

Re: keyboard/mouse programming

# Re: keyboard/mouse programming

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Assembler/alt.lang.asm/2007-11/msg00503.html>

---

- *From:* [s\\_dubrovich@xxxxxxxx](mailto:s_dubrovich@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Fri, 30 Nov 2007 13:55:37 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Nov 28, 5:01 am, "Rod Pemberton" <[do\\_not\\_h...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:do_not_h...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Robert Redelmeier" <[red...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:red...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:9n73j.27769\\$Pv2.9035@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:9n73j.27769$Pv2.9035@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

So? Raising your competitors cost of doing business is a standard American corporation practice.

Rather cynical: RRC (Raising Rivals Costs) is an illegal anticompetitive business practice (even if hard to prove):  
<http://ftc.gov/be/RRCGMU.pdf>

30 pages... Does it specifically say that's illegal somewhere or just that they have conducted research into the practice from an anticompetitive perspective such as by a firm believed to be monopolistic?

The few sections I skimmed seem to indicate that this research is highly theoretical in nature and different from predatory pricing, monopolistic practices, and even anticompetitive practices. I.e.,:

[snipped]

Thought you might be interested in:

<http://www.maxframe.com/>

Re:CALDERA, INC., Plaintiff, vs. MICROSOFT CORP., Defendant.

On second thought, perhaps you've seen it.

But as to RRC...

"

In addition to its improper vaporware and FUD campaigns, Caldera alleges that Microsoft also forced OEMs away from DR DOS 5.0 by what plaintiff refers to as the "licensing triple-whammy," which refers to (1) per processor licenses, (2) minimum commitments subject to forfeiture, and (3) increased license duration. Per processor

Re: keyboard/mouse programming

licensing agreements required an OEM to pay Microsoft a royalty on every machine the OEM shipped regardless whether the machine contained MS-DOS or a different operating system. This is in contrast to a per system licensing agreement, which required OEMs to pay a royalty on only those computers shipped with MS-DOS installed. The use of per processor agreements is argued by plaintiff to be Microsoft's most effective single weapon against DR DOS. Plaintiff alleges that DRI had no realistic chance to license DR DOS to OEMs under a per processor license with Microsoft. It would make no sense for an OEM to install DR DOS when it had already paid for MS-DOS on every machine. Microsoft contends that OEMs were free to depart from the per processor licensing scheme, and that price differentials between license types were "relatively minor." However, plaintiff points to the depositions of several OEM executives who testified that even slight price differentials between the per processor and per system licenses meant that only the per processor license was financially viable.

"

Steve

Rod Pemberton

.