

X

Tel: X

E-mail: tim@timj.co.uk

15 September 2003

Ms. A. McCarthy  
European Parliament  
Bât. Altiero Spinelli  
13G218  
60, rue Wiertz  
B-1047 Bruxelles

By fax: +32 (0)2 284 9501, 2 pages

Dear Ms. McCarthy,

**Re: Inappropriate language in press release – request for retraction**

Allow me to introduce myself, since we have not had the benefit of a meeting. I am a professional software developer, living in the Eastern region. I recently spent my own time and money travelling to Brussels to meet with some MEPs and others to discuss the topic of the proposed “software patenting” Directive.

I was, therefore, disturbed to come across your press release referenced below:

<https://www.copernicus.co.uk/WiaB2/ViewPage.cfm?Page=6917>

Specifically, I must raise the strongest objections to your classification of myself and other concerned citizens as “dishonest”, “destructive” and “bullying” liars. To carelessly use such language in a civilised society is outrageous and you disgrace yourself by so doing. In particular, calling others “dishonest” and attacking their views as “lies” merely because you happen to disagree with them is a despicable affront to common civility. Perhaps in a political context you have become immune to the use of such abuse, but in the wider world it is not acceptable to accuse someone of being “dishonest” without *extremely* good cause and evidence. Expressing disagreement is one thing; accusing constituents of outright dishonesty and destructiveness is quite another and I would ask that you issue a full public retraction. Furthermore, such unprovoked aggression is hypocritical in the extreme when you simultaneously call for a “reasoned debate”! Using your resources to attack constituents and their legitimate concerns does not seem to me to be assisting in any way an informed debate. It stains your character, does your cause a disservice and damages the reputation of your wider political groups.

I am not sure who it is you believe you are dealing with here, but there is no giant, faceless lobbying machine which bears the brunt of your aggression and inappropriate language; it is concerned constituents (such as myself) whose professional experience and qualification leads them to have serious concerns about the proposed Directive. Furthermore, in general we not experienced, paid political campaigners but in many cases (myself included) are forced to give up our personal time and money to try to protect our right to earn a fair and honest living without undue, unfair and

unbalanced interference in the form of an unreasonable patent system. So, to launch such a wild and unsubstantiated attack (irrelevant of the merits) seems to me to be rather ill-considered and to be taking advantage of your privileged position - the people you attack are unable to respond meaningfully (not least because we are paid to develop innovative software solutions, not wage a war of press releases). I take personal offence at the fact that you explicitly disregard the considered opinions of myself and others as “lies”, and counter these “lies” with “truths” that are certainly not established facts but merely statements of your opinion, many of which have been publically challenged with considerable supporting documentary evidence.

I would ask that, even at this late stage, you consider seriously the concerns of myself and other constituents and refrain from such attacks whilst issuing an apology and retraction of the above-referenced press release. I believe that if you take a step back and look at the wider issues, you will see that we share a number of fundamental goals and beliefs in common (principal amongst them that the current situation in Europe is confusing and inconsistent), and that many of our concerns (“lies” as you currently call them) have considerable grounding in factual evidence and research. I understand and appreciate that you have invested a lot of time and effort into the proposed Directive, yet it risks being classed by history as “the directive which allowed US-style patenting in Europe”, something which you appear keen to avoid (as do I). You can, however, help to avoid this by recognising that the current safeguards are not strong enough and adopting a courageous, principled position which ensures that even when the Directive is inevitably interpreted as loosely as possible by the EPO, it will still provide strong protection against the patenting of algorithms and logic. I understand that a number of amendments will be presented which will give this Directive the teeth it deserves by *clearly and unambiguously* limiting the scope of patentability, and even at this late stage your strong support for them can change this Directive from an unmitigated disaster into something that will provide real support and certainty for innovation in Europe. You will find a quite breathtaking level of support in doing this from leading economists, scientists, professionals and citizens alike.

Your kind consideration of this matter is appreciated, and you are more than welcome to contact me at any time via any of the methods given above to discuss this matter further or if I can be of assistance in any way.

I look forward to a response on this matter at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Jackson