

Re: Seeing VERSIONINFO under Vista?

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VC/microsoft.public.vc.mfc/2007-05/msg02176.html>

- *From:* Daniel James <wastebasket@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 29 May 2007 12:33:30 +0100
-

In article news:<27r1531h1adc519sf927fn5jbria222f2t@xxxxxxx>, Joseph M. Newcomer wrote:

That was not a relevant consideration. The PC was seen as a "niche product" that would NOT be a serious threat to the main business. The fact that it became so was totally unexpected. You are asking a company to have made different judgments in retrospect, and that is not possible.

Not at all. This very interesting side-discussion started when you said "Don't blame IBM". I'm just explaining why I do blame IBM.

In particular, I blame IBM for not understanding that the PC was NOT a "niche product" --- I bet a lot of IBM execs have blamed themselves for that, over the years, too.

This is all a little unfair of me as IBM is (and was) not an individual, but a huge company with many departments, some of which undoubtedly did have a good idea how successful the PC would be and what its potential would be, while others clearly didn't. However, that there was no overall planning and no coordination of these different departments' efforts is ... IBM's fault.

I'm certainly not "asking [anyone] to have made different judgements in retrospect" --- just assigning the blame where I see it as being due.

Remember, we are looking at chips that had maximum clock speeds of around 2MHz, but the PC, using a 4.77MHz chip, actually EXCEEDED almost anyother "personal computers" of its day.

Well, ... a Z80 actually ran at 2, 4, or 6 MHz (depending on model) and a 4MHz Z80A did most things faster than a 4.77MHz 8088, but I take your point that the PC ran at a faster clock speed than all the 8080, 8085, and 6502 machines