I think it is critical to make mine most of this notion IBM is spreading around that OS/2 is better Windows than Windows. Specifically we have to have concrete features that are neat in Windows that just aren't present in OS/2 2.0. It makes no sense that we don't have anything to point to. Let me give some examples:

1. 32-bit applications. Does IBM have win32? If applications can make DPMI calls I don't understand how the operating system is protected from bad application behavior - anyone who can set up and change selectors can bring the whole system down easily. If 32-bit applications don't run then let's take some cool stuff in 32-bit form and make it freeware as well as get the major vendors to ship 32-bit versions and tout the performance.

2. Fonts. Will IBM have the truetype rasterizer? If not let's make sure lots of truetype fonts ship when 3.1 does - not just the ones we bundle but lots of other fonts. I suppose they can add truetype in but let's say a lot of the standard help thing we ship with Windows is in a font only available in truetype which we control (no font with same width tables and glyphs) anyone who tries to look at that stuff under OS/2 it will look wrong.

3. Code pages. Since IBM uses the strange approach to code pages in OS/2 doesn't that create some incompatibility with Windows?

4. Metafile exchange - doesn't this break or show bad results or speed?

5. Device drivers. Can we get there to be lots of device drivers they can't do anything with?

We should design some of our extensions explicitly so that IBM can't run them under OS/2. We need to put some real thinking into this. They think they get to clone us forever based on the stupid marketing slogan. We have to humiliate such a claim.

At least we have to have some great 3.1 dependent stuff. Also we need to diverge our user interface from theirs. What does an app do not to run under OS/2?

I would like to get together to discuss how we get this cloning off our back and make it visible.