

## Re: C++ vs C

**Source:** [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.cpp/2005-02/1915.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.cpp/2005-02/1915.html)

---

**From:** Chris Hills ([chris\\_at\\_phaedsys.org](mailto:chris_at_phaedsys.org))

**Date:** 02/14/05

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 22:49:10 +0000

In article <1108412893.697653@athnrd02>, Ioannis Vranos  
<[ivr@remove.this.grad.com](mailto:ivr@remove.this.grad.com)> writes

>Julie wrote:

>

>> *In my personal embedded development experience, compared to C++, C is  
>> the preferred language: smaller code and less buggy compilers*

>

>

>*I have no experience of embedded programming, and just from curiosity,  
>what kind of embedded devices do you have in mind? (For example I have  
>in mind mainly Pocket PC handhelds with Windows CE and compact .net  
>framework).*

Most embedded engineers would see a Pocket PC as a small PC not an embedded system. For serious embedded work WIN CE and .net is not an option. Many embedded systems have a MTBF of 20 years. re-boots are not an option.

The vast majority of embedded systems use 8 bit processors and have no OS. About 60% of all processors produced are 8 bit I think. The average car has over 50 embedded processors in it. Also virtually anything with electric power on it usually has an embedded MCU (or two) in it. Washing machines, microwaves, phones, hi-fi, missiles, torpedoes, locks, elevators, any control or monitoring system, alarms,

^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^  
\\ \\ \\ Chris Hills Staffs England \\ \\ \\  
\\ \\ \\ [chris@phaedsys.org](mailto:chris@phaedsys.org) [www.phaedsys.org](http://www.phaedsys.org) \\ \\ \\  
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^