From: Brad Chase
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 1996 1:44 PM
To: Yusuf Mehdi; Charles Fitzgerald; Thomas Reardon; Ben Slivka
Cc: Tod Nielsen; Chris Jones (Exchange); Bob Muglia; Tom Button; Nancy Malm
Subject: RE: norvin leach, PC week, called re: HTML futures from MS and Navigator -- trying to paint a conflict

we should all sit down and make sure we are on the same page.

i'd like to do this right after thanksgiving. nancy pls drive

----Original Message----
From: Yusuf Mehdi
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 1996 7:40 PM
To: Charles Fitzgerald; Thomas Reardon; Ben Slivka
Cc: Brad Chase; Adam Bosworth; Internet Explorer Press Issues; Scott Isaacs; Chris Jones (Exchange); Gaby Adam (Internet) (Waggener Edstrom); Bob Muglia
Subject: RE: norvin leach, PC week, called re: HTML futures from MS and Navigator -- trying to paint a conflict

Not sure if there is a policy on what we talk about in terms of extending Java, but there seems to be a lot of interest in the fragmentation of stds with future versions of our development technologies as supported in our browsers. Here are my thoughts from the side lines of java battle and some press conversations as well as from chatting with thomasre.

In terms of our support for Java, I would say:
** We are committed and delivering on providing the best way to author and run java applets - via our Java VM and VJ++ tool.*
** If we can get away with it, I would no comment on our Java class extensions. If pressed I would say that there is industry agreement that the Java VM is limited. Since Java is not in a standards body, it makes it harder to gain consensus but we will collaborate with vendors like Sun and ultimately the market will decide. (sun has cross license on vm work)*

I don't think we should push or publicize our java class work or the fragmentation that is occuring with Java in the industry. Instead we should point the the VM and VJ++ work as examples of our support. Also, I don't think we should be saying that we are making Windows the best way to run Java apps. This sounds like we are coopting Java.

Java battle is very different from the HMTL/Scripting battle in that we can say support the W3C standard and we will adhere to it as witnessed in our pledge.

----Original Message----
From: Thomas Reardon
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 1996 5:35 PM
To: Ben Slivka
Cc: Adam Bosworth; Internet Explorer Press Issues; Scott Isaacs; Chris Jones (Exchange); Gaby Adam (Internet) (Waggener Edstrom); Bob Muglia
Subject: RE: norvin leach, PC week, called re: HTML futures from MS and Navigator -- trying to paint a conflict

ATTORNEYS ONLY

MSS 0163259
CONFIDENTIAL

ok, i just did a followup call, brought in the javascript issues.

this is gonna be hard to discribe, but i basically told norvin i thought he was overfocusing on java issues, that they aren't reflecting the real public sentiment that netscape is creating a mess of java classes. but then i shifted and told him i thought that the most important 'consolidation' occuring in the industry was around HMTL + JavaScript and that he should be focusing more there. at first he pushed back but i think he bought in to the idea that there is more public investment in scripting than java right now and that consolidation is goodness.

he knew noothing about the javascript meeting, so i gave him the rundown including the naming stuff. he agreed that was news. he agreed that IE was making substantial market progress and that jscripts importance reflects that.

from there we talked about Trident vs. Nav4. he said that the market would fracture because we both will be beta before the standard is done. he said that there were no submissions at w3c (this is wrong, i pointed them out to him). in response to "what should webmasters follow?" i said simply "w3c". said everyone should avoid vendor bickering

GAO-Bayonne, N. J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
1332

and just follow the standard, pointed him to our "HTML Pledge" and explained it was critical for vendors to take that pledge if customers were to keep the faith. i think this played well, he liked that i kept pointing customers to w3c standards. emphasized that we would track the standard wherever it went; he accused us of being schizo with this vs. our java approach, i said he misunderstood that we are merely trying to add rich platform support to an interop layer. our java => win32 work is just like the HTML -> activex work we did with w3c (the OBJECT tag). this plays well.

as i told charlesf on the phone, at this point its not good to create MORE noise around our win32 java classes, instead we should just quietly grow j++ share and assume that people will take more advantage of our classes without ever realizing they are building win32-only java apps.

-thomas

—Original Message—
From: Ben Slivka
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 1996 5:00 PM
To: Thomas Reardon
Cc: Adam Bosworth; Internet Explorer Press Issues; Scott Isaacs; Chris Jones (Exchange)
Subject: norvin leach, PC week, called re: HTML futures from MS and Navigator -- trying to paint a conflict
Importance: High

Thomas, you might want to call/mail Norvin (Norvin_Leach@zd.com) to follow up...

I think Norvin is trying to write an article about how Netscape and Microsoft are fragmenting HTML, perhaps as a follow-up to this weeks "MS fragments Java" article. I tried to point him at how we are working very closely with the W3C to have a standard here, and that we hoped Netscape would, too.

Norvin started out asking me what MS was going to do about supporting Navigator 4's HTML extensions (style sheets + java script), and how MS planned to reconcile our Dynamic HTML with Nav 4's stuff.
I said we were working very closely with the W3C, the HTML Editorial Review Board, and that both MS and Netscape had submitted their specs, that there was a lot of commonality, and I was hopeful that Netscape would work with the standards process to arrive at a standard which both companies could implement in a compatible way.

Norvin asked me what the chance of this happening was, would it happen in time for the IE 4 and Nav 4 betas. I said I was hopeful, that the W3C process had worked very well for the <object> tag and the Cascading Style Sheets specs. MS was ahead of Nav in implementing these specs, but since Netscape was a full participant in these efforts, I expected Nav 4 to implement <object> and CSS level 1, as they had promised to.

Norvin said Netscape had told him they were not going to implement the MS Dynamic HTML stuff -- pretty open-minded position for them. :-)
--bens

ATTORNEYS ONLY

MSS 0163260
CONFIDENTIAL