

**From:** Chick Tower  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 10:19pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

I do not think the "Microsoft settlement" goes far enough to prevent Microsoft from continuing and extending its monopolistic practices. Too much is left up to Microsoft's discretion, interpretation, and definition. The settlement needs to more specifically and rigorously define what it covers. The law generally does not allow convicted bank robbers to define what is a bank, or convicted rapists to define what constitutes rape; why should Microsoft, a convicted monopolistic company, be allowed to act in certain ways based upon definitions that the settlement says they alone may create, such as what constitutes Microsoft middleware or what is part of the Microsoft Windows operating system? What this settlement basically says is "Microsoft is prohibited from acting in ways that Microsoft deems monopolistic and unfair." Correct me if I'm wrong, but wasn't the company convicted because of actions it claimed were NOT monopolistic and unfair? In my opinion, this settlement gives Microsoft carte blanche to continue business as usual, and therefore does not serve the cause of justice.

Charles Tower