

From: kabazuki
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 11/16/01 9:59am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement?

Sirs:

Billions of \$\$ in sales. Why doesn't it work? It isn't meant to work, it's a cash cow. Can't avoid it because US Federal authorities folded on the AntiTrust suit.

Personally, I have 5 yrs research archives held hostage to MSFT marketing malice.

Netscape? The only way to save email records - unless your name is Monika Lewinsky, of course. But if you have an "uncontrollable situation" (DataRecoverySpeak for MSFT marketing practices) and you haven't used Netscape, your'e in trouble.

Java? It's more secure than DirectX, but MSFT forces it's "clients" to agree to the contrary when they pick up and install the MSFT browser's java-enabling package. Their practice of forcing individuals to agree to matters of fact under dispute or in which they have no personal expertise at their command which would afford informed consent/dissent remains open to legal challenge, nonetheless.

Furthermore, one is ill-advised to accept MSFT updates throughout the "life" of one of their products because these updates merely prepare for a major programming design switch, a questionable marketing method tantamount to blackmailing individuals into the purchase of "new" product versions which MSFT would like to sell in large numbers but for which individuals have no pressing, overwhelming need.

This happened in the switch from WIN95=WIN98 and it is happening again with the switch WIN98/ME/00 to WinXP.

Add to all these outrages and shoddy practice the fact that to get their "seamless package" to function, service advice must be purchased. It seems there is nothing in the manner in which MSFT's "offer" is structured likely to prevent further developpment of this marked trend in negative marketing.

It is safe to assume that as the "product" is divided into smaller pieces and more complex calculation packages are fitted to each product module in order to book higher revenues on sales of the same old stuff, features which demand heavy service will be built into the corporation's produt range.

It is suggested that the Court's IT specialists' attention be drawn to the evolution of Microsoft's .dll/migrate calculations from 1995 to October 2001, and that they evaluate the objective usefulness of this type of product developpment.

Respectfully,
Jackie Hulme