dragging their feet are just like the rest of this country—they have too many attorneys who can't get employment in the private sector. I say Hurrah for Bill Gates, even if he appears to be a liberal democrat. He must be the exception that proves the rule

Earl Hoveland
 PO Box 786
 Packwood, Wa 98361

MTC-00011963

From: NY. . . NY
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:32pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Consumers have not been effected by any "Anti-trust Act" by Microsoft. This pro-long at is being made by Microsoft's competitors who are using the nine state attorney generals as their lawyers,

Lets end this cast with the nine state attorney generals and competitors so that the consumers may be able to receive Microsoft's innovative technology.

MTC-00011964

From: Gail Fox
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:32pm
 Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to urge a settlement in this endlessly dragged-out litigation against Microsoft.

Right from the beginning, I was appalled by the U.S. government interfering with—and penalizing—one of the few remaining successful business (and superior products) still extant in the U.S.

I am a writer-editor—proud graduate of Brown University, proud former resident of Washington, DC—and I have lived long enough to remember pride in American products. However, if that sentiment were not enough, I have ALSO lived long enough to have tried MANY early software products, many word processors, many programs. The ones that could not measure up died on the vine along the way.

My particular success story with Microsoft is that I had to return to a 5,000-page, 5-volume history that I had edited fifteen years earlier for a client on a Microsoft WORD-DOS-based program. The hardware had long been deceased and I was left with the discs. This translated perfectly and easily into a WORD 2000 for Macintosh, about as foreign an exchange as you can get. I find that Microsoft is on top because IT HAS THE BEST PRODUCT. I thought this was what America was about.

Now I live in the Pacific Northwest. Seattle does not need another economic blow (think Boeing), nor does the U.S. (I personally think the stock market bubble that broke in March, 2000 was pricked mightily by the U.S. government going after a good business model—Microsoft.)

I support Microsoft because it makes the best products. It is run by a man who would probably be hacking around with computers even if HE had to pay YOU to do it. His success came from excellence, not slippery business practices.

Sincerely, Gail Fox, Bellingham, Washington

MTC-00011965

From: Jim Hoechstetter
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:33pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Sir or Madam,

I have been in the computer industry in a number of capacities since 1958 when it was in its infancy and am retired from IBM. It was absolutely unconcionable that you went after Microsoft in the first place. They were and are guilty of one thing: developing and producing the best products available. Microsoft products have been chosen by most businesses and consumers because they are the best. It appears that the Justice Department feels your charter is to find successful businesses and cripple them. How that helps the consumer is beyond me. The "settlement" that has been agreed to by Microsoft, you, and 9 states, is generous on the part of Microsoft and much more than the governments involved should get. I urge the judge to accept the agreement and end this whole debacle.

Jim Hoechstetter

3100 Cutchin Drive

Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

MTC-00011966

From: robert
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 5:12pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Having read The Revised Proposal Final Judgement, including the Competitive Impact Statement, it is in my opinion a thorough investigation of the Microsoft Corporation has been completed and it is now time to finalize the U.S. Government's involvement in this matter.

I do NOT believe that any further penalties are justified and that the U.S. Government should conclude it's case and let the Microsoft Corporation continue to offer to everyone all their products legally without any more prosecution since they have agreed to abide by the penalties and remedies imposed upon them and did them voluntarily and are abiding to th U.S. Government's wishes by law.

Finally I believe it is time to give Microsoft some praise for producing great products, products that are inovative and products that are well researched and promoted legally. Wishfully I would hope that more corporations would be at least as inovative as Microcoft thereby preventing the severe jealous feelings that I believe they have for Microsoft.

I believe that in a free business society that corporations should be free to inovate while breaking no laws.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Thacker =====

MTC-00011967

From: James Chambers
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 6:35pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Good Day,

I would like to say that I thought that the settlement in the Microsoft case is harsh

enough and serves its purpose and the better interest of the public.

I do believe, though, that Microsoft should be on probation, much like a high-risk re-offender. I believe that at this stage, Microsoft has appointed an internal Compliance Officer to adhere to the settlement and the other rulings of J. Penfield Jackson. This shows tremendous effort on their part that they are trying to do their best, but I think there should also be external monitoring.

This is not because I feel that Microsoft will reoffend, but rather that, in the eyes of the public, they will not be afforded such an opportunity. As we all know, you attract more ants with honey; let's keep the honey out of reach and everybody wins.

James Chambers

MTC-00011968

From: Dr. James F. Gaines
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:39pm
Subject: Antitrust settlement

Sir/Ma'am= I am a perennial user of Windows and many of its applications. I have n complaint about prices, service , upgrades or other aspects that some of the Attornies General seem to want to focus on upon directions from their respective corporate cohorts who compete with Microsoft. Microsoft has done a good service for me and for all of my friends who are part of the computerized public. If Apple doesn't want Microsoft to install computers in the poorer school for free, then let Apple install them for free. Antitrust statutes were established to protect the consuming public and not the businesses that fail to keep up. James F. Gaines, DVM, MS, Business owner.

MTC-00011969

From: Samhael
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
208 50th Street NW
Bradenton, FL 34209-2880
January 15, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice,
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I very much appreciate your strong leadership of DOJ over the past year. In order for the recent settlement agreed to by Microsoft and the Justice Department to go through it is critical that you demonstrate uncompromising support for this agreement. This settlement will end three years of litigation that have cost both sides dearly in time and resources. Outside interests would like this settlement eliminated because they claim it is unfair. The truth however is the settlement will give competitors never before offered access to Microsoft's secret code, including internal interfaces. Microsoft has also agreed to make it very easy for competitors to place their software on Microsoft operating systems. While both sides, MS and the DOJ, are ready to settle there will be those, many with anti-Microsoft prejudice, who will try to have this settlement removed. I would like to state again that it is critical for you to show

tenacious support for this settlement. Thank you.

Sincere regards,
Sam Espy

MTC-00011970

From: Bill Lucks
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I strongly support the settlement entered into with the DOJ and encourage you to do all possible to put this unfortunate attack by Microsoft's competitors behind us.

William G. Lucks

MTC-00011971

From: douglasleifeste
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft hearing

To whom, Please dont let a few narrow minded ,selfish people hold up the settlement of this case particularly after 911. We need to get this country back on its feet.

Thank You, Douglas Leifeste,1214 Vine Ave,Sunnyside Wa

MTC-00011972

From: Apurva Dalia
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe that the court should accept the settlement. Public money should not be used in bringing such cases against corporations that have helped USA become the world 's leading economy that it is today. If companies feel intimidated by government interference such as this, America will not remain the prime location that it is today to establish global businesses.

The current recession and events threaten to set us back. We need to do everything we can to not let this happen. The Government needs to focus on issues like Security, Foreign Policy and Economic Stimulus. There is no point in dragging this case any further. Please accept the settlement.

Thanks

Apurva Dalia
9926, 128th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

MTC-00011973

From: Rgakins@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:47pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Members:

I admit that I have Microsoft stock in my meager retirement account and have a vested interest in their well being. However, as I see it you have an opportunity to provided common sense solutions to this legal debacle that has gone far too far already. I urge you to find for Microsoft and allow them and other companies to get on with the business of innovation and life improvement for us all.

Thank you,
Robert G. Aikins

MTC-00011974

From: Smith-Bates, Jacqui
To: 'microsoft.atr(a)usdoj.gov'
Date: 1/15/02 6:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I would encourage the DOJ and the States to settle the Microsoft case. It has been tedious, has not proven that Microsoft has hurt consumers, and has been detrimental to the U.S. Economy. The case should be settled immediately.

Thank you,
Jacquelyn Smith
4319 Wallingford Ave
N Seattle, WA 98103

MTC-00011975

From: WannaBnLV@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case and allow Microsoft to function without government intrusion. Microsoft is a model of entrepreneurial spirit in the United States and the other companies who cried foul should take a lesson from Microsoft and compete in a capitalistic marketplace that is unfettered by government manipulation.

Thank you for your consideration,
C. Austin

MTC-00011976

From: thebirdsalls
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:52pm
Subject: Move on and off Microsoft
Get off Microsoft's case!

Elise M. Birdsall
1896 Peachtree Ave.
The Villages, FL 32162
352-259-9870

MTC-00011977

From: Scott Futral
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

As both a stockholder and a citizen I am appalled that the Microsoft offer of settlement was not accepted!

MTC-00011978

From: WILLIAM A CLEMENTS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

This whole law suit is a terrible thing for Microsoft and our country. It is preposterous for our justice department to stick their noses in private business when they "failed to share" with other merchants their secrets. If these other designers of software can do a better job than Microsoft on their own, then so be it.

And don't try to cheat Microsoft out of its just rewards for doing a superlative job.

William A Clements
ollietoo@thegrid.net

MTC-00011979

From: Walt Casey
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

We have wasted enough tax money on the Microsoft case, it is time stop any more action.

Walt Casey

MTC-00011980

From: thebirdsalls

To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 6:58pm
Subject: finalize the Microsoft case ASAP
Gentlemen:

It's time to move on. Microsoft is the goose with the golden eggs. Oracle is using USA's, DOJ for competitive advantage. Finalize it!

Marianne Gyle
1896 Peachtree Ave.
The Villages, Florida 32162
352-259-9870
MarianneGyle@thebirdsalls.com
CC:Elise M. Birdsall

MTC-00011981

From: JEskelin@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

This action by the remaining States can only continue the attack on American enterprise and the freedom to be innovative. The nine States are simply going after Microsoft's cash position so they can make high settlements with outside attorneys and add more to each States' general funds. Much the same as those States sharing in the bonanza produced by the tobacco industry.

Buyers in the past had the opportunity to load what ever was available in the operating system inventory if they wished. They were not forced to buy MS products anymore than we are forced to buy a Ford. As for buyers paying too much, how in the world will this ever be determined?

Finish this farce being done in the name of justice.

Sincerely,
John L. Eskelin
Puyallup, WA

MTC-00011982

From: SHARONNE PLOTNIK
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:07pm

I find it very disturbing that we do not let microsoft help our public schools. The settlement and lawsuits are now just feeding into people that want to make money on lawsuits. Think of the rest of the people—get over it and get on with the business of progress.

MTC-00011983

From: James Lambo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gentlemen:

Microsoft is providing a tremendous product to the public. Please find a way to settle this case fairly and let them get on with their work.

Jim Lambo

MTC-00011984

From: EDWARD E KELLUM
To: microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov.?@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 7:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I concur with the proposed Microsoft Antitrust settlement with the exception of Microsoft supplying schools with Microsoft software. This would be very unfair to Apple Corp. As I understand it, this part of the agreement has been denied by the judge. If

Microsoft gave money only to the schools and the schools could select the hardware software they chose, I think that would be OK.

I am a Mac computer user and I also use Microsoft Office Software, Microsoft Internet Explorer and Outlook Express. I think that Microsoft has supported the Mac computer very well. That is in contrast to Word Perfect word processor which dropped Mac support and to Netscape which was a much poorer browser than Internet Explorer. I used to use Word Perfect and Netscape. I think it would be detrimental to computer users and the United States if more destructive terms were adopted, such as a break up of the company.

Edward Kellum
615 Vaquero Rd.
Monrovia, CA 91016
ekellum@earthlink.net

MTC-00011985

From: Gunner Agosto
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern,
The Microsoft settlement is too critical an issue to allow the stalling tactics by a small minority of users bent on enriching themselves. The issues have been argued endlessly and a reasonable settlement reached through the Tunney Act. Let's finally move on.

Gunner Agosto

MTC-00011986

From: Shelley Blumberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am a consumer who uses and likes Microsoft software. I hope that the settlement that was reached with the Department of Justice and nine states will be accepted. I want Microsoft to focus on developing more and better products. Microsoft produces good products that work well, are easy to use, and are low cost. I don't think that taxpayer money should be spent on yet more lawsuits against Microsoft to benefit Microsoft's large competitors, such as Sun Microsystems and Oracle. These companies should compete with Microsoft by producing better products at competitive prices rather than using the judicial system to try to prevent Microsoft from producing innovative products. I hope that I will open my Wall Street Journal soon and see that the DOJ-Microsoft settlement has been accepted and that the case is over!

Sincerely,
Shelley Blumberg

MTC-00011987

From: TJMARYHANA@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:15pm
Subject: (no subject)

I think its time the government left private business alone

MTC-00011988

From: TedVanzwol@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

They sure are making a lot about little. Why not make a small reasonable settlement to those that are crying because of their inability to compete and move on.

What an expensive pain they are being.
Ted Vanzwol

MTC-00011989

From: Evelyn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:21pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

In my opinion the settlement that has been reached in the Microsoft case should be consummated. I am in favor of settlement now and in not prolonging this case with further litigation. It is good for America and therefore in the public interest. It is not in the public interest to spend taxpayer's dollars to drag this out further.

Sincerely,
Evelyn H. Payne

MTC-00011990

From: james.scrivener@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Antitrust

Litigation on Microsoft Anti-trust charges have gone on much too long and continuation cannot be good for our economy.

Microsoft provides a great reliable service which may be seriously compromised if it is further restricted.

J.R. Scrivener

MTC-00011991

From: Kerlin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:21pm
Subject: Microsoft

Microsoft has done more to bring order and ease of use in it's software than any other company.

THANK YOU. KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK.

Rick Kerlin

MTC-00011992

From: markthome
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:22pm
Subject: Holding up progress

Please do what you can to enable the companies of the United States to progress on the basis of their achievements. Not on the basis of one suing another in order to compete.

Mark Thome,
Bellevue, Washington

MTC-00011994

From: GKowa49992@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:28pm
Subject: Fwd: Returned mail

January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DO 20590-0001

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I am writing to express my opinion of the recent settlement between the US Department of Justice and Microsoft. I think the case dragged out far too long, and should

be finalized, even if the penalties imposed on Microsoft are too harsh.

I am a proponent of free enterprise and I think Microsoft should not be restrained from being able to innovate and grow as they have in the past. I also do not think Microsoft has a monopoly that could possibly be construed as bad for our economy. Actually, I think Microsoft as it is today does more good than harm for our public. But, I understand some of the lawmakers' and politicians' complaints, and that is why the terms of the settlement are more than fair. Microsoft will be conceding internal interfaces and protocols. They will be designing future Windows versions so that competitors can more easily promote their own products. And, the government will be forming a three-person team to monitor compliance with the settlement. We are at war and in recession. We need Microsoft's industry strength to be building wealth and technology for our country instead of fighting legal battles in the courts. I thank you for your time and hope your office looks out for the public's best interests, and I hope that you work with Attorney General Butterworth to have this settled in the State of Florida as well.

Sincerely,
G. Kowalski
201 Orlando Boulevard
Indialantic, Florida 32903

MTC-00011995

From: AAA270@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe the Microsoft settlement is fair and should be approved. Let's put this behind us and grow our economy, to which Microsoft contributes a good deal.

Al Ackerman
9141 NW 13 Street
Plantation, FL 33322

MTC-00011996

From: hairdoc
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do now and always have felt that the DOJ's and various state attorneys suits against Microsoft Corp. are the result of the prejudiced views of elected officials from states where Microsoft's competition reside. This constitutes what I and everyone I speak to considers an injustice perpetrated against Microsoft Corp. As you know millions of our tax dollars have already been wasted in an attempt to wrongfully punish this company. I like most Americans who used P.C.'s. before the advent of Windows hold Microsoft in the highest regard. I am proud of it's performance in dominating it's field because in doing so it took us out of the realm of cryptic DOS code and into the future of computing. Lets face it, the driving force behind any great advancement has always been profit. By punishing Microsoft for doing exactly what any other large corporation or small businessman would do in it's place sends a bad signal to those of us who have the nerve to gamble in the high stakes world of business. By the way what would the trade deficit have been last quarter if Microsoft did not sell software worldwide?

Please stop this nonsense and accept this settlement that is already much larger than the so-called (but in my mind fabricated) harm done to the "public" Let this great American company thrive and grow.

Thank you for considering my position.
Stephen F. Dasaro

MTC-00011997

From: Michael.Martak@sun.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft
ATR,michael.martak@sun.com@inetgw
Date: 1/15/02 7:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom It May Concern,

In 1997, I took a job as a software graphical user interface engineer for a company called Imedia Corporation. At that time, the technical leadership of the company had determined that the graphical user interface for the project needed to be supported in a web browser, and as a result, Sun Microsystem's Java technology was chosen. As a then Microsoft developer, I preferred to retain my skills in Microsoft's tools while learning what was required to complete my task in Java, remaining agnostic towards any particular platform or vendor. What happened externally during the life of that project was shocking, unprofessional, unethical, and (as we now know) historic. Microsoft decided to wrest control of Java technology from Sun Microsystems, not only at a platform libraries level, but at the language-specification level by adding new keywords whose intention was uncontestedly to subvert the promise of "write once, run anywhere" that made Java technology an appealing choice for developers. As we know, Sun Microsystems sued Microsoft over this issue and won it, but at the cost of Microsoft's dropping Java support entirely from their operating system and browser. While this was happening, though the future of the technology was uncertain, my own project at Imedia Corporation was going extremely well. Java technology had allowed me enough time to complete my project and had given me plenty of time to tune it, a much faster turnaround for a project than I had ever been accustomed to. The entire time I could not help but feel that the world was losing a fantastic technology that was being stifled only through monopoly power.

Now it is 2002, and sadly, Java technology has still not become widely available on the desktop. I now work for Microsoft's competitor, Sun Microsystems, which I find ironic because of Microsoft's attempt to determine the future of my project and own my code or choice of language. Microsoft made me a competitor, and all I ever wanted to do was to own my own code, and be free to choose the right technology for the right job. As a professional software developer, it is highly important to me that Microsoft's illegal abuse of monopoly power has stifled innovation, created an environment with little to no regard for security, and left the consumer vulnerable and unaware that there is even anything missing or wrong. Innovation is easy to measure, but measuring non-innovation is difficult.

It is important for software developers and the future of technology that Microsoft not be allowed to walk away from stifling

innovation for so long without suffering so much as a scratch, and for these reasons (as well as more specific technical ones), I highly disagree with the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice, nine states, and Microsoft.

I would like to extend support to the proposed remedy by the nine states which objected to the settlement, including the state of California, of which I am a resident as well as a registered voter. I believe that this solution is far better for the state of technology, Java technology in particular, as well as the security and integrity of data for all consumers. Because I work for a competitor of Microsoft, I want to assert that my opinion as a software professional is my own and is unsolicited by Sun Microsystems.

This I swear under penalty of perjury,

Sincerely,
Michael Martak
Oakland, California

MTC-00011998

From: rick
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement
TO: DOJ

The software industry is highly competitive and one dimension of that competition is to use government to gain a competitive advantage rather than one's own creativity and initiative. To settle this case now in favor of Microsoft is the best way to ensure competition, satisfy customers and help the economy get back on track

Thanks

MTC-00011999

From: Normakorn@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft

I am in favor of supporting Microsoft. They should not be penalized for their success.

Norma Korn
normakorn@aol.com

MTC-00012000

From: Intlglstc@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

I believe that as a taxpaying citizen and someone who is eager to see the United States keep it's lead in technology, it is time to settle this prolonged action against Microsoft. I, more and more, get the strong feeling that legal action is intended to foster an unfair competitive advantage for manufacturers in those states working to further "muddy the water". Why not let actions agreed speak for themselves and let competitive products work to obtain their own marketing success rather than ask Microsoft to subsidize their operations. Enough already!

Donald S. Chakas
810 W. Pacificview Road
Bellingham, WA. 98226

MTC-00012001

From: PATRICIA ANTLITZ
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:37pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

P.O. Box 1395
Hampton, NH 03843-1395
January 16, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I appreciate the difficulty of your job, and the many weighty issues you must consider, particularly in these difficult times. I appreciate your strong leadership and the difficult decisions you are called upon to make.

I am in favor of the Microsoft antitrust case settling. I am disappointed the settlement has been held up for so long and view this as not beneficial to Microsoft, its competitors, the computer industry, or the US economy. I believe that Microsoft is great American company and has done many great things not only for the computer industry, but also for the US economy as a whole. I am supportive of the work they have done to make technological advances. I would like to see the parties involved in this case move on so that Microsoft may continue to innovate. I believe that any further delays will be detrimental to our nation.

The settlement agreement should satisfy those who feel Microsoft has engaged in any anticompetitive behavior. The changes purported in the agreement are fair to all parties involved. There is no reason to continue the litigation. Monies being spent on litigation would be better put to use in research and development, an area that has helped our nation maintain a competitive edge in technology and remain a leader among nations.

Thank you for considering these comments.

With greatest respect,
Patricia Antlitz

MTC-00012003

From: Dean Parsons
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:42pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
Dept. of Justice.

This is a great company in a great country. Microsoft built a better mouse trap and people want it. This country was built on competition, and great ideas. We should have more people like Bill Gates, and no more Bill Clinton.

This is a huge waste of tax payer dollars. And I for one have seen enough waste to last a thousand years. For anyone that is crying about Microsoft, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Sincerely
Dean Parsons

MTC-00012004

From: l.m.james@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

SETTLE!!!! This is a ridiculous, old, tired argument and Microsoft has awesome products at fair prices that have never harmed anyone. They have made my life at home and running my own business easy! I am so happy with their product, and as a

business owner I hope the government does not decide to sue every successful company Americans make!

Laurel James

MTC-00012005

From: Cecelia Breidenbach
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I can't believe how long this litigation has dragged. With all that has happened, it seems prudent to wrap this up. The states holding out are, in my opinion, are more than greedy—in that they turned down the MSN gift of computers for their schools. I believe they are holding out for \$\$\$ which I hope they don't get.

MTC-00012006

From: Robert Wright
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:43pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
TWO VOTES FOR SETTLEMENT NOW—
ROBERT C. WRIGHT
SUSAN V. WRIGHT
1524 HARVEST LANE
MANASQUAN NJ, 08736

MTC-00012007

From: Laurent Tardif
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I'm a research fellow at Monash university. I read the judgment and all the informations given on the Proposed Final Judgment in the US v. Microsoft case on the java-sun web site. I'm quiet surprise, that the judgment give only restriction to the middleware and OS issues. The judgment doesn't give restriction on the key points, for my point of view.

I give a example. I designed a plug-in to visio, a microsoft product. To design this plugin, the documentation tell me that I can write my plugin in visual C++ or visual basic. Two microsoft languages. To write and compile such language I needed to buy a license to be able to write the application. (at the same time, we can notice that the microsoft compiler for C or C++ language doesn't not provide a full implementation of this language, which decrease the possibility to compile an application written in C under unix/linux on windows system).

After buying the Microsoft visual suite, I need to access some API information, to do so, because the free information are useless I need to buy a license to access the developer web site of microsoft.

I used to use netscape to browse the web, the microsoft web site is unaccessible with this browser, most of the page are unreadable. So I need to set up internet explorer.

So, in conclusion, to write 200 lignes of code, I have to buy 3 microsoft license, and install 4 microsoft products. if that, is not taking advantage of the situation, what is it.

Also the judgment doesn't say a word on what microsoft did on free-standard, like html, or XML today. The free standard allow, in the idea, every body to access information, from every operating system, every browser. But microsft doesn't not provide a full

implementation of these standard, and add some private extension inside. The effect, is, the HTML (xml now) page written by microsoft application is only readable under microsoft.

Ask to people using linux/unix, how many html pages they can't read, because of some microsoft features.

Also, nothing is said about the policy of microsoft to provide free/cheap license to school, university of microsoft product. The effect, is that new student / child know only microsoft product. And because when you buy a new computer you have microsoft on, most of the people don't know they have other solutions.

Laurent
Laurent Tardif
Monash University
mailBox 36—Building 26
School of Computer Science and Software engineering
Clayton Victoria 3168
Australia
Phone : (03) 99055779
www.csse.monash.edu.au/tardif/

MTC-00012008

From: david thurlow
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:49pm
Subject: The Microsoft Settlement

It is high time the Government's case against Microsoft was settled. To continue this protracted litigation against Microsoft is a waste of taxpayer dollars and a major contribution to the legal profession who control far too much in America and represent competitors who want a bigger piece of the pie without earning it through competitive effort.

The State Attorney Generals are no more than a vested interest group seeking to transfer wealth from a creative, productive enterprise and it's shareholders to the legal profession and causes espoused by them.

Look what has happened in the tobacco settlement—the enormous funds extracted from tobacco companies ostensibly to be used in programs aimed at reducing teen smoking habits has instead been used by most states to balance state budgets. Where is the integrity and fairness in that—and at what cost in legal fees. Why doesn't government stand up to the legal profession and control excessive fees paid in this type of litigation?

Throw out the States case and let Microsoft get back to participating in the resurgence of our damaged economy.

David Thurlow

MTC-00012009

From: Bettye Ray
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Think it is time to settle this and move on to other things. Microsoft has had enough and other things are more important now. Enough is enough.

MTC-00012010

From: Joy Buck
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 7:55pm
Subject: Settle Microsoft

This is a free country. Yes, Bill Gates has become a millionaire, however, he had the brilliance to do so. If you personally had the foresite to pursue as he did, would you be a little upset about the government involvement in your business? I think you need to leave his business alone.

Joy Buck

MTC-00012011

From: G. Franklin South

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 7:56pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is difficult for me to understand why there is still so much controversy about settling The United States versus Microsoft, when the United States and nine of these 'united states' have accepted a proposed settlement. Nine other states, supported and encouraged by competitors of Microsoft, seem to question the wisdom and the veracity and the ability of their litigation partners to monitor and enforce the provisions of the proposed settlement.

I fail to see how continued litigation and argument and rehash is going to benefit me as a computer user. For that matter, I still do not see how I have been disadvantaged or overcharged by Microsoft. As an example, I used the Netscape Communicator for almost a year, but then downloaded Internet Explorer and after some use, decided that I liked the Explorer better. On the other hand, even though I use Microsoft Word, I do not use Microsoft Excel, but rather use IBM Lotus 123. I read the argument that the competitors of Microsoft do not have a level playing field, that they are disadvantaged by Microsoft size and market share. I do point out that not too many years ago, IBM was in a similar position—they had a monopoly on the data processing business. I dare say that many competitors by hard work and improved technology have disproven the argument that you can't compete against the big bully.

I think it is time for those state attorney generals who are trying to disrupt a proposed settlement of United States versus Microsoft, written, reviewed and accepted by the US Department of Justice, and nine states, to put personal ambition aside for the good of all of the data processing users. I believe it is next to impossible to try to substantiate how further delay is going to reward individual users of computers and computer software.

MTC-00012012

From: David Hoech

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 7:58pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it is in the best interest of the consumer to drop all charges against Microsoft. Shame on the justice department for letting criminals such as ADM continue to screw America and want to take down Microsoft

MTC-00012013

From: Patty J. Le Beau

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:12pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

PLEASE SETTLE

I am loyal to Microsoft because I love their products and firmly believe if left to the other

computer companies we would still be in the dark ages. Microsoft is a company which has done much for the U.S. and much for computer users, both business and personal. I don't understand why people keep messing around with them. I for one am sick of it.

PLEASE SETTLE

Patty Le Beau

lebeau@thesurf.com

MTC-00012014

From: GibIV@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:00pm

Subject: Government should look at PRIORITIES. .

IF the U.S. Government spent the money,time and resources on the war against terrorism, cancer research, education instead of wasting OUR TAX \$\$\$ on this matter our country would be way better off, The only potential here is to stifle innovation and creativity and without that we would be just another third world country instead of a great superpower that owes it's strength to innovation and creativity to the likes of Microsoft.

MTC-00012015

From: Cliff Magnussen

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:00pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

I believe this settlement is fair, Microsoft, as far as I'm concerned is a great Company, the amount of technology that they have passed on to the public is more than any Company would normally do. Lets get on with it, and SETTLE !!! and let Microsoft do it's job, and get this all behind us, it has been far to long in coming.

Cliff Magnussen

MTC-00012016

From: HoTaxLady@cs.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:02pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe it would be in the interest of the global economy to settle this lawsuit quickly and swiftly.

One must take under consideration that Microsoft has not just made itself wealthy but has spread the wealth among many people—its own employees and many outside stockholders. Matter of fact the stockmarket began to spiral downward the moment you started messing with the company. Please consider that Microsoft has donated millions to good use and is continuing to do so. That does not erase some of the tactics Microsoft might have used in obtaining business that you consider illegal and for which Microsoft will suffer consequences and already has. Punishing the company more and more and breaking it up into pieces will not help many folks. Look at what has been done to the telephone company in Washington State. The negative effects are still felt today and that was 15 years ago. Sure it has brought about many small competitors which meanwhile increased the bankruptcy numbers of this country. It is a good thing that you let folks speak out for or against Microsoft. Thank you.

MTC-00012017

From: Carol

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:05pm

Subject: litigation ended or prolonged

In the interest of all, lets get to the bottom of this fast and resolve it. All want the freedom to be innovative, and we should not be curtailed; however, there must also be a way to protect the little guy and the weak in all charity, and not just at the whim or preference of the rich and powerful. Humility, fairness and charity of heart is needed here.

Carol Dixon Klein, Naples, Fl.

MTC-00012018

From: lillian ingram

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:05pm

Subject: Bad Joke!

All the opposition to Microsoft is nothing more than the competition being unable to compete with the Research and Developments of MSFT. The government should butt out. MSFT has done more for this country than the others combined.

MTC-00012019

From: Jim Kilgore

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:05pm

Subject: Gov't vs Microsoft

To Whom It May Concern:

Please stop using Microsoft as a political football. Leave them alone and let them innovate. I enjoy their products and I consider that the price they charge is reasonable. Why does the government not want companies to be successful?

Sincerely

James L. Kilgore

MTC-00012020

From: Lemastfam@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:08pm

Subject: No Subject

To Whom it May Concern:

I was disappointed to see that the Government refused Microsoft's offer to donate 1 billion dollars to the schools of the United States. The children of this country will be the ones who lose. I thought this administration was the Education administration but with this decision it makes me question if the government is really interested in education.

Lawrence E. Mast

MTC-00012021

From: lbstuart@webtv.net@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:09pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is about time to end this litigation which only serves to enrich the lawyers and give the politicians a platform to attempt to get votes. All of this is a great waste at a time when it serves to further slow economic recovery.

Please, put an end to it!

L. B. Stuart

MTC-00012022

From: Sandra Maino

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:10pm

Subject: Settlement

It is about time the government needs to stop this witch hunt. Microsoft innovations have allowed the common man to enter the realm of technology by providing user friendly software and operating systems.

We are a country which allows competition among the industries, and if you have a good product, your company will flourish. Should we condemn Chrysler for selling more cars than Chevrolet and call them a monopoly? If the other software companies were so great, they would be another Apple or Microsoft.

Perhaps in our down economy, the Justice Department would like Microsoft to become another Enron.

MTC-00012023

From: AGGIECHURC@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:10pm

Subject: microsoft

Hi Microsoft is the best company in the world. The justice department has ruined a great economy by trying to bread up and control Microsoft & the rest of the computer science world. Just leave private enterprise alone. The government spent millions of dollars that could have been given back to the tax payers, because it is our money, but or no Clinton was in the pocket of the California computer science group. Just think of all the money spent by the government and Microsoft combine, the tax payers could have been buying all kinds of new computers and software, that would have been very good for the economy. Get off Microsoft's back and let it innovate for the good of us all. Good by.

MTC-00012024

From: Brassytrader

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:13pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Enough is enough, Microsoft has done more for the computer industry and the economy in general than any corporation in history. The competition failed to realize that proprietary and non integrated technology has no place in the computer industry and have become part of our economic slowdown. (I remember well the pre Windows era when new programs did not work without re-configuring the whole operating system, now thanks to Microsoft it all works together) Please drop this ludicrous litigation and let Microsoft get on with the business of helping the country move ahead.

Regards,

Michael Harrington. 5097477412

MTC-00012025

From: AToll1211@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:12pm

Subject: Re: Microsoft Settlement

Dept. of Justice:

Please tell me by what "moral" right the government of The United States of America goes after, with such malice, one of America's greatest companies and one of this countries greatest businessmen?

Could ANYONE in the Dept. of Justice write one piece of software or produce any goods that could be marketable?

I strongly suggest that this government leave it's most productive citizens alone because what you are doing is so immoral that you are not only damaging the company Microsoft but all the millions of people who have invested in this company. He, unlike the government did not steal anyone's money but produced a product "better" than his competitors. This is precisely why he/ Microsoft is being punished.

The attack on this country from within is far greater than from outside.

I urge you and your immoral laws to simply "LEAVE THEM ALONE"!

MTC-00012026

From: MelHorwitz@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:17pm

Subject: Microsoft litigation

Please cease the expensive litigation surrounding Microsoft. The effort thus far has been detrimental to our economy and an example of businesses that could not compete in the marketplace trying to compete in court. This is an everchanging playing field and open to anyone with new and good ideas. ENOUGH is ENOUGH>

Melvin Horwitz

223 Ludlow Road

MAnchester, CT 06040

MTC-00012027

From: W. Roger Gehman

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:19pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Sirs,

Let's end this farce and let Microsoft get back to doing what they do best. This whole case was nothing more than a big political football cooked up by Microsoft competitors, with the full cooperation of the Clinton administration, and Attorney General Reno. She investigated everything imagineable, except what was really in need of investigation—namely her boss, the President!

Warren R. Gehman

126 Park Avenue

Miunt Joy, PA 17552

MTC-00012028

From: Okey McQuain

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:04pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Do not appeal Microsoft settlement. Please let Microsoft alone.

Okey McQuain

227 Evergreen Drive

Elkins, WV 26241-3007

e-mail — omcquain@neumedia.net

MTC-00012029

From: WPear76@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:21pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think it is not the american way to penelize a company for working hard, taking the risks involved, and making a success.

I further feel that it is envy, or jealousy on the part of the others to accuse Microsort of

being a monopoly. after all, one of the biggest monopolies of all time is the U S Postal Service, and their service is poor in many cases, They fail to perform a suitable service to the american public. So I say "Lay off microsoft, and let then continue to provide services that have became essential to the american public.

William H Pearson.

MTC-00012030

From: Khwbc@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:22pm

Subject: Microsoft

This agreement that Microsoft has offered is more the gererous so this argument should be settled once and for all.

Kathryn Wells

MTC-00012031

From: Srinivasa Eedarapalli

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:24pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Microsoft Settlement is great for consumers. I do not see that Microsoft was at fault in the first place. Judge Penfield Jackson just used his personal opinions arrive at a rash judgement. His judgement should have been thrown out atleast after listening to his post trial comments.

I am a Technology Consultant and I know how SUN & Oracle loot Companies with thier high priced products. AOL—Look who is talking about misusing monopoly. AOL refused to let other instant messengers to integrate with their version. Their advertisements say "all my friends are in AOL (basically their instant messenger)", saying that if you do not take AOL internet access you will miss out on istant messages to your friends. Is this not misusing monopoly? Is this good for consumer?

Let companies compete in marketplace. Not go to government for help compete.

Srinivasa Raju Eedarapalli

MTC-00012032

From: Carole Joy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:23pm

Subject: microsoft ruling. . .

I believe that who ever invents and sells their product should be allowed to keep it fully theirs and all the profit from it. . . . Microsoft did the research, work, invention, and building of the product and should be able to reap its reward for it. carole taylor

MTC-00012033

From: Frank Spencer

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:25pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

It is in the interest of this voting family to resolve tthe Microsoft issue as soon as possible, and we urge the courts to quickly and fairly resolve the current litigation.

Frank & Pam Spencer

MTC-00012034

From: Tom Bires

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:26pm

Subject: You got the wrong guy

With all due respect, Microsoft is not the bad guy in the world of computers. As a software developer and user for the past 26 (yes 26) years, I can say that Microsoft has been a breath of fresh (and inexpensive) air in a world of otherwise expensive computer hardware and software. Just look at the price for any of the standard PC applications we know and depend on. Word processors, spreadsheets, databases, personal information managers, and yes Web browsers. Microsoft has employed the standard economies of scale to slash prices on all of these major applications at all times in their history. How can that be bad for consumers. Does our justice department really think that we are not paying enough for our software. All of these applications on all other platforms over the past 25 years were MUCH more expensive before Microsoft entered the market. Sun Microsystems, the chief Egger Onner of the Justice Department against Microsoft is a prime example of a company with proprietary hardware and limited market software and the resulting MUCH higher prices for all major applications—not to mention slower performance relative to the incredibly fast Pentiums which are a direct result of the beneficial mass marketing efforts of Microsoft and Intel. Go after Sun if you want to punish a company that tries to corner a market and turn the screws on its customers.

I have lived the computer revolution from the inside and can say with no qualms, "You got the wrong guy."

Please feel free to contact me if I can clarify or elaborate.

Thank you for taking time to listen,

Tom Bires

Thomas L. Bires

Application Networks

444 Ramona

Palo Alto, CA 94301

(650) 289-1048

MTC-00012035

From: John W. van der Hulst

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:28pm

Subject: Settlement

I encourage the Government to settle this matter ASAP. Microsoft's offer appears appropriate. Our economy needs this company to concentrate all its resources on developing and exporting its technology, not endless legal maneuvering with the Justice department.

John van der Hulst

MTC-00012036

From: SUE BONK

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:32pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please settle this suit, it would help the economy, especially since it was the beginning of our economic slump and until this is settled, we will remain in a slump. Microsoft leaders are not bad guys, Enron leaders are bad guys, can't you see a difference????

S. Bonk

MTC-00012037

From: Durand C. Waters

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:34pm

Subject: Fwd: Returned mail: see transcript for details

Note: Forwarded message attached.

Durand C. 'Randy' Waters

How can you even seriously consider allowing Microsoft to gain an even bigger hold on the software market and drive schools away from their beneficial relationship with other systems that they have used for years, such as Macintosh, UNIX and LINUX.

If you allow this to go as the accused is asking, you will have lost any credibility that you may have had.

Durand C. Waters

5922 Brook Falls

Windcrest, TX 78239-2648

Durand C. 'Randy' Waters

MTC-00012038

From: NJWRESEARCH

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:34pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please settle case as is. States' continuance will be against consumers' best interests.

Gerry West

MTC-00012039

From:

hodgson@gogol.humnet.ucla.edu@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:38pm

Subject: <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/ms-settle.htm>

Having read the relevant documents, I am persuaded that the U. S. Government has caved in to special interests. This is particularly distressing, since it coincides with the recent change in federal administration.

Puteracy is a new medium. America is playing a world wide role in defining its parameters. It would be a disgrace if we were to stifle competition at this early stage.

Microsoft must not be allowed to bully the American people, or the world.

Yours truly,

Peter Hodgson

[Emeritus Professor]

MTC-00012040

From: Ernie12237@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:35pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

This case against Microsoft doesn't make much sense to me.

Compare it to Ford and General Motors. Lets say Microsoft is General Motors who makes a very good pickup truck and is equipped with a very good Chevy engine. Prior to this Ford had a better engine but the GM engine now out performs the Ford. Now here comes Ford who thinks it is unfair that GM is selling so many more units with the Chevy engine than Ford sells so they get the Government to try to force GM to put a Ford engine in the GM pickup.

What would DOJ do in a case like I just explained?

Microsoft does not have a monopoly, they just build a better product. No one says another company cannot design something better but if they did, people would buy it. Computer users want the best regardless of

who makes it. If people want to buy a Chevy pickup, they want a Chevy engine in it, not a Ford.

If this settlement is supported, it will smell of politics supported by only the lawyers that are pushing it and the outlandish fees they will reap.

Ernie Aufenkamp

Mission, TX

MTC-00012041

From: (123)USER(u)FIRSTNAME(125)

(123)USER(u)LASTNAME(125)

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

It is my belief that the proposed settlement by the U. S. DOJ is fair and equitable and should be adjudicated on that basis promptly.

Ronald Matthews

San Diego, Calif

MTC-00012042

From: Terrie Takemoto-Sua

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:35pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

The Microsoft case should be settled. I am extremely disappointed that the suit has returned to litigation.

I felt that the agreement was fair to all parties involved. That is the last thing the US economy needs. . . .

Please do not drag this on. Let us get a settlement as quickly as possible.

Terrie Sua

MTC-00012043

From: S. A. Cranney

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen:

I would ask the United State Justice Department to drop the Microsoft case and let them get on with their work. It is plain and simple, the government has egg on its face and should cut their losses and take care of more important matters.

Thank you,

Spencer A. Cranney

1760 North 400 East

North Logan, Utah

84341

(435) 752-2273

MTC-00012044

From: Ruthanna Wolf

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:36pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Think you MUST accept Microsoft's offer. Suggest you research the history of computers in education (a field I worked in for years)—that research will show that Apple got special government privileges and perks for donating Apples to Schools around the country in the early 1980's. That is why the education system is behind the rest of the computer world in system implementation and design.

Suggest you give the school professionals a chance to "catch-up" with M/S's offer to assist US Schools.

And that should end the entire matter.

Ruthanna Wolf
Whittier, California 90603

MTC-00012045

From: Susan Brunasso
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:37pm
Subject: SETTLEMENT OF MICROSOFT
LAWSUIT
GENTLEMEN

I think getting MicroSoft to donate \$1 Billion in equipment and/or services to the US Public School System is great for America. I wish more settlements of this nature were made that would benefit the general US Public. I would add that some of this settlement value should be given to the private schools also. Maybe the value could be appropriated in porportion to the students are in the overall school population. Thank you & "go get the money from MicroSoft for the People!"

Mario V. Brunasso

MTC-00012046

From: Beth (038) Bob Vogt
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:
I feel that the Federal and State Governments should have never gotten involved in this case. There is no telling how many years they have set back free enterprise and initiative. Please get this case settled fairly. Do not believe all the sour grape sources that are anti Microsoft and want a free ride. I have used Microsoft products going back many years. I have found their product to be well integrated and thus easy to use between platforms. I can't stand to think what can become of this good company and their products if their adversaries have their way.

Sincerely,
Robert A. Vogt

MTC-00012047

From: ABrisolara@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:38pm
Subject: Microsoft litigatin

It is apparent that the original steps taken to pursue litigatin against Microsoft was politically motivated. Microsoft has enabled the ordinary individual to become com- puter competent. The various programs developed have been a boom to users and to the economy. Any punitive action would appear to smack of jealousy.

Somehow the entire process has done nothing but collapse the computer industry. We hope that the case would be dropped, so the public can continue to receive the kind of service which Microsoft has been able to afford its customers, not to mention the many who have benefitted from its charitable donations.

The Brisolara Family

MTC-00012048

From: MANYAKA8@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Gentlemen or whoever it may concern:

It's high time to put the Microsoft suit and settlement to bed. The current settlement parameters are fair to both sides. No more court time or monies should be spent persuing more penalties against Microsoft. Most states have agreed to the latest terms. What are the other nine or so looking for? More bucks?

There are plenty more pressing items our federal and state governments and politicians should be spending their time on.

MTC-00012049

From: JPEO826@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:42pm
Subject: DOJ SETTLEMENT FOR
MICROSOFT

This is to strongly recommend that the proposed DOJ settlement of the Microsoft litigation be upheld.

John Peoples

MTC-00012050

From: MIKE ESS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi, My name is Mike. I am 16 yrs old. Microsoft Corporation should be required to include Java with Windows XP. I go to a chat room called Wetbuster. Its for kids that wet the bed and have wetting problems. Its a place to talk and cope about it. You need Java to chat there, if there is no more Jave, then there no more wetbuster. Also tns of people wont beable to chat there either if you take it way. So please keep java. THANK YOU MIKE

MTC-00012051

From: Jim
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To Whom it may concern, I believe the settlement with Microsoft is fair. Let's not waste any more time and money regarding this issue. This is what stifles free enterprise and a strong economy. Let everyone get back to work on the important things.

MTC-00012052

From: Carole
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
501 TidePointe Way #5118
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928-3053
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

I support the Department of Justice's endeavors to settle the Microsoft antitrust case. This case has dragged on for far too long, and a rapid conclusion is in everyone's best interest.

The settlement agreement in its present form is quite reasonable. The federal judge should approve the agreement, and all parties should move forward. No further federal action is needed or justified.

I am particularly impressed with the concessions Microsoft has made in the

interest of resolving the case. In essence, Microsoft is making it easier for its competitors to compete. Microsoft's concessions include the agreement to allow computer makers rights to promote software other than Windows; the agreement to not retaliate against software developers who promote software other than Windows; and the commitment to not enter into contracts with retailers or distributors to exclusively sell Windows technology, to name a few.

I appreciate your ongoing efforts to resolve this case.

Sincerely,
Carole Fowler
cc: Senator Strom Thurmond by snail mail
you also will receive a copy by snail mail

MTC-00012053

From: Margaret (038) Doug Green
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:42pm
Subject: Settlement

Will you please do the whole world a favor and drop these charges? We don't need the same settlement we had with our phone system years ago.

MTC-00012054

From: Richard W Carr
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:43pm
Subject: SETTLE THE CASE

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH. WHY SHOULD THE WHOLE COUNTRY SUFFER FOR THE WHIMS AND JEALOUSIES OF A FEW. AS I HAVE STATED BEFORE, THIS IS A WORLD OF COMPETITION. IF THOSE WHO ARE WHINING ABOUT MICROSOFT WANT TO DO SOMETHING, LET THEM BUILD A BETTER MOUSETRAP.

MTC-00012055

From: CobraBitten@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:45pm
Subject: Please. .

To whom it may concern,
Please, support the settlement and stop wasting money. Prevention is the key, learn from it and set up preventative measures.

Sincerely,
Geoff Morrison??
God's judgment may not be immediate, but it is inevitable.

MTC-00012056

From: Erik N. Funk
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 8:46pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice:

Please record this citizen's petition to let the market decide the fate of Microsoft. . . this will allow the Justice Department to focus its considerable energy on people who and corporations that have actually done something wrong besides facilitate development of standards and make great software.

Best regards,
Erik Funk

MTC-00012057

From: Charles Barrett
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:48pm

Subject: microsoftsettlement

I am retired from a successful partnership farming operation with my Father and Brother which lasted 52 years; so you see I have had a lot of experience. I own a personal computer and have had several programs in it and the one I like best, which I was not forced to buy is Microsoft. I think they are a very brilliant and advanced company. I think that since a majority of the states involved in the litigation against Microsoft have elected to settle the suit, I think the remaining states should settle also.

The settlement would be good for the economy and for our Nation. Thank You for a "voice" in this important litigation.

Charles R. Barrett
charlelyme@intplsrv.net

MTC-00012058

From: JasonAllen12@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:48pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement Please install JAVA in there XP operating softwear

Hi

My name is Jason, I go to a support chatroom for kids that uses Java softwear Microsoft has taken the Java softwear out of its XP computer softwear. Without the Java in the XP format that means other kids who dont have it cant get support from support chatrooms. Please consider having them put it back in their XP format so that adults and kids can get support online. Thank you

MTC-00012059

From: TOM (038) SUE PONTIUS

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:51pm

Subject: Settlement

Please settle the Microsoft case, it is fair to all but most importantly the consumer!

Tom and Sue Pontius
Mariemont, Ohio

MTC-00012060

From: Arcilla, Ryan

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:52pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear Department of Justice,

I strongly agree with the proposed Microsoft settlement. I question the motives of the nine states that refuse to join in the settlement. Is it a coincidence that these states are the home to some of Microsoft's rivals? Obviously not. I hope these non-joining states are looking out for consumers and not for Microsoft's competition.

I use Microsoft products and I also have a choice on what to install on my computers. I also use Linux, StarOffice from Sun, and a host of other non-Microsoft products. Consumers always had a choice.

This settlement should come to fruition. The non-joining states should reconsider.

Sincerely,
Ryan Arcilla

MTC-00012061

From: Michael A Waller

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Antitrust settlement

To whom it may concern. . . .

I believe that the Microsoft settlement is fair.

It's time that the DOJ realizes that Microsoft makes a greater contribution to the world of technology and the overall growth of our economy than the negative impact of their aggressive practices. I am in favor of the DOJ accepting the settlement and stopping the remainder of litigious actions in play.

Get on with life. There are bigger fish to fry.

Regards,
Michael A. Walter
25 Lexington Road
South Barrington, IL 60010

MTC-00012062

From: Deborah Kaplan Clancy

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 8:57pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The Microsoft vs DOJ case has gone on long enough and wasted enough taxpayer money. I think and thought the case should have been dropped long ago. But, since that is not what happened, I implore you for a speedy resolution.

It's time to end this lawsuit.

I believe Microsoft DOES have the interests of the consumers at heart and believe this company should be left to do what it does best—create software. Because of Microsoft technology many companies are able to run their businesses better and faster.

The DOJ should move on to more important matters.

Sincerely,
Deborah Kaplan Clancy

MTC-00012063

From: Fussweg@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:01pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's put an end to the hounding of Microsoft, easily the most innovative and influential company of the last decade. As a computer geek (but not part of Microsoft), I was in the business when there were literally dozens of brands of personal computers, each with their own operating system and software. IBM's open architecture and Microsoft's DOS and Windows operating system put an end to the chaos. Microsoft's Office and email have become such a standard that it would be difficult to imagine a modern company without them. I also believe that the suit against Microsoft was the beginning of the stock market downturn. Yes, Microsoft has become a large company. Yes, Microsoft has zealously positioned itself as the market leader. Yes, Microsoft's Windows is now the world standard and has become one of the great American success stories. Microsoft should be allowed to continue its journey unshackled by excessive regulation. Please, allow them the "Freedom to Innovate".

Thanks,
Mac Salfen
Arlington, Texas

MTC-00012064

From: jsb

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:01pm

Subject: microsoft settlement

To whom it may concern:I would urge you stongly to approve the microsoft settlement!!!Microsoft provides real jobs to our country which are desperately needed.To continue this costly litigation under the guise of facilitating competition is a sham on our country.I am a hard working citizen and its time to end this horrible litigation to help out other competitors.

If these competors cant make a better product that is there problem.Thanks for your consideration.

MTC-00012065

From: Hgknuth@aol.com@inetgw

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:02pm

Subject: Microsoft settlement

The provisions of the agreement in the Microsoft settlement are tough, reasonable, fair to all parties involved, and go beyond the findings of Court of Appeals ruling.

Consumers, including myself, overwhelmingly agree that the settlement is good for us and the American economy, and we, overwhelmingly, want to move beyond this litigation. Yet 9 state's attorney generals refuse to listen to the citizens they serve, and refuse to accept the settlement.

It is long past time to take whatever action is necessary to get them on board and move on (a 2x4, maybe)! This process has gone way past helping the public, and is now actually doing harm. Thank you, Harvey Knuth 160 Regency Dr Conway, SC 29526

MTC-00012066

From: Bill Williams

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:03pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Please, enough is enough. Within the last thirty days I had sent an email to you folks praising you on coming to an agreement concerning Microsoft. Again I believe the settlement to be fair to all parties and now we must move on.

Please do all possible to bring this case to a swift close.

Regards,
W. G. Williams

MTC-00012067

From: Donald E. Olsby

To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:04pm

Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To all concerned. Would you please take the offer Microsoft has put on the table. It may serve you well to get out and about to realize how much Microsoft has helped our children. I am unable to understand how people are so selfish to deny our children the vast spectrum of the best and most innovative software in the world— for FREE ! They have to be self serving !! If it so important to hurt Microsoft in some way take them out behind the barn and slap them with a wet noodle. Thank God for Bill Gates and family that shares wealth like no other family—and for the children not the "The States" with there hands out to use it where?// Donald E. Olsby, Carol M. Olsby, Cynthia A. Olsby, Dean E. Olsby, Daniel S. Olsby, David E. Olsby, just another American family that knows the "RIGHT THING TO DO"=Settle Now!!!! Go Microsoft

Corporation they can't take your brains away!!

Donald E.Olsby

MTC-00012068

From: Marge Moe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

This case should be settled immediately, it has gone on far too long. I suspect the only reason is to get more money from Microsoft. Please settle this so we can continue to receive the benefits of Microsoft's innovation.

MTC-00012069

From: charles jantho
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:09pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

IT IS MY SINCERE AND EARNEST OPINION THAT THE MICROSOFT SUIT BE SETTLED IN ITS' FAVOR IN THE MAJOR PART AND IMPLEMENTED AT THE EARLIEST DATE.

THANK YOU,
CHARLES ROBERT JANTHO
133 WELCOME ALLEY
BALTIMORE, MD. 21201

MTC-00012070

From: rbsox@att.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I do not own Microsoft Stock, but I use their products. No, I depend on their products and I also need their updates and innovation to continually improve the way things work for me. I do not support the concept that Microsoft has done anything wrong. Rather, I feel that they are being penalized simply for being successful at doing what they do.

Please do not take any punitive action toward them; rather, please reward them for their important contributions to our productivity and enjoyment of life.

Sincerely,
B. Richard Bowersox
A long-term resident of Ohio.

MTC-00012071

From: Malini Balakrishnan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:14pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

I believe that the Microsoft case should be settled as quickly as possible, and that the current settlement agreement is fair to all parties concerned.

Malini Balakrishnan

MTC-00012072

From: Ben Vega
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get on with it. Have you not caused this Company enough unwarranted grief? Or do you think that prolonging the fiasco will serve to get your brain addled fifteen minutes of fame?

MTC-00012073

From: KATHIE MC CLURE
To: Microsoft ATR

Date: 1/15/02 9:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
To Whom it May Concern:

It is my opinion that the Antitrust Settlement that was made with Microsoft should be upheld in the interest of the economy and the furtherance of technology. I believe that the economy will suffer even more if the Microsoft case is not settled and goes back to court, especially in light of the events of September 11, 2001 and the war against terrorism. Thank you,

Sincerely,
Kathie L. McClure

MTC-00012074

From: Georgie Seitz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

Microsoft is responsible for creating millions of jobs.

At a time when our economy is so poor, we need to get companies like Microsoft back to work full time and out of the court system. The longer this trial continues the more our economy will suffer. Millions of Americans have already lost their jobs, and millions more will lose them soon if there is not a spark of hope to ignite the economy and the consumer confidence.

People will not spend, if they are in fear of losing their jobs or worst yet, if they have already lost their jobs. Let's get on with it and let one of the leading forces of our economy lead us out of this recession before it turns into a depression. We do not have anytime to waste, this case must be settled immediately. Microsoft and Bill Gates should be given a medal of honor and the fact that there has been an antitrust suite brought against them is total ridiculous. The most important consideration today is getting America back to work, getting Americans to spend money, and getting the economy back to normal. There are not many corporation left that can clearly lead the way in doing this, but Microsoft can and has done so before. If we waste any more time, they may lose the momentum to spark a resurgence and that would be devastating to us all.

A settlement to the states would result in little more than the outcome of the tobacco settlement. The only winners were the states who frivolously have spent the settlements on everything other than what the money was intended for. Is that the governments intent here too? I implore you to settle this case so Microsoft can continue to make the strides it has in the past by creating a competitive environment with new technologies which create jobs for us all.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,
Georgie Seitz
Certified Senior Consultant
IBM Global Services—USA
27 Commerce Drive
Cranford, NJ 07016
Phone: 908-931-4918
e-fax: 707-313-2433
Email: gseitz@us.ibm.com
God Bless America. God Bless the US Troops.

MTC-00012075

From: Ambugnu@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:23pm
Subject: Microsoft suit

Let Microsoft get back to developing more programming options rather than spending time and money on court fights. Until Windows came along computers were only for people who had time, money and energy to learn intense programming. Microsoft opened it up to the whole world.

Bonnie Magure

MTC-00012076

From: Laverne Wilson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

How can you possibly delay the Microsoft Settlement? It appears to me that too much has been made of a successful company that takes care of its employees and the other companies that Microsoft works with in the daily operation.

If you have so much time and money to spend please spend it on companies that take advantage of its employees and the other companies should be important to its day to day operation. Please settle with Microsoft as soon as possible and let them get on with what they do best. Make products that a tremendous number of United States citizens are very pleased to have at their fingertips.

MTC-00012077

From: Rita Silva—Home
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I think this whole entire case against Microsoft is absurd & should be dropped. In my humble opinion, Bill Gates came up with a good idea or two, developed those ideas and marketed them. There are those in the world who are jealous of his business skills and they decided to wreak havoc on Microsoft. I am disappointed that our judicial system would let this whole mess get so out of hand!

Rita F. Silva
8019 E. Troop Circle
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314
(928)772-2615—home
(928)442-5141—work

MTC-00012078

From: SBrown3633@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I believe there should be a settlement. Enough already! Too much time and money has been spent on this. Let Microsoft spend its efforts creating its wonderful products for the consumer. Sandra Brown

MTC-00012079

From: BryanLizG@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

201 Freedom Court
Rockwall, Texas 75032
January 9, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft

US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

After three years I believe it is time to end the Microsoft antitrust case. The settlement that you have reached with Microsoft will end this case at least at the federal level. This settlement represents the most viable solution to date in this case, and that is should be put in place soon. Despite the contention by some that this settlement is not hard enough against Microsoft this settlement is fair and balanced. The settlement will end any contractual restrictions Microsoft may have that could possibly harm competitors. Furthermore Microsoft has agreed to share formerly secret information with competitors so they will be able to place their own programs on Microsoft's operating system. The only reason to continue this case would be to satisfy those with anti Microsoft bias, and this we should not do. This settlement will bring our country back towards economic health, and for that reason it should be supported. I do not want to see any more legal action taken against Microsoft. Sincerely, Bryan Griesbach

MTC-00012080

From: June
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:05pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

PLEASE -SETTLE THIS SITUATION AND LET MICROSOFT DO IT'S JOB. DO NOT WE HAVE ENOUGH PROBLEMS IN THE WORLD WITHOUT DRAGGING THIS THING ANY FURTHER. WE NEED TO FOCUS OUR MONEY TOWARD SOMETHING CONSTRUCTIVE. IF SOME ONE WANTS TO BUILD HIS OR HER POLITICAL FUTURE LET THEM LOOK FOR SOMETHING OTHER THAN MICROSOFT. LET THE AMBITIOUS FOLKS AT MICROSOFT INVENT. AFTER ALL THEY DO IT BEST AND OTHERS WANT TO PROFIT FROM IT. SO FAR THE GOVERNMENT HAS ALLOWED THAT TO HAPPEN. JUNE HUBER 701 14TH NE EAST WENATCHEE, WA 98802

MTC-00012081

From: dgcj4
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:33pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs:

This case has turned into another political, counter productive, bad for the country's economy and spirit exercise that too often occurs when soap boxes and greed are supported by competitors and those who covet the success of others. This has gone on far too long. Between a judge who used his position to most inappropriately foster his personal and perhaps others' prejudices and the politicians and lawyers who want to make many dollars by hiding their greed behind the hollow statements of justice for the common man, this case is an embarrassment to the country, our justice system and common sense. The common man, with free choices, has selected Microsoft products millions and millions of times—I suppose this would irritate a competitor. The ability of competitors to

have the government use my tax dollars and resources to do their dirty work is disgusting. Having spoken to friends in other countries, we are the laughing stock around the world for, particularly in these times, forcing one of our most successful and creative companies to defend itself against the bottomless well of government. This certainly does represent me. There are many millions of people who understand that Microsoft may at some point played too hard ball in this highly competitive industry and some reasonable price is to be paid, but thus far it has gone beyond reason. We are not, and do not want a socialist government that discourages ambition and incentive. Our government is supposed to work for all people even those in business that work hard to grow and keep people employed have not chosen to base themselves in any number of other countries who would be eager to have them. Settle this thing now and reasonably. The sooner the better for both sides and our country.

MTC-00012082

From: Karl Van Blankenburg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Dear U.S. Department of Justice, Please proceed with settling the case with Microsoft. The United States has far more greater issues that it needs to focus on rather than continuing to pursue litigation against a U.S. company. I believe that the proposed settlement is fair and just. Please let us focus on the other pressing issues at hand to make this a better and safer place. Thank you, Karl Van Blankenburg

MTC-00012083

From: AL FRODERBERG
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:36pm
Subject: Settlement

It is time to settle this case—the attorneys general have grandstanded long enough. I am tired of their political machinations. End it!

MTC-00012084

From: Motelman2@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:38pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The Dept of Justice and all but nine states have spoken. The Microsoft matter should now be settled as proposed. The actions of the minority (9 states) should not be allowed to overrule the actions of the majority. In these times of economic uncertainty, we have better things to do with our energy and funds than to drag out the Microsoft matter unnecessarily. H. Johnson, New Jersey

MTC-00012085

From: Edward W. Hackett
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Please stop these never ending court cases. Settle the case and let MicroSoft go back to making the software we all need and use.——— Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail. <http://www.hotmail.com>

MTC-00012086

From: Cdory22@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:44pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

My feelings on the remaining states holding out on the settlement reached, is one of unbelief. Microsoft and its products have never harmed me or anyone I know in any way whatsoever. For these holdout states to not settle on this fair agreement is not in anyones interest in this country. With the economy reeling and taxpayers dollars being wasted on further litigation is crazy. This company has done nothing but developed better products than the competition, which has benefited me and not harmed me in any way. I urge you to settle this litigation by accepting the tentative agreement reached, so this country can move along with innovating. Also this economy does not need anymore stumbling blocks. Thanks for letting me share my thoughts on this very important matter. I hope you choose to settle. Sincerely: Jeffrey D. Schmitt

MTC-00012087

From: Kenneth Bond
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Hi

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I would like to say how much Microsoft has added to my life by providing programs and software that an older person like myself can use and depend on and I think at a very reasonable price. I would hate to see all the progress Microsoft has made be destroyed in favor of competitor's that are trying to destroy Microsoft. Microsoft has brought the whole world into the high tech arena which has created millions of jobs and economic advances which will probably lead to many more. So I say lets not kill this horse because we have all benefited from it.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Bond
CC: Kenneth Bond

MTC-00012088

From: Larry Clason
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:45pm
Subject: MicroSoft Settlement

I respectfully request that the Department of Justice not appeal the revised proposed settlement in the (Subject) case. I feel that further contest of the legalities and punishments would be a further waste of everyone's tax dollars—money that could be much better spent by each one of us to increase the quality of life for ourselves, our families, and our neighbors. Most sincerely,

Larry F. Clason
larryc@itis.com
112 N. Mills Street, #207
Madison, Wisconsin 53715

MTC-00012089

From: PegHMcL@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:47pm
Subject: Leave them alone.

It is my desire that you simply leave Microsoft alone. They have done so much for

our world, the computer age, and advances beyond belief. If they make money by doing so, then so what? Doesn't everyone need money? On top of that, they are giving back to our society, not only with unimaginable feats in technology, but through monetary gifts as well. GO! MICROSOFT!! Let's clean out our own closets, then maybe our views will be clearer. Peggy Youngblood

MTC-00012090

From: Paul Goetsch
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:46pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

The time has come for all the states that are holding out to either settle or have it done for them. We have spent too much time and tax payers money already on a case that never should have started to begin with. . Please get off the dime. PR Goetsch

MTC-00012091

From: Bob McDermott
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:51pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Please get off Bill Gate's back, & go catch some terrorists instead!!!!

MTC-00012092

From: raven3001
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's sad with all the other things going on like the WTC, recession, and war, that people are so petty that they think they paid too much for a free browser. I think this anti-trust business has gone on too long and costing the tax payers too much money. I believe that this bogus lawsuit angst Microsoft is a bunch of money-hungry, sleazy lawyers and showboating bureaucrats trying to justify their existence.

Tired Of Hearing About small Petty Problems.

J. C. Oost.

MTC-00012093

From: Pat Collins
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
P.O. Box 315
Belmont Street
Carbondale, PA 18407-0315
January 15, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft:

It is considerate of Microsoft, as the dominant source of hardware and software, to open its doors to competitors. I realize that they have been in an antitrust settlement with the U.S. government for three years. So I am glad that they will have a fresh new start in software development. One way that Microsoft is providing their expertise in software development is by configuring Windows so as to promote non-Microsoft software programs as well as their own. The interim release of Windows XP will ensure that computer makers, consumers, and software developers can promote non-

Microsoft software within Windows. Not only will this benefit the computer manufacturers, but it will give choice to the consumers as well.

I am glad that the leading American company in software development will finally be released from the grip of this antitrust settlement. Now Microsoft can focus on doing what they do best, being innovative in software development. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Patrick Collins
cc: Senator Rick Santorum

MTC-00012094

From: Victor Hoover Sr.
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whomever it may concern.

In my opinion, the legal action against Microsoft should never have gone to court, but since it has, it should be settled quickly with no further litigation's. I believe that court actions against the corp. of Microsoft is not in the best interest of the public.

In contrast to what the competition would like the public to believe, I believe that Microsoft has done more than any similar business unit in making computer systems available, useful and affordable.

Thanks
Victor Hoover

MTC-00012095

From: Stuart Thiel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:00pm
Subject: Civil Action No. 98-1232 (CKK), etc.

This is my opinion on what I have read. I am 3rd year University student in the field of Software Engineering and a part time software consultant, software designer.

Regarding Sun's suggestions that the proposed civil action against Microsoft: ***

1 Fails to reduce the application barrier to entry that Microsoft was found to have illegally protected;

2 Fails to remedy the injury done to the Java™ technology community;

3 Fails to remedy the illegal injury that Microsoft was found to have done to Netscape Navigator and the browser market;

4 Fails to curtail Microsoft's illegal bundling of middleware programs including browsers, media players, and instant messaging software into the monopoly Windows operating system;

5 Is ambiguous and subject to manipulation by Microsoft because it lacks an effective enforcement mechanism. ***

I have little/no information regarding the first point. I would fully agree with the second point (being very interested in java development). I would agree with the 3rd point, especially considering Microsoft's habit of ignoring the majority of standards and modifying existing systems (Javascript) just enough that they have to be re-written to be IE specific (not to mention that they feel renaming it to DHTML and calling it a new language fixes that. . .). I have some difficulty agreeing with the 4th point as it clearly indicates in the proposed action that OEM and others may remove icons of

Microsoft stuff stated above and add non-Microsoft software. I would agree with the enforcement issue. A firmer/clearer stance should be taken regarding enforcement as Microsoft is large enough to ignore tiny barbs.

With regards to the following sections of the proposed action (not properly quoted, but still getting the main idea): ***

III.C.3

Microsoft shall not restrict by agreement any OEM licensee from exercising any of the following options or alternatives:

* Launching automatically, at the conclusion of the initial boot sequence or subsequent boot sequences, or upon connections to or disconnections from the Internet, any Non-Microsoft Middleware if a Microsoft Middleware Product that provides similar functionality would otherwise be launched automatically at that time, provided that any such Non-Microsoft Middleware displays on the desktop no user interface or a user interface of similar size and shape to the user interface displayed by the corresponding Microsoft Middleware Product.

III.H.3

1. Ensure that a Windows Operating System Product does not (a) automatically alter an OEM's configuration of icons, shortcuts or menu entries installed or displayed by the OEM pursuant to Section III.C of this Final Judgment without first seeking confirmation from the user and (b) seek such confirmation from the end user for an automatic (as opposed to user-initiated) alteration of the OEM's configuration until 14 days after the initial boot up of a new Personal Computer. Microsoft shall not alter the manner in which a Windows Operating System Product automatically alters an OEM's configuration of icons, shortcuts or menu entries other than in a new version of a Windows Operating System Product. ***

Section III.C.3 seems to be saying that Microsoft may restrict OEMs from displaying a user interface completely dissimilar to that of Microsoft software. This is very wrong in that Microsoft then has control of the user interfaces developed, thus fortifying its monopoly position. I may have misunderstood this section, it seems ambiguous. I feel that it would be better to say that Microsoft has no right to restrict OEMs from using any software based on the user interface period.

Section III.H.3 has a section that states Microsoft software may modify an OEM configuration without warning after 14 days from initial boot-up. This is clearly a bad idea. Whether 1 day, 14 days or 100 days from any point, software should not modify configurations of other software without warning (when automatically initiated) unless the original soft was intended to be updated in that manner possibly with specific intent to be modified by the modifying software exclusively or inclusively. Otherwise, we call the modifying software a virus. The exception to this, is the upgrading of OS or software that the modified software is based upon, in which case automatic modification of the original configuration should be allowed if it is necessary to continue the proper

functionality of the software modified. Lastly, a clear definition needs to be made as to what the modification of a configuration is, as one could consider changing the order of icons a change in configuration given the existing proposed action (which would be false in my opinion).

Thank you.
Stuart Thiel

MTC-00012096

From: Bill Sharpe
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I urge you to accept the settlement in this case. No more taxpayer's money needs to be wasted in pursuing this litigation further. Let the market and consumers control the fate of Microsoft, not the courts.

William E. Sharpe
1 Silver Oak Court
Pooler, GA 31322

MTC-00012097

From: evelyn saunders
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:08pm
Subject: Microsoft SETTLEMENT
I AGREE WITH MICROSOFT.

GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO LEAVE THEM ALONE.

MTC-00012098

From: Al Wedekind
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 9:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Let's get this settled and let Microsoft continue to do what they do best and that is to satisfy their customers. We think they are great!

MTC-00012099

From: LWellsNYC@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:09pm
Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT

As a citizen of the US and a stockholder of Microsoft, I urge the Department of Justice to accept the terms of the settlement now on the table. It is our taxpayer dollars that pays for the litigation, it is our consumer dollars that pay for the products and it is our brains that choose the products that we want. In a country founded on the principals of equality and freedom, every company has a clear, even playing field, but only a few rise to the top. This is America, after all, and that is the reward of Democracy, but not of Socialism. I thank God all our voices can be heard.

Lynda Wells
311 E. 72nd St.
NYC, NY 10021

MTC-00012100

From: Louis F. McDonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Without question, settlement of the Microsoft antitrust litigation is in my best interest as well as the best interest of the rest of those who use personal computers.

Louis F. McDonald
4250 Lansdowne Dr.
Atlanta, GA 30339-4615

(770) 434-3816

MTC-00012101

From: JOHN CAMPBELL
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
JOHN CAMPBELL
5040 N DESERT TORTOISE PL
TUCSON, az 85745
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:
leave microsoft to the marketplace,we consumers are perfectly capable of defending ourselves against predatory pricing and price fixing.

Sincerely,
JOHN CAMPBELL

MTC-00012103

From: Blair Marsteller
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:15pm
Subject: The settlement

Dear DOJ:
I believe the settlement pounded out which all but a few states have signed is good. Microsoft should not be subjected to further measures and the nine states should agree to the fair and reasonable settlement the DOJ and the other states have produced. Say no to further troubles and litigation. Let the reasonable settlement stand.

Blair Marsteller

MTC-00012104

From: Zanetta Laskaris
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I have been following the litigation of DoJ against Microsoft for several years now, and as a concerned citizen I would like to voice my opinion that it is in the public interest of consumers that this case be settled as soon as possible rather than continue with further litigation.

MTC-00012105

From: Wallace Greene (MSLI)
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement-A GOOD THING!

I am more than pleased that the United States Government has come to a settlement agreement with Microsoft. Our country certainly has more pressing matters than fighting an American company that we should all be proud of. A company that is innovative and energetic, to the benefit of so many.

Thank you
Wallace Greene

This communication is strictly private and contains confidential information intended solely for the addressee(s). Access to this communication by parties other than the intended recipient(s) is unauthorized. If you have received this communication in error and are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or action

taken is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

MTC-00012106

From: John Manning
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:19pm
Subject: anti trust suit

When are politicians going to get it? They are not in business to break all of us, they are going to far again and again. Tax payers and our daily Joe Nobody are going to find a way to get someone in office that will follow their lead and not what the parties want!

John Manning
johnm23301@earthlink.net
EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

MTC-00012107

From: Bill Mcilveen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:24pm

Subject: Why don't you just leave Microsoft alone. These attorney generals should

Why don't you just leave Microsoft alone. These attorney generals should concentrate on the problems of their own states. Chasing deep pockets so they can spend additional money on state pork projects (RE: Cigarette settlement) is a load of crap. The American consumer is bright enough to make their own decisions. The public would be better served if these guys would go after clowns like ENRON. Must be all of the graft is gone at that point.

MTC-00012108

From: Glennp58@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:25pm

Subject: Comments on Microsoft settlement

I am not a developer, I am a home user of a PC. I am concerned that Microsoft is starting to take advantage of not only the industry, but the public at large. I have been informed that Microsoft now has a mechanism in their Windows XP operating system which sends the registry back to Microsoft if the system is connected to the internet. Considering that I would guess that a conservative 90% of the pc's are running Microsoft operating systems and are connected to the internet, this is disconcerting to me. The registry includes everything about the hardware, the software you run, whether it be Microsoft applications or not and information about each user of the system. This is not only an unfair advantage for Microsoft in the marketplace, but an invasion of privacy. I know that not many systems are running Windows XP at this time, but that will change as Microsoft stops distributing and supporting Windows 98 and ME.

Please consider this while deciding what is fair to the American public.

Kindest regards,
Glenn Philllips

MTC-00012109

From: Shuryl A Potter
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Department of Justice;

My family along with many friends, beg you to vote in favor of Microsoft. We admire Microsoft for everything they stand for. The courts and their completion may see Mr. Bill Gates as a Butt head, but we the people view him as a Great businessperson, who created great, jobs, serves not only his community but contributes large amounts of money to many great causes throughout the world. Again, we sincerely beg the courts not to destroy Microsoft, one of the greatest corporations in America today.

Shuryl A. Potter

MTC-00012110

From: Keith Bingaman
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Keith A. Bingaman
119 Main Street
Lykens, Pennsylvania 17048
January 14, 2002
Attorney General John Ashcroft
US Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Mr. Ashcroft:

I would like to see the Microsoft antitrust case settle as soon as possible. I do not believe this case should have been brought against Microsoft in the first place. It is in the best interest of everyone that the Court approves the settlement as soon as possible. Microsoft has really gone far beyond what should be expected of them in the interest of bringing this case to a close. They have taken steps to make their servers operable with those of its competitors. They have also agreed not to impose any contractual restrictions on third parties that will require them to exclusively distribute or promote Microsoft products. These types of concessions will help ensure that no antitrust laws are violated. Settling this case will benefit the technology industry and consumers alike. Thank you for your efforts to bring this case to its resolution.

Sincerely,

Keith Bingaman cc: Senator Rick Santorum
Representative George W. Gekas

MTC-00012111

From: mdonald
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It is time to put this to rest for good and Finally.

Miriam E Donaldson m
donald@alaweb.com

MTC-00012112

From: Jesse Stence
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:31pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

Please settle the Microsoft problem by helping the schools soon. Sincerely Jesse Stence

MTC-00012113

From: BGFG57@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:30pm
Subject: Micosoft Settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft,

I am writing to inform you that hearing of your decision to settle with Microsoft brought me relief and pleasure .Our nation has endured enough of this and this settlement is a fair one. It is time to move on to more pressing issues .

The complainants should be thrilled with the concessions Microsoft has made and allo should look forward to putting their energies to the most productive causes.

I urge you to promote and support this settlement and end this litigation.Thank You.

Brian Grimm 8 Apache Drive
Englishtown,New Jersey

MTC-00012114

From: SunRm60@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement To Whom It
May Concern:

Please settle this litigation as soon as possible.

Marianne Montrose

MTC-00012115

From: WIN B ENDERS
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Stop this endless and expensive litigation once and for all. Microsoft is the goose that lays golden eggs for our economy. Don't kill it!

win enders

MTC-00012116

From: Walt Statkiewicz
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Firstly, it was the consumer who gave Microsoft the monopoly through its choice of purchases when there was competition. Through their choice, the consumer essentially voted for a Microsoft dominant environment to simplify their computing needs. Without this populous consent, the consumer would be left to determine on their own whether some new software and / or hardware would work properly with their system. This is sometimes difficult for the experts let alone the individual who only wants to send and print emails.

The consistency standards enabled the productivity gains of the consumers and fostered the growth of the American economy for the past ten years. The point here is that it was an active choice by the consumer and not a situation that only Microsoft could push their products down the consumer's throats. When the decision by the consumer was being made, alternatives were available that offered similar environments (e.g., IBM's OS2, Apple Computer's Macintosh, etc.). At that date in time, one could hardly argue that Microsoft was too large for someone like IBM to challenge. Yet Microsoft did challenge IBM and enabled innovation and productivity gains that formed the foundation for much of today's computing technology.

Microsoft learns from its markets what the users desire, works at making the changes that users desire, and has become dependable at issuing updates that users desire. Without these three things, many people might

recommend other software, but the other companies either do not or cannot provide these things which businesses depend upon. Indeed, many companies are having trouble maintaining their businesses because the competition is fierce and hard to deal with. Not because there is only one competitor (i.e., Microsoft) and you can't compete against them. Companies such as Adobe compete with Microsoft all the time and have been doing so for many years.

You will note that Adobe follows the same things listed above as prerequisites for success: they learn from their markets what the users desire, they work at making the changes that users desire, and they are dependable at issuing updates that users desire. In other words, these companies provide comfort for the users and the future of computing.

These are the notions that consumers use to make sure their work get's done. The essence of the arguments presented here is that the consumers are the ones who drive the industry and whenever innovation occurs, the consumers decide based on a set of business rules whether a company can compete or not. To think otherwise would be to deny that business and consumers are some idealists that have no justifications for their actions and can simply be manipulated through mass marketing. Such people would not survive for very long in today's fast paced global economy.

Walter R. Statkiewicz
218 Sivia St.
N. Cape May, NJ, 08204

MTC-00012117

From: kitsten matson
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:40pm
Subject: SETTELMENT.
January 14, 2002

It make me very angry that "The Justice Department" continues to keep Microsoft in the courts. How many years does it take? How much does Microsoft have to give up? Remember this is the land of the free and where everyones dreams can come true, except when you don't like someone. It got so out of hand during "The Clinton Administration" Microsoft is a huge player in our economy and everyone knows what happened when Janet Reno and Co. went after them. Not many companies would be able to survive the length of time you have kept Microsoft in the courts.

I would like to see the Justice Department go after fraud in the Government with as much determination as it has gone after Microsoft.

SETTLE THIS SUIT!

Sincerely, Kirsten Matson

MSN Photos is the easiest way to share and print your photos: [Click Here](#)

MTC-00012118

From: Robert Grauel
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 10:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

It's time to settle the Microsoft antitrust case and move on. I fear greed is getting in the way of the good judgement of nine attorneys general.

MTC-00012119

From: Frank Harmuth
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:41pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please do not appeal the Microsoft Settlement.

Frank D. Harmuth
 1128 Sweet Spot Circle
 Morrisville, NC 27560
 e-mail address:
 harmuthfd@worldnet.att.net

MTC-00012120

From: hayho
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:43pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please do what is best for the economy and settle the suits against Microsoft.
 Thanks

MTC-00012121

From: Lloyd McKee
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:48pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Hello, The United States government needs to request Microsoft to maintain a data base of all bugs in Microsoft products and Microsoft fairly compensate people who discover any bugs in Microsoft products. The United States government needs to increase the punishment against Microsoft.
 lloydmckee@attbi.com

MTC-00012122

From: Byron Stavrou
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:51pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please quit punishing Microsoft. There is enough trouble in this world. Let's let one of our economy's strongest influences help right the ship. Market forces will dictate Microsoft's future.
 Byron Stavrou

MTC-00012123

From: Drlaser@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:54pm
 Subject: MICROSOFT SETTLEMENT
 PLEASE SETTLE THIS REDICULOUS ASSAULT ON THE BEST INNOVATIVE INSTITUTION IN THE USA (THAT WILL BE ATTACKED BY FOREIGN CORPORATIONS) BY AGREEING WITH THE MICROSOFT APPROACH TO ENDING THE LITIGATION AND MAKING MICROSOFT THE AMERICAN ANSWER TO THE 21ST CENTURY REGARDING COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY AND AMERICAN SURVIVAL IN THIS GLOBAL ECONOMY—
 FRANCIS A. L'ESPERANCE, JR. M.D.

MTC-00012124

From: KATHLEEN JENKINS
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/15/02 8:56pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 KATHLEEN JENKINS
 3315 CR 762
 JONESBORO, AR 72401
 January 15, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement: The lawsuit against Microsoft was a stupid waste of our tax dollars. And it harmed investors in the high-tech industry, without giving us any benefit in return. It is time for this trial, and the wasteful spending, to be ended. Consumers need to see competition in the marketplace, rather than in the courtroom. Competition creates better goods and services for the consumers, and Microsoft has done a great job of giving us what we want and need, at ever better prices. Let's get our government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations.

Sincerely,
 Kathleen Jenkins

MTC-00012125

From: charles jantho
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:56pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement
 IT IS MY SINCERE AND EARNEST OPINION THAT THE MICROSOFT SUIT BE SETTLED IN ITS' FAVOR IN THE MAJOR PART AND IMPLEMENTED AT THE EARLIEST DATE.
 THANK YOU,
 CHARLES ROBERT JANTHO
 133 WELCOME ALLEY
 BALTIMORE, MD. 21201

MTC-00012126

From: HALCAMICIA@aol.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 Gentlemen, we have spent far to long on thwarting microsoft from moving forward with their innovations and resulting benefits to we consumers. The products that microsoft developed has enhanced my life significantly and at a price which I feel is fair. Continuing this case further only makes the lawyers in this country richer and we consumers/tax payers poorer financially and intellectually. Lets settle the bloody case and get on with life. yours truly.
 Harold P. Camicia

MTC-00012127

From: Bernard
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:57pm
 Subject: Microsoft settlement
 Let us end the farce of competitors trying to enrich themselves with the Governments help. Microsoft has done no harm to anyone. It has helped us tremendously.
 The others can whine and cry and try and to tare Microsoft down for their own benefit. Please don't help them.
 Help Microsoft!
 End this Now!
 Thank you,
 B Gert Hollin

MTC-00012128

From: Edgar Gallardo
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 10:58pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To the United States Department of Justice:

In light of the ruling handed down by the court finding Microsoft guilty of monopolizing several aspects of software and operating systems, I wish to voice my hopes that your agency will punish the corporation.

Fines and token apologies are not enough in my opinion, especially considering the vast amounts of revenue that the company has produced along with the powerful grip over countless businesses, home owners, even school districts. Significant restraints and reprimands should be levied against the large corporation.

An idea gaining large acceptance within the technological community would be to standardize the Windows API code, which I believe would be a great step towards ensuring a more competitive market. Intellectual property is important and quite cherished in our society, but it is because of the great value placed on it that it must be the source of punishment for Microsoft.

Considering the vast resources the company has at its disposal, fines and lawsuits are hardly going to prevent or even hinder their continued stranglehold on the market they so obviously dominate.

Your duty is to prosecute those who violate the laws of the United States of America. If Microsoft was a first time offender, leniency would obviously come into play. However, they are in fact repeat offenders that have blatantly broken and scoffed at the laws in place to protect the greater population of society. I implore your agency to protect the consumers and competitors of Microsoft and force them to cooperate within our capitalist economy. We are driven by competition and market sharing, it is the core of our society. You are the best hope for society to topple the juggernaut.

MTC-00012129

From: jmorris
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:00pm
 Subject: Enough is Enough
 Why do we allow the Anti Trust action against Microsoft to drag on after it aww settled? You have made a deal to punish them and that's enough. The States continuing anti-trust action IMO have an anti business agenda or get a very successful business at any costs. Microsoft did wrong, got punishment and it's way past the time to move on.

MTC-00012130

From: ed barry
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:01pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Settle this matter as soon as possible. The only beneficiaries to ongoing litigation are the lawyers.
 Respectfully,
 Edward L. Barry

MTC-00012131

From: Ron Authier
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:04pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 To those involved; It is time to agree on this settlement and move on to other matters much more important to the taxpayers of this country.

Yours truly,
 Ronald G. Authier
 23 Cote Rd
 Monson, Ma 01057-9763

MTC-00012132

From: Bernard H
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Please end this, Now!

Microsoft should not be hurt to help Competitors who want to enrich themselves with the Governments help. Myself, my Companies all are very happy with our Microsoft Products. We wont even do business with the sniveling cowards who want the Government to enrich them by tearing down Microsoft. So please stop this now. More important things need to be dealt with.

MTC-00012133

From: Bill Marshfield
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:05pm
 Subject: Antitrust Settlement

I for one do not understand why the Federal Government wants to meddle around in private business when they can not even run the Government. What makes them think that they know how to run a business. If anyone of them could they would be in business where they would control their own destiny, not sponging off of the people of the United States. If these other companies cannot compete then they should get out of the business.

As I heard the other day. From the Democrats point of view it is scandalous for the White House to let Enron go under but OK for the House and Senate to attempt to put Microsoft out of business. Fed's leave Microsoft alone and let them do their business the way they know how.

William E. Marshfield
 20 Fox Glove Ct.
 Reno, NV 89511

MTC-00012134

From: Bill
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:06pm
 Renata B. Hesse
 Antitrust Division
 U.S. Department of Justice
 601 D Street NW
 Suite 1200
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

As a consumer I feel Microsoft has damaged, prevented and delayed innovation in the computer industry. Microsoft's dominance (technical monopoly) severely limits competition and innovation. Even though I am a member of the Microsoft Freedom to Innovate Network, I still feel changes must be brought about to promote the growth and innovation that Microsoft's monopoly position is limiting. I don't feel I can give a adequate description of the complex and integrated relations within the technical industry and computer technique itself in this email. but as a consumer I urge the justice department to act to limit Microsoft's control of the software marketplace. I don't know if I should list the blue screen, Dr. Watson, crashes, of other

issues. I don't know if the recent "market control" exhibited with the release of XP and "2000" product version has been presented in this case. If not please let me present a consumer who is being forced to "choice Microsoft" not because the products are good, but because they are the only ones available, because "Microsoft owns the market place.

I can't resist giving one example in a recent book published by Microsoft Press "Microsoft Visio Version 2002 Inside Out" by Nanette J. Eaton; ISBN 0-7356-1285-4. On page 11 under the title "Features Deleted from Visio" . . .some tools, . . .have been removed from Visio 2002 . . . In some cases, Microsoft plans to make an add-on or tool available as a download . . . In general Microsoft has consolidated it's control. While Microsoft speaks of it's innovation, most is not all Microsoft's products and ideas were copied from a want-to-be competitor or bought. Apple, SUN, Netscape all are reminisces of good companies now playing second fiddle in Microsoft land. If this includes breaking the company up, making the core code open source, I can't say, but one or more activities should be implemented. Please continue with the case against Microsoft, don't let Microsoft buy of the government. The justice department is the last hope.

Thank you
 Keith Elkin
 Keith Elkin
 1800 Beech CT
 Frederick, MD 21701.
 SN 229-62-4368

MTC-00012135

From: ateepee
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:06pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement

May I urge you to settle the Microsoft case as soon as is possible. From my viewpoint, Microsoft has provided great benefit to the consumer, and all the anti-trust actions are a grave injustice to Microsoft. I am convinced that the growth of the PC market and business is largely due to the fact that Microsoft provided a 'standard' software which enabled all of us to work on the same wave-length. Let's continue to have America reward those that provide the most benefit to the nation—not arbitrarily reduce everyone to the 'lowest common denominator'.

Thank you.
 T. P. Higgins,

MTC-00012136

From: maryasara
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 So settle it already.

MTC-00012137

From: Glenn Sproule
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:09pm
 Subject: Antitrust Settlement

It is my opinion that the antitrust suite should be settled without further investigation or delay in which would be in the best interests of the consumers.

W.G.Sproule MD

California
 CC:GLENN SPROULE

MTC-00012138

From: mlorr1@juno.com@inetgw
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:08pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Gentlemen:

I believe it is in the public interest that all government entities drop their current law suits against Microsoft. Our government, both state and federal, should not prosecute and persecute people and organizations for being successful. If they have violated the law; then enforce the law. If they have not; then get the governments hand and the lawyers hands out of their pocket.

Respectfully,
 Marvin L. Orr
 P.O. Box 63
 Moreland, Idaho 83256

MTC-00012139

From: Kathryn Mills
 To: Microsoft Settlement
 Date: 1/15/02 7:38pm
 Subject: Microsoft Settlement
 Kathryn Mills
 3275 West 128 St.
 Cleveland, OH 44111
 January 15, 2002
 Microsoft Settlement
 U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
 Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

It is time that we put the litigation against Microsoft to rest. Enough of the taxpayers' dollars have been squandered. This trial must be over. The marketplace, not the courtroom, should now decide how Microsoft performs. We need to unshackle Microsoft so that they can again be innovative and creative in the hi-tech economy . . . moving freely and competitively. The consumers need it . . . the investors certainly need to know that the hi-tech industry is again on steady ground.

Let America do what America does best in the marketplace . . . allow an economy to grow freely and creatively . . . this will not happen if we continue to drag this company, and others, through the courts. Enough is enough!

Sincerely,
 Kathryn C. Mills

MTC-00012140

From: Rick Girdner
 To: Microsoft ATR
 Date: 1/15/02 11:12pm
 Subject: microsoft settlement

Dear Sirs,

I am sure everyone is hammering you guys over the Microsoft settlement. My main concern is that the way Microsoft wants to pay their debt to society is through a giant sales campaign to the schools. I am so tired of people in Washington doing crappy jobs on every front, then saying they are doing it for the good of the CHILDREN. This is the wrong settlement for America. Have their executives go out and pick up trash if they want to do some real good things, but do not let them infiltrate the schools with sales pitches.

Thank you,

Rick Girdner,
Concerned Taxpayer

MTC-00012141

From: Tracy Pipkin
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Monopoly
Please break up the Microsoft monopoly
. . . as an IT professional, they have caused
much grief over the last 10-15 years.
Thanks.
CC:attorney.general@po.state.ct.us@inetgw

MTC-00012142

From: Arsenio Calle
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
For the good of the Us and of our economy
I humbly ask that this case be settled as soon
as possible. The Us needs less litigation and
more innovation to get the economy going
again. This litigation is only helping the
economy of the lawyers involved in the case.
Respectfully,
Arsenio Calle

MTC-00012143

From: Bob Condie
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:18pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
I've been involved with the computer days
since its inception. Let Microsoft play in the
free market. There products are great and
have set the standard and platform for the
future that no other company could have.
Others can compete with the latest and
greatest technology.
Bob Condie
Executive Director of Engineering
(303) 652-3464

MTC-00012144

From: ICUTTER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:21pm
Subject: microsoft settlement
I believe that this matter ought to be settled
immediately. It is a drain on the economy,
and if one polled the many millions of users
of msft products, I believe it would be
difficult to justify that we were overcharged
for an operating system that we freely chose
(over Apple or Linux), and that we use every
day, with additional features added at no
extra charge. I still remember that I had to
forgo getting Netscape because I did not want
to spend hundreds of extra dollars—in the
end, I got it free from msft.

MTC-00012145

From: Warren Taylor
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Enough litigation already! Settle the
Microsoft suit and let's get back to the
business of innovation. This was never about
the interests of the consumer but only about
the pathetic attempt of competitors to do in
the court room what they couldn't do in the
market place. As I believe the secretary of the
US Treasury said of the Enron collapse:
That's the genius of the free market system;
you have winners and losers. In this case,

only sore losers who convinced enough
people so that years later we're still suffering
the effects of this ill timed and poorly
managed suit. Witness the collapse of the
high tech market. We, the consumers of high
tech goods and services, are the losers.

Best wishes,
Rev. Warren F. Taylor
607 E Mulberry Ave
Porterville, CA 93257
559-781-0266 the
So we row on . . . boats against the
current— f. scott fitzgerald

MTC-00012146

From: Steve T
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dear Sir/Madam.
My name is Steve Tripp, and I live in a
small town in Iowa and work at a local ISP.
I will not pretend to know the legal minutia
of the case, but have been keeping abreast of
the situation through online news and
newsgroups. I have used Microsoft products
at work, not because they are the best or even
good, but because there is no other choice.
The software market did not start out as a
monopoly, and the best man did not win. But
as someone who works with computers every
day, and would even if I did not get paid for
it, I know who the losers are. . . we are.
What truly amazes me is watching supposed
experts debate whether or not Microsoft as a
monopoly has hurt the industry. As a
Network/Internet technician in Algona, Iowa
I deal with Microsoft products every day at
work, but will not have them in my home.
I know they have hurt the industry, and I
know their products are not the best that
could be on the market. The Microsoft
stranglehold on OS and application software
needs to be relaxed, and Microsoft will not
do so on its own.
Thank you for your time.
Steve Tripp
505 N. Main St.
Algona, IA 50511

MTC-00012147

From: ART1300@webtv.net@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Please do not appeal.

MTC-00012148

From: Curtis Killorn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Attention: Renata B. Hesse
I wish to comment concerning the up-
coming settlement of the corporation of
Microsoft. Under the federal law of the
Tunney Act, I believe I have this right. In my
thirty years as a working tax paying citizen
I have never had a good experience with the
products of Microsoft, my exposure is as
follows:
I was a Composition Manager for the
largest publication company in central
Colorado for six years and found the software
to be cumbersome and very difficult to carry
out our daily work load without the constant
problems which seemed to be inherent with

this product. As technology progressed and
the internet become much more important,
our work load and complexity doubled. The
experience of networking servers and work
stations together with Microsoft programs
required constant maintenance and a
continual bills for technical support and
training.

As a owner of the largest restaurant in
Chaffee county, Colorado, I have inherited a
point of sales system which runs on
Microsoft. I have spent over \$120,000 on a
networked system which is at best faulty and
at the worst useless. This system has been the
source of constant frustration. The system
promises great efficiency and productivity to
help enhance the work load of a restaurant,
but in turn has become the signal largest
liability we have to contend with.

On a personal note: All the talk of
Microsoft has been that they the "great
innovators" and "revolutionary designers",
well, I just don't see it. If this settlement
allows Microsoft to "give" their leftover
products to our children, Microsoft will only
be given an even greater advantage to
propagate their product. Here's an idea: why
not have Microsoft pay Apple to give their
new iMacs to the poorest schools in America.

Curtis Killorn
Owner
wind@chaffee.net
Check us out on-line @
www.windmillonline.com
The Windmill Restaurant
720 E. Rainbow Blvd.
Salida, CO 81201
719-539-3594 fx 719-539-3479

MTC-00012149

From: Simon Selitser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
As a consumer and as a developer I do not
believe that proposed final judgment (by DOJ
and nine states) is in a public interest. I
believe that this settlement will do little to
restore competition or prevent Microsoft
from monopoly behavior. Far more reaching
in preventing Microsoft from abusing its
monopoly are remedies proposed by nine
states and District of Columbia and, if
adapted, will protected the public interest.
Simon I. Selitser, Ph.D.
President,
TimeDomain CVD, Inc.
470 Division St.
Campbell, CA 95008

MTC-00012150

From: Ray Hix
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ray Hix
209 W Troy Street
Dothan, Al 36303
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
Dear Microsoft Settlement:
The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers'
dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ray Hix

MTC-00012151

From: Stan
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Don't you think you have spent enough of the tax payers hard earned money.

It is time to settle.

Stanley R. Kneppar
8109 Hibiscus Circle
Tamarac, Florida 33321-2134
(954) 720-0413

MTC-00012152

From: R. Ronald Corbett
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
R. Ronald Corbett
231 SE 45th Terrace
Ocala, FL 34471
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

It's time to leave Microsoft alone, to allow that big company to get back to producing good products and creating jobs for the American workers. The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars and was a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. Consumers should see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom.

Most Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, instead of wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than

bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
R. Ronald Corbett

MTC-00012153

From: Cy Rayburn
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Cy Rayburn
p o Box 83
Gibbon, NE 68840
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Cy Rayburn

MTC-00012154

From: Ken DeJonge
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ken DeJonge
2911 52nd SW.,
Grandville, MI 49418
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be

over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely, Ken DeJonge

MTC-00012155

From: Jane Smith
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jane Smith
27259 Hedge Rd
Albemarle, NC 28001
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jane Smith

MTC-00012156

From: Karl Hanson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Karl Hanson

76 Drew Ave.
Manchester, NH 03104
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Karl Hanson

MTC-00012157

From: Don Bates
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:36pm
Subject: Microsoft settlement

Dear Attorney General Ashcroft: Having been a Microsoft Windows user for over a decade, I would like to take a moment to go on record supporting the recent settlement reached between Microsoft and the Department of Justice. In my opinion Microsoft has been a target of unfair criticism over the years. Sure, as a Windows user I've had my share of headaches but I feel that overall the product is reasonably priced and a valuable addition to my lifestyle. I am pleased that the three-year-old antitrust suit against Microsoft is now over and being put to rest.

You are well aware of the terms of the settlement where Microsoft agreed to not enter into any agreements forcing any third party to distribute or promote any Windows technology exclusively. Personally, I'm pleased to see that Microsoft is being forced to turn over intellectual property to its competitors. This allows for software that is more compatible with Windows to be produced and allows for competition.

All in all, I am happy with the settlement because it is going to be beneficial to the American economy, the tech industry, and competition and in the end the consumer.

Sincerely,
Donald Bates,
Cincinnati, Ohio

MTC-00012158

From: Kenneth Brown
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kenneth Brown
PO Box 234
Windermere, FL 34786
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kenneth W Brown

MTC-00012159

From: Lynn Sant
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lynn Sant
P.O. Box 329
Preston, ID 83263-0329
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lynn Sant

MTC-00012160

From: Ted Piatt
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ted Piatt
3403 Fox Lake Rd.
Wooster, Oh 44691
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ted Piatt

MTC-00012161

From: David S
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David S Campbell
Vanceboro, NC 28586-8055
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Steve Campbell

MTC-00012162

From: G. MARIC
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
G. MARIC

113 Crestwood Avenue
Branchburg, NJ 08876-3911
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
G. Maric

MTC-00012163

From: Robert Cave
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Cave
4953 B Ave
Marcus, IA 51035-7009
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert C. Cave

MTC-00012164

From: David Houk
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Houk
217 Cedarwood Dr.
Madison, In 47250
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Houk

MTC-00012165

From: John Gerber
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Gerber
698 S. Cascade Dr.
Woodburn, OR 97071-3022
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John Gerber

MTC-00012166

From: David Tiry
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:17pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Tiry
217 May St.
Rockland, Wi 54653
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Tiry

MTC-00012167

From: William Peteet
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William Peteet
2024 Fordham
Denton, Tx 76201
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

William Peteet

MTC-00012168

From: John Mackey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:38pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Mackey
3520 Scenic Dr
Redding, Ca 96991
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John E Mackey

MTC-00012169

From: Susan Blevins
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Susan Blevins
P.O. Box 162
Nashville, GA 31639
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Susan Blevins

MTC-00012170

From: Willis Gray
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:27pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Willis Gray
2218 Graystone Drive
Sumter, SC 29150
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Willis T. Gray

MTC-00012171

From: John Giesey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Giesey
203 Galway Dr.
Niceville, FL 32578-2377
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John Gieseey

MTC-00012172

From: Gary Stolp
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gary Stolp
1218 Boston Street
Muskogee, OK 74401
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gary C Stolp

MTC-00012173

From: David M. Holly
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David M. Holly
1211 Shady Lane
Tecumseh, MI 49286
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David M. Holly

MTC-00012174

From: patsy Rowzee
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Patsy Rowzee
P.O. Box 323
Slagle, La 71475
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Patsy Rowzee

MTC-00012175

From: Betty Lloyd
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Betty Lloyd
145 Valley Dr
Bridgeport, WV 26330
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Betty M Lloyd

MTC-00012176

From: Tracey Sigle
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tracey Sigle
5303 Stockwell
Lincoln, NE 68506
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tracey Sigle

MTC-00012177

From: Kennyth Long
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kenneth Long
928 Dove Lane
Louisville, KY 40213-1322
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Long

MTC-00012178

From: Lynne Piper
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lynne Piper
8015 Chorale Ct
Houston, TX 77040
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lynne Piper

MTC-00012179

From: James Lucas
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
James Lucas
11108 Church Rd.
Ellsworth, MI 49729
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James Lucas

MTC-00012180

From: David HARold
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David HARold
PO box 3465
Mount Airy, nc 27030
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Harold

MTC-00012181

From: ICUTTER@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:36pm
Subject: msft settlement

We common people depend on the developers to make things easy for us. If there was not Windows, millions of people could never use a computer. Apple was out there for yrs., with a graphical user interface (GUI) but it took Windows which was fairly priced at about 80 dollars, to unlock the many millions of users nowadays— IT IS NOT

BECAUSE WE HAVE NO CHOICE——WE CHOSE Windows over IBM OS2, We chose Windows over Linux, and over Apple, and especially over UNIX and Xenix. Now there is a monopoly—if u were a physician, in 1990, there was absolutely no software other than UNIX/Xenix—and it cost thousands of dollars, and could only run certain types of applications . Please, please, please make this stupid lawsuit go away!!!!!!!!!!!!

MTC-00012182

From: John Moore
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:16pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Moore
22340 Bracketts Rd.,
Shorewood, MN 55331
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John W. Moore

MTC-00012183

From: Walter Kubli
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Walter Kubli
300 Solari Rd.
Coos Bay, OR 97420
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be

over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Walter Kubli

MTC-00012184

From: Glenn Dobson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Glenn Dobson
2203 Palmersville Hwy-89
Dresden, TN 38225
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Glenn Dobson

MTC-00012185

From: R Keith
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:21pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

R Keith
1146 Millers Mill Road
Stockbridge, GA 30281-4712
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Randy Keith

MTC-00012186

From: Jerry Franks
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jerry Franks
2353 Magnolia Dr
Little Elm, TX 75068
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and

losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jerry L Franks

MTC-00012187

From: Robert Bubala
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Bubala
1103 E. Miller St.
Griffith, IN 46319
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert Bubala

MTC-00012188

From: Edward Citak
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Edward Citak
6216 Anaconda St.
Las Vegas, Nv 89108-3926
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Edward J. Citak

MTC-00012189

From: Jack Russell
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:02pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jack Russell
143 Adobe Court
Weatherford, TX 76087
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jack Russell

MTC-00012190

From: David Alvar
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Alvar
7727-236th St SW
Edmonds, WA 98036
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David M. Alvar

MTC-00012191

From: Sandi Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sandi Johnson
3182 Quail Dr
Deltona, FL 32738
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sandi Johnson

MTC-00012192

From: Gary Guptill
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gary Guptill
P O Box 1
Springfield, SD 57062-0001
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gary Guptill

MTC-00012193

From: Allen Palmer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:29pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Allen Palmer
901 Easton Place
Dallas, TX 75218-2347
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over,

companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Allen Palmer

MTC-00012194

From: lander@samref.com.sa@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/15/02 11:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement.

The US and State governments continued action against Microsoft is ridiculous and a total waste of our taxpayers money. Microsoft is one of the greatest companies in the US and has produced fantastic products that no other software company can. When we have so much crime and criminal activities within companies (e.g. Enron) why are we continuing to punish success. Stop prosecuting Microsoft now!

Nigel Lander Superintendent CIS SAP
Project Manager
Samref Refinery, Yanbu, Saudi Arabia
Phone: +966-4-396-4590

MTC-00012195

From: Ed Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ed Johnson
9541 Silver Spur Lane
Highlands Ranch, CO 80130
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the

high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ed Johnson

MTC-00012196

From: Kendall Funk
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kendall Funk
200 Aspen St. Apt. #23
Clayton, NM 88415
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kendall Funk

MTC-00012197

From: Carol Rowe
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Carol Rowe
102 W Railroad Box 366
Lake Park, IA 51347-0366
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Carol Rowe

MTC-00012198

From: art selhorn
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:07pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
art selhorn
3604 McCormick St . SE
olympia, wa 98501
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Art Selhorn

MTC-00012199

From: Kim Stowe
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kim Stowe
5407 59th Place NE
Marysville, WA 98270-9016
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kim Stowe

MTC-00012200

From: Rex Shinholt
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Rex Shinholt
8885 E 400N
Van Buren, IN 46991
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

The Shinholts

MTC-00012201

From: Betty Grimm
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:44pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Betty Grimm
922 Sugar Hollow Rd.
Apollo, Pa 15613-8007
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Betty R.Grimm

MTC-00012202

From: Sally Young
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:40pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sally Young
2700 Highway 54
Moreland, GA 30259
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting

valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sally Young

MTC-00012203

From: Roy Hamilton
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:39pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Roy Hamilton
230 SE 2nd Street
Gresham, OR 97080
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Roy Hamilton

MTC-00012204

From: Ira Paul
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ira Paul
18495 NW 78th Avenue
Hialeah, FL 33015-2704
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ira J. Paul

MTC-00012205

From: Michael Fry
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:49pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Michael Fry
229 Southport Dr
Newton, KS 67114-5429
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Michael Fry

MTC-00012206

From: John O'Brien

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:59pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John O'Brien
68 Lyford Drive
Tiburon, ca 94920-1715
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
J.J. O'Brien

MTC-00012207

From: Lawrence Gold
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lawrence Gold
880 Westmont Dr.
Chico, CA 95926-7761
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
L. Gene Gold

MTC-00012208

From: Oliver Arnold
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Oliver Arnold
1252 N. Hazelton Drive
Chandler, AZ 85226-1333
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. The investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Perry Arnold

MTC-00012209

From: Tom Fisher
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tom Fisher
6931 Azalea lane
Dallas, TX 75230
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dr Tom Fisher MD BSEE

MTC-00012210

From: Harold Cantley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Harold Cantley
513 Dumas st.
Watson, AR 71674
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Harold Cantley

MTC-00012211

From: Jim Zitek

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jim Zitek
5785 Hyland Courts Dr
Bloomington, MN 55447
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James Zitek

MTC-00012212

From: James Huspek
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:24pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
James Huspek
PO Box 893
Jackson, WY 83001
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With

government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
James P. Huspek

MTC-00012213

From: Linda Fitzhugh
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Linda Fitzhugh
2207 Lytham Lane
Katy, TX 77450
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Linda Fitzhugh

MTC-00012214

From: Sharon Kellogg
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sharon Kellogg
RR 1 Box 774
Shinglehouse, PA 16748
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sharon Kellogg

MTC-00012215

From: Wanda Trapp
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Wanda Trapp
Rt. 4, Box 327
McAlester, OK 74501
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Wanda Trapp

MTC-00012216

From: Robert Owens

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:06pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Owens
408 West Jefferson
Cole Camp, MO 65325
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert L. Owens

MTC-00012217

From: .net@wolverine.capwiz.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Pierce Mills
Rt. 3, Box 108-3
Lake City, FL 32025-9424
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Pierce Mills

MTC-00012218

From: Lia Olivieri
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lia Olivieri
31 N. 3rd Street
Cortlandt Manor, NY 10567
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lia Olivieri

MTC-00012219

From: Steven Svec
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Steven Svec
PO Box 552
Chillicothe, MO 64601-0552
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Steven T. Svec

MTC-00012220

From: Stanley Burris
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Stanley Burris
P.O. Box 368
Keystone Heights, FL 32656
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Stan Burris

MTC-00012221

From: Barbara King
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barbara King
7311 Oak Hill Dr.
Sylvania, OH 43560
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Barbara King

MTC-00012222

From: Mikel Conner
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Mikel Conner
12616 Darryl Dr.
Buda, TX 78610-2572
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Mikel W. Conner

MTC-00012223

From: Joyce Oberly
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joyce Oberly
97 East Bethany Road
Womelsdorf, PA 19567
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Joyce M. Oberly

MTC-00012224

From: Dorothy Rush
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dorothy Rush
5965 Happy Pines Drive
Foresthill, CA 95631
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Rush

MTC-00012225

From: Richard Ellis
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Richard Ellis
1072 Hayes Ave
West Liberty, IA 52776
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Richard Ellis

MTC-00012226

From: Tom Hill
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:11pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Tom Hill
10839 Hortense Street
N. Hollywood, CA 91602
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Tom Hill, E.A.

MTC-00012227

From: Alfonse De Marco
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alfonse De Marco
3-7 Atlanta Court
Freehold, NJ 07728
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Alfonse De Marco

MTC-00012228

From: Gregg E Finley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gregg E Finley
1386 Rockdale St
Upland, CA 91784-7422
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gregg E Finley

MTC-00012229

From: Jay Pattiz
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jay Pattiz
102 Cottonwood Close
Warrensburg, MO 64093
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jay Pattiz

MTC-00012230

From: Frank Murray
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Frank Murray
618 Avenue B
Trevose, PA 19053
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Frank Murray

MTC-00012231

From: Michael Moore
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Michael Moore
5309 Round Prairie
Shawnee, KS 66226
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Michael E. Moore

MTC-00012232

From: Timothy Sawyer
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:19pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Timothy Sawyer
P.O. Box 278
Hudgins, VA 23076
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Timothy P. Sawyer

MTC-00012233

From: Kenneth G. Loeb
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kenneth G. Loeb
434 7th St
Jesup, IA 50648
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement

U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530 Dear Microsoft Settlement: The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kenneth G. Loeb

MTC-00012234

From: Lisa Cahill
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:50pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lisa Cahill
1615 W. Blue Springs Ave.
Orange City, FL 32763
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lisa M. Cahill

MTC-00012235

From: George Rush
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George Rush
534 W. Chisholm St.
Sanford, NC 27330
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
George B. Rush

MTC-00012236

From: Clara Reese
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Clara Reese
4006 132nd St. E.
Tacoma, WA 98446-1938
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Clara Reese

MTC-00012237

From: Maurice Knudsen
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Maurice Knudsen
4428 Main Street
Elk Horn, IA 51531
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken

up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Maurice J. Knudsen

MTC-00012238

From: David Sheehan
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:00pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Sheehan
1208 Wine Spring Lane
Baltimore, MD 21204
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David J Sheehan

MTC-00012239

From: Robert Hartsell
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:30pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert Hartsell
RR 2, Box 18
Lockwood, MO 65682-9601
January 15, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert N. Hartsell

MTC-00012240

From: John Beasley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:41pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Beasley
319 E. Thompson Ln.
Nashville, TN 37211-2663
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create

new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John W. Beasley

MTC-00012241

From: George Isaacs
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:13pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George Isaacs
1858 Middlebury Drive
Aurora, IL 60504
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
George U Isaacs

MTC-00012242

From: Barry Stephens
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Barry Stephens
37 Gray Lodge Rd
Kittery, ME 03904
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Barry D. Stephens

MTC-00012243

From: martin guerra
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:14pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
martin guerra
1606 Arkansas Ave
Killeen, TX 76541
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
martin v. guerra

MTC-00012244

From: Fred Stacey
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:48pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Fred Stacey
9309 Habersham Drive

Louisville, KY 40242-2309
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Fred Stacey

MTC-00012245

From: Donna Soares
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Donna Soares
3704 Coco lane
North Highlands, Ca 95660
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With

the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Donna Soares

MTC-00012246

From: Glenna Potts
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:22pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Glenna Potts
110 Marina Dr. #13
Needles, CA 92363-3717
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Glenna Potts

MTC-00012247

From: Cynthia Knight
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:10pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Cynthia Knight
1982 McGirr Road
Ashton, IL 61006-9547
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.,
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the

courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Knight

MTC-00012248

From: Charles Rowe
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:12pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Rowe
102 W Railroad Box 366
Lake Park, IA 51347-0366
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles Rowe

MTC-00012249

From: Perry Staley
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:42pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Perry Staley
411 Orchard Street
Ironton, OH 45638-1166
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Perry L. Staley

MTC-00012250

From: George Kelder
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
George Kelder
4012 El Norte Rd.
Cameron Park, Ca 95682
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than

bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
George Kelder

MTC-00012251

From: Nile Gomez
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:52pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Nile Gomez
220 Meadow Lane, #D11
Secaucus, NJ 07094-4319
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Nile Gomez

MTC-00012252

From: Andy Hatle
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:43pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Andy Hatle
22827 Muscupiabe Dr.
San Bernardino, Ca 92405
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be

over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Andy Hatle

MTC-00012253

From: Joy Wilson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joy Wilson
3260 Keith Bridge Rd. #270
Cumming, GA 30041
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Joy Wilson

MTC-00012254

From: Terrence Moore
To: Microsoft Settlement

Date: 1/15/02 9:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Terrence Moore
102 Recreation Dr.
Baden, Pa 15005
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Terrence M Moore

MTC-00012255

From: Lillie Price
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:58pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Lillie Price
7815 CHIPPOKES ROAD
RICHMOND, VA 23881-9335
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of

stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Lil Price

MTC-00012256

From: JAMES HIBBS
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:33pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
JAMES HIBBS
2504 south cheryl ct.
veradale, WA 99037
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
JAMES C HIBBS

MTC-00012257

From: Jennifer Terhune
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:36pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jennifer Terhune
3938 Lott Ave.
Corpus Christi, TX 78410-6033
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech

industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Terhune

MTC-00012258

From: Jean Freeman
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jean Freeman
413 Columbia Ave.
Lumberton, NC. 28358
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jean Freeman

MTC-00012259

From: Dwaine F. Keck

To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:31pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Dwaine F. Keck
321 Fox Rd.
Lexington, OH 44904-9337
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief. Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Dwaine F. Keck

MTC-00012260

From: Kevin McElroy
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:47pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Kevin McElroy
24 Brushy Ridge Court
Plum, PA 15239-1140
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers.

With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kevin McElroy

MTC-00012261

From: Christy Perez
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:32pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Christy Perez
3824 Jarrett Dr.
North Tonawanda, NY 14120
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Christy Perez

MTC-00012262

From: Betty Wyhowanec
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:08pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Betty Wyhowanec
32 West Main Street
Vergennes, VT 05491
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a

serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Betty L. Wyhowanec

MTC-00012263

From: Charles Huelsmann
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Charles Huelsmann
8321 N. Pocono Dr.
Citrus Springs, FL 34434
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Charles Huelsmann

MTC-00012264

From: Ed Schulz
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:54pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Ed Schulz
7643 Wachtel Way
Citrus Heights., CA 95610
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Ed Schulz

MTC-00012265

From: John Mack, Jr.
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
John Mack, Jr.
5254 S. Riverview Circle
Homasassa , FL 34448-3629
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
John Mack Jr.

MTC-00012266

From: Sallie Pierdolla
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:55pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Sallie Pierdolla
5232 FM 2538
Marion, , TX 78124
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Sallie Pierdolla, Texas, Bush Country

MTC-00012267

From: Robert P. Hanrahan
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Robert P. Hanrahan
7268 Evans Mill Road
McLean, VA 22101
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Robert P. Hanrahan

MTC-00012268

From: Joseph Wojtowicz
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:04pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Joseph Wojtowicz
1390 Northfield Drive
Mineral Ridge, OH 44440-9420
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

Joseph T. Wojtowicz

MTC-00012269

From: Gerald Kotyuk
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:37pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Gerald Kotyuk
2300 Orleans Ave
Marietta, GA 30062-7214
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Gerald and Debbie Kotyuk

MTC-00012270

From: Alan De Ville
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Alan De Ville
7111 Tuckahoe Rd.
Williamson, NY 14589
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better

products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Alan De Ville

MTC-00012271

From: Rex Wilson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:15pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Rex Wilson
912 Pavillion Street
Dallas, TX 75204-5513
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Rex Wilson, LCol, USMC Ret

MTC-00012272

From: Michael (Mick) Orton
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:51pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Michael (Mick) Orton
1099 D Street, Suite 205
San Rafael, CA 94901
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Michael Orton

MTC-00012273

From: Scott Johnson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:34pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Scott Johnson
6003 Westbourne Place
Centreville, VA 20120-1865
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Scott Alan Johnson

MTC-00012274

From: Hal Scoggins
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 9:35pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Hal Scoggins
2807 Jackson St.
Houston, TX 77004-1242
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Hal Scoggins

MTC-00012275

From: David Jacobson
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:01pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
David Jacobson
700 Norcova Dr.
Chesapeake, VA 23320
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into

the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
David Jacobson

MTC-00012276

From: Edward Smith
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 7:03pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Edward Smith
130 Somerset Drive
Brooklyn, MI 49230
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Edward R. Smith

MTC-00012277

From: Thomas Zamrok
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:45pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Thomas Zamrok
4805 Transit Road #1808
Depew, NY 14043-4904
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Thomas P. Zamrok

MTC-00012278

From: Jennifer Freeman
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:09pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Jennifer Freeman
226 Wilson Dr.
Summerville, SC 29483-3032
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Jennifer M. Freeman

MTC-00012279

From: William Signorile
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 5:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
William Signorile
2360 Hemlock Farms
Hawley, Pa 18428
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies. Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Kathy & Bill Signorile

MTC-00012280

From: Donald McGee
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 6:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Donald McGee
545 Hidden Creek Drive
Merritt Island, FL 32952
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With

government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Donald D. McGee

MTC-00012281

From: Frances Colvin
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:57pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
Frances Colvin
323 Bailey Blvd
Tahlequah, OK 74464-9261
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation. Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers—rather than bureaucrats and judges—will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,
Frances and Charles Colvin

MTC-00012282

From: C. Mack Powell
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/15/02 8:23pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement
C. Mack Powell
1437 N. Easman Rd Apt B
Longview, TX 75601
January 15, 2002
Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the