

**From:** Drew Mackenzie  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 12/6/01 11:41 am  
**Subject:** Opinion: Consumer vs. Taxpayer

Consumer

I understand the allegations at hand in part focus on benefit/hurt to the consumer. In this category, as a consumer, I have been hurt by Microsoft's market monopoly.

As a software purchasing decision-maker, this is my thought process:

- I have a problem, which requires either software [x] or [y].
- Either will accomplish the job.
- [x] will allow me to use the results from [y].
- [y] will not allow me to use the results from [x], based on [x]'s corruption from an original agreed industry standard.
- some people are already using [x].
- I need to use all software results, so anyone can be my business partner.
- I must buy [x].

I.E., I am bullied into buying [x] - Microsoft products - because of their corruption of industry standards.

Taxpayer

- If Microsoft can't continue to sell lots of software, the company will be reduced in value.
- If Microsoft is reduced in value, the markets will be hurt, negatively impact the domestic economy, reduce corporate profits, and reduce the corporate contribution to the federal tax base.
- I'll end up paying more taxes.

In the end

The only way I won't get hurt is if Microsoft actually changes it's products. If their products are designed in such a way that the products themselves do not use their market saturation to leverage future purchases, then they are no longer using their monopoly to prevent advances in the software industry.

Microsoft could continue to produce, but would be forced to meet the same standards as other companies. They would have their products compete on an even footing with other software producers.

Feel free to contact me if you like  
Drew Mackenzie  
DMackenzie@ho-chunk.com