

Re: System IRQ's

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.misc/2004-08/0118.html>

From: Kadaitcha Man (*nospam_at_rainx.cjb.net*)

Date: 08/04/04

Date: Wed, 04 Aug 04 06:08:32 +0545

JT wrote:

> *On Mon, 02 Aug 2004 17:19:34 GMT, "relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net>*

> *wrote:*

>

>> *JT wrote:*

>>> *On Sun, 01 Aug 2004 20:33:23 GMT, "relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net>*

>>> *wrote:*

>>>>

>>>> *DeMoN LaG wrote:*

>>>>> *"relic" <nospam@relic211.cjb.net> wrote in*

>>>>> *news:ptbPc.68611\$SO5.47788 @twister.socal.rr.com:*

>>>>>>

>>>>>> *Go ogle. It's ACPI.*

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> *ACPI and APIC are two different things. Go ogle yourself.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *There are 4 entries. NOTHING to do with System IRQ's is mentioned*

>>>>> *in them. That would be ACPI.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

<http://www.microsoft.com/whdc/system/sysperf/IO-APIC.msp#XSLTsection127121120120>

>>>>

>>>> *Microsofts info on APIC. Google for "APIC interupt" and you won't*

>>>> *get all the noise of non-related links*

>>>>

>>>>

>> *I probably sounded like I'm trying to argue that it's /not/ APIC,*

>> *it's that I saw advice to the OP about using APIC. I believe the*

>> *option in BIOS is ACPI, not APIC; at least it is on the motherboards*

>> *I've seen lately. You have to enable ACPI to get APIC.*

>

> *Depends heavily on the BIOS and what they have modified. APIC does*

> *not Have to depend on ACPI.*

>

> *You came across as though APIC didn't exist, which it very much does.*

sci.electronics.misc: Re: System IRQ's

You fucking gormles nong. That misses the point entirely. The fact remains, the yanKKKee-like Howdying fucktard named Walph, put his size 12 hobnail boot in his own gob and tried to swallow it.