

Re: Intel rejects Vista, will stay with XP and wait for windows7

Re: Intel rejects Vista, will stay with XP and wait for windows7

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-06/msg04905.html>

- *From:* Guy Macon <<http://www.GuyMacon.com/>>
 - *Date:* Fri, 27 Jun 2008 15:38:43 +0000
-

MooseFET wrote:

NeoPax >wrote:

Eeyore wrote:

Jan Panteltje wrote:

Intel rejects Vista, will stay with XP and
wait for windows7

Why change from XP ever ?

More than 3GB RAM

If you have 4G Vista consumes an extra 1G of overhead, if you have 10G
it uses up 7G. It carefully makes sure you never come out ahead.

Do you have a source documenting the above claim? If it were true,
I expect that everybody would be complaining about it.

BTW, I consider my OS to be a critical business tool, so I don't
run XP *or* Vista.

My main OS is currently Slackware. I also have an Asus Eee with

Re: Intel rejects Vista, will stay with XP and wait for windows7

Re: Intel rejects Vista, will stay with XP and wait for windows7

the original version of Linux on it, and I plan to switch it to running EeeXubuntu soon.

I never ran Windows 95 or 98. Instead I ran Windows NT Server.

I never ran Windows 2000. Instead I ran Windows 2000 Advanced Server.

I am now running Windows server 2003 x64 instead of XP or XP x64.

If I upgrade, it will be to Windows server 2008 x64, not Vista.

And I am doing as much work as possible -- on Linux and on Windows -- inside of VMWare Workstation Virtual Machines.

Others appear to have come to the same conclusions that I came to about Vista vs, Server 2008:

<http://www.itwriting.com/blog/581-windows-server-2008-is-better-than-vista-but-why.html>

<http://www.itwriting.com/blog/596-vista-sp1-vs-server-2008-as-a-desktop-os-more-comparisons.html>

<http://rabdullin.com/using-windows-server-2008-64-bit-as-development-workstation/>

--

Guy Macon

<<http://www.GuyMacon.com/>>

.