From: csaunders@databytesoftware.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/25/02 12:11am
Subject: my personal view on the ms vs doj case

Dear Sir / Madam

On the face of it, it would appear that my view on this matter is irrelevant; I am after all a British citizen living in New Zealand, half-a-world away from your great nation.

However your decision in the matter of the Microsoft will affect my life deeply. I am a senior IT professional, working with Microsoft products daily.

In short my very living will be affected by your decision. The world, and I await with baited breath what impact this will have on our lives.

It is under such circumstances that I offer my humble opinion:

My summarisation is this, that it would appear to be a decision of the issue of "freedom", how much "freedom" should a corporation be allowed vs. the freedom of the public to enjoy goods and services at a competitive price.

In fact it would appear that the entire issue is summed in the above fashion. Most people today believe that "I can do whatever I like, pursuing what ever goals I determine to be to my best interest, SO LONG as I respect the rights of others and do not impinge on their right to do the same."

It is that above view, which I find utterly abhorrent. I propose that the belief that your great forefathers held such a view is a lie, and a dangerous lie designed to steal your freedom from right underneath you.

If this issue (and all the similar arguments like it) are decided based on the merits of who has "which freedoms to do what", then the end result will be incorrect and self-serving, no matter how noble your aims.

If entities such as governments, businesses, organisations and ultimately people, really believe that they have a "right" to follow their own desires, without hurting others, they will, given enough time, destroy everything around themselves.

Like a horrible Midas curse, it is not possible to gain your own goals without affecting others.

The pursuit of self, at all costs is disgusting. The dangerous lie that it is possible to peruse self, without impinging on others is a falsehood.

No man is an island, all decisions involve costs. Any decision based on the "faintly" held notion that it is permissible to pursue your own goals

as "long as you don't hurt others" will produce a result that is a real evil in itself.

I urge you to consider your forefather?s real aims and goals in promoting liberty, not one of "SELF" but rather "OTHERS FIRST".

If you are proud of your heritage you will put others first, and demand of both the plaintiff and the defendant that they show how they are putting "OTHERS FIRST".

The result will be a judgement based on the activities of both parties, designed to show whether self-interest or others-interest was the goal.

It is obvious then that by upholding the freedoms of both parties, both will suffer equally. If both parties are forced to place the other party first, the result will be a correct settlement, designed to uphold the other?s rights.

If the "people" are willing to allow Microsoft the right to "practice business", then Microsoft must allow the "people" the right to make their own livings.

(I imagine the issue of forcing OEM vendors to pre-install windows will be shown for the foul business practice it is, self-serving and abhorrent.)

Self-first always results in loss of freedom, never the promotion of freedom.

It is your own forefathers whom taught their children to follow the ways of the man that first promoted the idea of "Others First", en-masse to the public.

He was Jesus. Parents often paraphrase his teachings like this "Treat others as you would have them treat you." He actually said, ?Love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your mind and all your soul. And love others as yourself.?

May the Lord grant you the wisdom of Solomon as you consider such a weighty decision.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Kind regards,

Colin Saunders
PO Box 98817
South Auckland Mail Centre
New Zealand
csaunders@databytesoftware.com

CC: pohj@ihug.co.nz@inetgw