

**From:** Peter Au  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/27/02 3:39am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

All the law suits including DOJ's and state attorneys' anti-trust suit and civil suits are full of contradiction, irony and hypocrisy. On one hand Microsoft is accused of anti-trust violation monopolising and overcharging consumers, and on the other hand was accused of lower pricing than competitors as a form of predatory pricing. Microsoft achieved 95% of the market through good and renovating products and competitive pricing, was accused of monopolizing. Then no company should try to succeed because if you do, you are a monopoly. The objective of the Anti-trust Law is to prevent any company from dominating the market and gouging prices and thus do harm to consumers. However, Microsoft was accused of bundle products, selling them at lower prices or component such as browser free. I can't see how consumers could be harmed to have some free products or get a good deal in buying bundle of programs. DOJ do have the intention of vaguely protecting the consumers in the long run, but never directly place consumer immediate interest in the equation; is also presuming too much in assuming Microsoft will gouge prices in the future. Every body is innocent before proven guilty. The fact that Microsoft selling the browser program free greatly benefit consumers, and have greatly advance the popular use of internet that renovate this country and the world intellectually, culturally and economically. And now AOL who is charging consumer for using her service is suing Microsoft for harming Netscape. I wonder whether "competition" or "benefit consumer" has any meaning in this society. Any party loses a competition will feel unfair and wants a rematch in a so called "leveling field". Parties who feel unfair may not be limited to Netscape. There are parties in this country and in history that were, unlike Netscape, arguably really being wronged. Slavery of the blacks, killings of American Indians, slaughtering of south and central Americans by Spaniards, just to name a few. It would be great to have an equalizer so as to provide fairness to ALL companies, nations and people. Maybe we should all go back to Stone Age, which will be the ultimate equalizer. Of course we know that that is impossible, because the world moves on and keeps going forward. This "leveling the field" idea is kike for us to go backward to the stone age. It is not progress, not advancement, not innovations; it is not an idea of civilization. The consumers will be harmed, the economy will be harm, and our nation and people will be harmed. Then on the other end of the spectrum, civil suits are accusing Microsoft of overcharging their products. Of course we know that if microsoft lost this suit, each consumer user will get about \$10, and millions of dollars will go the lawyers. The settlement of Microsoft to provide millions of dollars of computers and softwares to school was again hampered by selfish and self-serving objections. Certainly any companies are free to provide programs to our schools. One reality the nay-sayers, DOJ and state attorneys keep forgetting but really have to face is: Microsoft have achieve enough critical mass in competition and is been used by say 95% of software users. It has become a defacto standard. If we want our kids to learn softwares, they better learn microsoft's programs first, because they are the most popular ones. This is the system mostly sschools, offices and society. How are we going to stop the engine of progress and moving forward and level the field by pulling back Microsoft ? This is against consumers, against progress, against innovations and against the economy. I think the economy has been harmed enough by all these follies.

-----  
Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Auctions Great stuff seeking new owners! Bid now!

**CC:** msfin@microsoft.com@inetgw