- No threads. It is not as easy to add threads as larry will make it out to be. Multiple threads will really effect memory management and I/O. Witness MACH (Unix w/ threads). Early versions of MACH single thread I/O because so much of the system was effected. Memory management in MACH ignores some of the multi-thread issues, and single threads alot of the time.

- Is AIX really clean with respect to AT&T, SUN..., or did IBM develop all of AIX, NFS, TCP/IP under clean-room conditions.

- AIX's memory management is probably not sophisticated enough to support OS/2 memory management APIs. We need to check up on this. If all they have is Unix System V style shared memory then supporting OS/2 will be lots of work.

    - stress that our team can deliver faster even with all new code, than a Boca team starting with AIX. This will be tied to the first point.

When are you guys going to let on how far along we are ?

-markl

From billg Thu Apr 20 17:11:10 1989
To: steveb
Subject: Terriblew news
Cc: jonl nathanm paulma petern
Date: Thu Apr 20 17:08:08 1989
Mail-Flags: 0000

Frankston is the person who we never got back to on his complaints about os/2. In fact he sent me mail recently saying that he had never got a response and restating the issue.

Having pc magazine do a UNIX column would be a true disaster.

If someone cares, they should talk to frankston more.

From paulma Wed Aug 9 17:33:51 1989
To: billg nathanm steveb
Subject: OS/2 and Windows - again
Date: Wed Aug 9 17:31:52 1989
Mail-Flags: 0000

I have spend couple of days over last few weeks think about OS/2 positioning and merchandising - this was occasioned by having to prepare for Sales Meeting and Intel meetings.
Most of the following points are fairly obvious, but are worth thinking about:

1.   Our current OS/2 product marketing is anaemic at best, non-existant at worst - we have moved warrenm out, but I need to do more (I am going write separate piece of mail on the issue of OS/2 personnel).

2.   Our basic positioning of Windows and OS/2 to a corporate account is:

Windows is:
- for <2MB machines
- is GUI for DOS
- is a transition path to OS/2

OS/2 is:
- for >2MB machines
- is where you will end up eventually:
    - because this is where we will put major new function)
    - because OS/2 "inherits" all DOS/WIN apps.

3. We need OS/2 to succeed as it is the platform on which our defence against long term threats (UNIX) is built. Windows must pay the light bills, but we have to hit the targets in terms of market share that we have laid out for OS/2 (10% in 1990, etc). The danger if we do not, is that we "burn" the ISV's who have invested in PM, we open ourselves to the perception that the PC market does not offer stability and continuity, high returns for ISV's etc. UNIX begins to look less random, our ability to control the RISC market is weakened, etc.

Right now we are blessed with an incredible investment by ISV's in OS/2 - unfortunately the fruit of this investment wont be felt until mid'90 (although we can start merchandising it now - see comment above).

How do we blow this? We blow it if the "feedback loop" of Apps shipments and OS shipments fails to get started and be self-sustaining in 1990.

4   So what can we do to avoid burning ourselves:

a. Position Windows 3 as firmly as transition path to OS/2 - this means when we announce Windows 3, we need to:
    - announce OS/2 versions of key MS apps
    - announce Porthole direction
    - make statement of things we will "not" do in Windows but will do in OS/2 - principally 32bit, Objects, Security, RISC.

b. Never give evidence from MS of lack of belief in OS/2:
    - whenever we talk about Windows, make the above positioning abundantly clear.
    - the toughest and most delicate forum for us to do this will be the way we announce and position our coming suite of Win Apps, and the Comdex Win 3 announce.

c. Really crank up a PR campaign around the theme "OS/2 - the Apps are coming/here, the Corporations are committing". Lazarus claims to have good evidence of this based on the call-down he did on OS/2 SDK customers.

From paulma Wed Aug   9 17:27:19 1989
To: billg cameronm nathanm petern steveb