

From: [Amy Gijsbers van Wijk](#) [agvanwi[REDACTED]]
To: [Read, John](#) [John.Read@ATR.USDOJ.gov]
Cc: [Fairchild, Stephen](#) [Stephen.Fairchild@ATR.USDOJ.gov]
Subject: United States v. Apple, Inc. et al., No. 12-CV-2826(DLC) (S.D.N.Y.) – Comments on Proposed Final Judgment as to Defendants Hachette, HarperCollins, and Simon & Schuster
Date: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 3:30:09 AM

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding the case "United States v. Apple, Inc. et al., No. 12-CV-2826(DLC) (S.D.N.Y.) – Comments on Proposed Final Judgment as to Defendants Hachette, HarperCollins, and Simon & Schuster" I believe that the DOJ should not back Amazon in this case. The idea that the book groups were colluding asides, the implications of the decision - if Amazon has the ability to set the prices as low as they want, and the other book companies are charged with price-fixing and collusion because they are *trying to stay in the business* then i think that we aren't looking properly at the situation. Amazon is trying to monopolize the market in a ridiculous way!

By allowing Amazon to set prices at any rate and cut out the middle man, which is what Amazon does already, it disregards the need for physical books. While this might not seem like a big deal, and it means lower prices for consumers - it ultimately has lots of negative outcomes. Writers will have a harder time making money, and the idea of a capitalist-based market instead of an art-based market for writing, which partially exists already, will widen. Barnes and Noble will likely be driven out of business and the idea of physical-based markets for books and publishers will be lost. What this means on certain levels is that things such as browsing for physical books - because statistics show that a large amount of the time people go into bookstores, they leave with a book they weren't planning to buy - will be lost. Independent bookstores are struggling, and it may seem like B&N is part of that adversarial struggle, but B&N is at least a physical bookstore. The idea that all of these other, traditional publishing companies are being looked at as the bad guys for this price-fixing is sinister when it is obvious that Amazon is trying, in a monopolistic way, to drive all of them out of the e-book business because they just *cannot* compete with the price levels where the entire model for operating is different, since Amazon just distributes e-books, it doesn't publish them. I've even heard accusations that the DOJ has a hand in Amazon, or would receive some kind of kickback for the success of their side in this suit, and it sounds possible the more I look at how a decision in Amazon's favor would mean a bad thing for writers and publishers. While consumer may be happy in the short term with the cheaper prices, in the long-run it is a bad business model because it doesn't base any of the pricing on quality of product. It bases it all on cheapness, and that isn't a viable way for good literature to be published or writers to make a living.

As a young writer looking to the future of her career, I'm upset by the negligence that the DOJ has in thinking about this case from a perspective that would actually benefit the American people, not the Amazon corporation.

Sincerely,

Amy Gijsbers van Wijk
College Student, Writer

--

Amy Gijbers van Wijk

Apprentice Playwright and Production Intern
Wide-Eyed Productions
2012 Season

Macaulay Scholars Council 2011-2012 (Returning Member)
Representative: Brooklyn College 2014
Macaulay Honors College