

## Re: Damm Small Linux

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2004-11/6680.html>

---

**From:** Joel Kolstad (*JKolstad71HatesSpam\_at\_Yahoo.Com*)

**Date:** 11/27/04

Date: Sat, 27 Nov 2004 09:38:24 -0800

Joerg,

"Joerg" <notthisjoergsch@removethispacbell.net> wrote in message news:9oRpd.27531\$6q2.9653@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...

> *That is true. But with a (manually) switched parallel port I did pretty  
> much the same stuff as with USB.*

Fair enough, and I suppose I did too, but IMO USB is a much better interface than the parallel port ever was. People were constantly having problems with, e.g., scanners connected to dongles, multiple dongles stacked, printers piggybacked on scanners... ugggh!

A USB stack --- while far from trivial --- is also not too huge; I expect it could be readily achieved in <100k with some effort.

> *Multitasking with Windows is often a joke. I am using two PCs or more  
> simultaneously because one alone is too slow for me. You switch to another  
> window and then nothing happens for many seconds until a task in the other  
> one is finished.*

Under Windows XP, multi-tasking is pretty smooth so long as you don't have a program trying to hog all the CPU time (and so long as you haven't run out of RAM and Windows is swapping to the hard drive --- it crawls in such cases). Manually setting a program's priority lower using task manager does the trick. It would be nice if Windows were a little 'improved' in this regard; UNIX boxes don't seem to have this problem.

> *There were routines for DOS which let you do the same and also went past  
> the 1MB extender limit.*

Yeah, remember Desqview and Carousel? Pretty sweet programs, at the time.

> *There is a reason Bob Pease stuck with VW Bugs.*

A lot of people I know these days take these old cars and slap a third-party microcontroller-based engine control system on them! :-)

---Joel