

39
From bradsi Sat Dec 14 16:24:55 1991
To: w-clairl
Subject: RE: PC week letter to editor
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 91 16:24:55 PST

i talked to paul for a while about this issue on wednesday. i read him the quotes from john constant (author of drdos) in the computerworld hong kong interview where the guy hints very strongly that dr was working on a windows clone. that took paul aback! the real situation started sinking in. he said we was now starting to see it from our point of view, not that he's all the way there yet, but it's not the black and white issue it used to seem to him, where we were stifling competition and unfairly picking on dr. people tend to think of dr as a utilities product, a little add-on that should work with windows as qemm works with mados or borland c++ works with windows now.

i also explained to paul off the record that operating systems are the very core of microsoft. it's ok that people compete with word or excel, or C. but competing with mados or windows is a very different story. we will protect those products.

i am not happy with the negative pr we are getting — especially the editorial more so than paul's story. but there is some good news in it. if you were an oem or corporate customer thinking of adopting dr, you would now know that there are problems with running with windows and microsoft ain't gonna help. it lets people know they are taking a risk. and that's goodness for us.

paul told me that dr was not pushing to have the story written; the articles were coming from users. he said that it's not a good story for dr, either, for the reasons i just described — potential dr customers now see they are taking big risks (risks dr doesn't want them aware of).

40
From bradsi Sat Dec 14 16:30:58 1991
To: andyhi davidcol johnen karist
Cc: richp
Subject: coma problems?
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 91 16:30:52 PST

i asked on compuserve about bugs that still exist in 60 or 61 that people had expected to be fixed by now. here is one response. the other was from dave nanian who says almost all the bugs he's reported are still there...

#: 25681 S12/Comments, etc.
14-Dec-91 14:15:41
Sb: Bugs still present
Fm: Gerald Kelly 76645,2122
To: Brad Silverberg [MS] 72260,2630

Since you're asking, the COMM.DEV still doesn't deal with the 16550 UART's FIFO buffer very well. In fact, it seems to have gotten worse since Build 43; under Build 43 at least it worked sometimes. Build 60 seemed to have problems with Windows communication applications in general, even on machines without a 16550 UART. I couldn't run Lexis 2000 1.7 for Windows at all under Build 58, it would always cause a GPF in itself. At first under Build 60, Lexis 2000 worked fine, but now—without my having changed anything in my system configuration—it won't even dial. I'll try it with Build 61b on Monday and see if the problem is still there. The weak communications driver was one of the biggest beefs I—and many others, ask Randall Kennedy about the RIME Windows Conference users—had with Windows 3.0. I try to stay in the 3.1 environment all day at work, and thanks to the improved Netware drivers I can pretty much do that now, but I had to go back to 3.0 to use Lexis—what a difference! Background communications is one of the main advantages of a multi-tasking environment. Let's get this to work right, OK?

41
From bradsi Sat Dec 14 16:35:54 1991

EXH 39 DATE 2/13/01
WITNESS Silverberg
MARY W. MILLER

MS 5049491
CONFIDENTIAL

DEFENDANT'S
EXHIBIT

5620

MS-PCA 1112951
CONFIDENTIAL