

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

TIM and PENNY PATERSON, husband
and wife and the marital community
thereof,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

LITTLE, BROWN AND COMPANY, a
Massachusetts state corporation, TIME
WARNER BOOK GROUP, a Delaware
state corporation, HAROLD EVANS
ASSOCIATES LLC, a New York state
limited liability company, HAROLD
EVANS AND JANE DOE EVANS,
husband and wife and the marital
community thereof, GAIL BUCKLAND
and JOHN DOE BUCKLAND, wife and
husband and the marital community
thereof, and DAVID LEFER and JANE
DOE LEFER, husband and wife and the
marital community thereof,

Defendants.

NO. 2:05-CV-1719-TSZ

**DECLARATION OF TIM
PATERSON IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION
TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

1 I, Tim Paterson, hereby declare I am over the age of eighteen, am competent to testify and have
2 personal knowledge of the following:

3 1. I am Plaintiff in the above-entitled matter.

4 2. I am the inventor and creator of an operating system known as DOS, 86-DOS or QDOS
5 that was licensed and eventually purchased by Microsoft and subsequently named MS-DOS.

6 3. I invented DOS while I was employed by Seattle Computer Products (hereinafter referred
7 to as "SCP") between 1978 and 1981. I designed a computer system using Intel's 8086
8 microprocessor chip. The 8086 computer system was initially sold with Microsoft's Stand-
9 Alone Disk BASIC as the primary software. However, we found that BASIC was useful to only
10 a specific group of computer users and was not set up to serve the real needs of commercial
11 users. We realized that we needed a different software program for our machine that would be
12 more useful to the public.

14 4. My idea to rectify the software problem was to write our own operating system. I
15 proposed a two-phase software development project: first, to create a quick and dirty operating
16 system (hereinafter referred to as "DOS") to fill the immediate need for SCP's computer; and,
17 second, to create a much more refined operating system that would be made available in both
18 single-user and multi-user versions.

19 5. I began working on DOS with the primary objective of making it as easy as possible for
20 software developers to write applications for it. To do so, I sought to make the application
21 program interface (hereinafter referred to as "API") compatible with CP/M to enable automated
22 translation of 8-bit programs into 16-bit programs. CP/M, the system created by Gary Kildall,
23
24
25

1 could not be run on 16 bit chips. But, since no one had yet developed an operating system to run
2 on 16 bit chips, there was no point of reference but CP/M.

3 6. I felt that CPM translation compatibility would significantly promote the adoption of
4 DOS by others in the computer industry, so I made it a primary design requirement.

5 7. The concept of translation compatibility was that if an 8-bit program for CP/M were
6 translated into a 16-bit program according to Intel's published rules, that program would execute
7 properly under DOS.

8 8. However, attempting to use Intel's rules on the 8086 chip resulted in a program that was,
9 in many cases, not better. So, the result was that no one used the process. No one used the
10 translation because this idea did not end up to be useful.

11 9. However, translation compatibility does not equal the code, which is obviously totally
12 different between CP/M and DOS. Defendant Evans used an analogy in his book about a car
13 being stolen. The better analogy is this: someone in the very early days of automobiles wanted
14 to design a better car. Existing cars had brakes, which consisted of a pedal that when depressed
15 would force a stick into the ground. The designer also had to use the concept of stopping a car,
16 and to use the label "brake," but thought it would be better to cause pads to adhere to discs
17 attached to the wheels. The label was the same, the pedal being depressed was the same, but the
18 mechanism by which the function was accomplished was completely different. Same label,
19 same trigger, but totally and fundamentally different mechanics. Translation compatibility
20 represents having the same control, such as a brake, perform the equivalent function but in a
21 completely different way. The code which implements the function was a stick dragging on the
22 ground in CP/M, but a disc brake in DOS.
23
24
25

1
2 10. There are major differences between Kildall's CP/M and DOS.

3 a. File storage, which represented 80% of the code in DOS, was completely different
4 in DOS. The system I designed was much faster and minimized overhead. Disks
5 were not interchangeable between CP/M and DOS because of the improved file
6 format. Defendant Evans misinterpreted this statement about percentages of code
7 to imply that the remaining 20% of the code is the same as CP/M. This is not
8 true.

9
10 b. DOS had rudimentary built-in editing, which represented about 15% of the code
11 in DOS. CP/M did not have such a function.

12 c. The remaining 5% of the code in DOS accounted for utilities, such as date and
13 time. Such functions were non-existent in CP/M.

14 11. Defendant Evans accused me of "rewrit[ing] the bottom part of the soft-ware – improving
15 the way files were stored and adapting the program to a 16-bit machine – while copying most of
16 the top part of Kildall's operating system interfacing mechanisms." (*See Declaration of Das,*
17 *Ex.B, p. 412*) However, I did not copy any of the code.

18 12. I did use CP/M as the model for the specific disk functions since I had decided to attempt
19 translation compatibility. The functions themselves, such as the facilities to open, close, read,
20 and write, are present in any operating system. The implementation of these facilities is quite
21 different.

22
23 13. The specific elements of the API that were needed to be "translation compatible" do not
24 constitute an "architecture".

1 14. I never used a debugger or any other tool to look inside CP/M. It is obvious that the
2 internal architecture of DOS (the FAT file system) is so completely different from CP/M that
3 there would be no point in studying CP/M.

4 15. I never saw CP/M source code.

5 16. I never saw CP/M binary code.

6 17. I did use the CP/M Interface Guide to aid in developing the translation compatible
7 interface in DOS.

8 18. DOS is not a version of Kildall's CP/M program.

9 19. I have no problem with Kildall being credited for CP/M. But, I wrote DOS. He didn't.

10 20. I did not steal, "clone," "rip off," borrow, or "take a ride on" the code from CP/M.

11 21. Any novice programmer or end user would be very well aware of some of the many
12 differences between CP/M and DOS. There are, of course, similarities, just as there are
13 similarities between a hundred dollar car and a hundred thousand dollar car. But, nobody would
14 or should be confused or mistake one for the other.

15 22. I have put together the following table to illustrate some of the many differences between
16 CP/M and DOS.
17

| Operating System Features | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | CP/M 2.2 | DOS |
| Target processor | 8-bit 8080 or Z80 | 16-bit 8086 or 8088 |
| Maximum memory (bytes) | 65,536 | 1,048,576 |
| Source language | PL/M & 8080 assembler | 8086 assembler |
| Standard OS function call | CALL 5 | INT 21H |
| OS function parameters | C = function no. DE = data pointer | AH = function no. DS:DX = data pointer CX = count (fcn. 39 & 40) |
| File format | Proprietary | FAT (still standard on memory cards, thumb drives, floppy |

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
| | | disks, etc.) |
| Max file size (bytes) | 33,554,432 | 66,928,640 |

| File Control Block | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| FCB byte offset | CP/M 2.2 | DOS |
| 0 | Drive | Drive |
| 1 – 11 | File Name | File Name |
| 12 | Extent | File position (bits 7-14) |
| 13 | reserved | File position (bits 15-22) |
| 14 | reserved | Record size (low byte) |
| 15 | Record count | Record size (high byte) |
| 16 – 19 | Disk allocation map | File size |
| 20 – 21 | Disk allocation map | Date |
| 22 – 23 | Disk allocation map | Time |
| 24 | Disk allocation map | Device ID |
| 25 – 26 | Disk allocation map | First cluster |
| 27 – 28 | Disk allocation map | Last cluster accessed |
| 29 – 30 | Disk allocation map | Position of last cluster |
| 31 | Disk allocation map | not used |
| 32 | Next record | File position (bits 0-6) |
| 33 – 35 | Random record | Random record (bits 0-23) |
| 36 | not used | Random record (bits 24-32) |

| Hardware Disk Interface | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | CP/M 2.2 | DOS |
| Disk read sequence | SELDSK (C=drive) SETTRK (BC=track) SECTRAN (BC=sector, DE=table) SETSEC (BC=sector) SETDMA (BC=address) READ repeat for each sector in sequence | READ (AL=drive, CX=number of sectors, DX=logical sector, DS:BX=address) all sectors read at once |

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Track read time (8") | 0.981 seconds | 0.167 seconds |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|

| Line Editing | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | CP/M 2.2 | DOS |
| Delete last character | Rubout, backspace | Rubout, backspace |
| Delete line | ctrl-U, ctrl-X | ctrl-X |
| Physical end-of-line | ctrl-E | Linefeed |
| Retype line | ctrl-R | N/A |
| Copy 1 char from template | N/A | F1 |
| Copy up to char from template | N/A | F2 |
| Copy remaining template | N/A | F3 |
| Skip 1 char in template | N/A | F4 |
| Skip up to chare in template | N/A | F5 |
| Enter insert mode | N/A | Blue |
| Exit insert mode | N/A | Red |
| Edit new line | N/A | Gray |

23. Kildall's CP/M relied heavily on commands used in the DECsystem, the operating system used on the PDP-10 computer made by Digital Equipment Corporation. These are the same commands I am accused of "ripping off" from Kildall. I have illustrated below some of those commands:

| DOS | CP/M | PDP-10 | Description |
|------------|--------|--------|--|
| dir | dir | direct | Display listing of file directory |
| rename/ren | ren | rename | Rename file |
| erase/del | era | delete | Delete file |
| type | type | type | List contents of file on screen |
| copy | pip | pip | Copy files |
| clear | n/a | n/a | Wipe disk clean |
| asm | asm | macro | Assemble a program |
| trans | n/a | n/a | Translate Z80 program to 8086 |
| hex2bin | load | load | Convert hex or object file to binary |
| n/a | save | save | Save memory image to file |
| sys | sysgen | n/a | Put bootable OS on a disk |
| chkdsk | stat | systat | Display disk or system status |
| edlin | ed | lined | Start the editing program |
| debug | ddt | ddt | Start the debugging program |
| n/a | submit | submit | Start batch processing of a command list |
| n/a | dump | dump | List contents of a file as hex bytes |
| n/a | movcpm | n/a | Relocate OS to match memory size |

24. In conclusion, I have been available to discuss, explain, and opine on any issue having to do with the origin of DOS. On occasion, having been involved in DOS's genesis, I have been interviewed by limited-circulation technical magazines. These reporters have had no difficulty finding me. I have a published phone number. I am able to be found on the worldwide web. I continue to be in business in the same general area of computers. But, I have never been contacted by Defendant Evans in person or by any of his research staff or any agent of

1 Defendant Little Brown and Company prior to publication of the book, *They Made America*.

2 Therefore, I was given no chance to explain and clarify my position on the context of the
3 statements I may or may not have made to the interviewers referred to above.

4 25. As a result of this book being published without my ability to clarify the slanderous and
5 libelous phrases and misconceptions, I have been harmed economically and I have been
6 ridiculed with respect to my standing in the community. Defendants have called into question
7 my integrity, honesty and my very place in history. These outrageous comments have also
8 harmed me emotionally.
9

10 I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED
11 STATES OF AMERICA THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND ACCURATE.

12 Dated this 16th day of April, 2007.

13
14
15 
16 Tim Paterson