

Re: Stolen designs

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-06/msg03201.html>

- *From:* Keith <krw@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 14 Jun 2006 16:40:09 -0400
-

In article <44905f8c\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, david@xxxxxxxx says...

dagmargoodboat@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Keith wrote:

In article
<59ru829m1p0u7iui8luip9tib5sh4dq0c@xxxxxxxx>,
gfretwell@xxxxxxxx says...

On 13 Jun 2006 21:08:21 +0200, David
<david@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

On Mon, 12
Jun 2006
17:19:01
GMT,
mzenier@xxxxxxxx
(Mark
Zenier)
wrote:

Microsoft
was
a
half
a
dozen
guys
eating
Pizza
in
Albuquerque,
and

Re: Stolen designs

IBM
was
in
full
"we
invent
everything
we
need"
mode
back
when
the
8086
was
cooked
up.

It always
seemed to
me that
both
Microsoft
and Intel
were out of
the
mainstream
of
computing,
which is
why we
wound up
locked into
the
bizarre,
short-sighted
kluges we
have today.
If IBM had
picked the
68K
and Digital
Research...

John

The IBM engineers wanted
the 68k – it was vastly
better suited for the

Re: Stolen designs

job. But some suit decided the 68k was too expensive, and the 8088 was cheaper. It didn't matter that it was old-fashioned and a poor design even when it was made, since they didn't plan on selling more than a few thousand machines anyway. The original PC was just a marketing experiment, to help find out what the market really needed – then they would re-design it with a sensible choice of processor.

The strange thing is IBM had plenty of 68k experience. It was the engine in a lot of IBM custom built test equipment and the Personal Terminal (an 80s version of the blackberry) that every field guy carried was 68k based.

Intel was selected for business reasons, not technical ones, nor price.

—
Keith

Yes, the "business reasons" being that Motorola wasn't delivering—and kept slipping—the debut of the 68008. I was designing an RTU (Remote Terminal Unit) at exactly that time, and was forced to the 8088—against my will and preference—for the same reason.

James Arthur

Failure to deliver is a valid technical reason – the IBM decision to pick the 8088 was not for such important reasons. A main part of it was price, but there were probably other "political" reasons too. The technical guys did not want a 68008 either – they wanted a 68000 with the full 16-bit databus.

It doesn't mater squat what the geeks wanted. They weren't getting

Re: Stolen designs

Moto. Price had nothing to do with it.

—

Keith

.