

Re: My predictions for 2004-2005

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2004-04/0683.html>

From: Arthur Hoornweg (arthur.hoornweg_at_wanadoo.nl.net)

Date: 04/05/04

Date: Mon, 05 Apr 2004 16:22:39 +0200

Oliver Townshend wrote:

- > *MS will release a version that can run on a 64 bit machine that is*
- > *compatible with Intel 32-IA chips and AMD/64 bits. They won't waste their*
- > *time with multiple machines.*

Sorry, you're dead wrong here. You can already download the 64-bit beta version of WinXP/AMD on Microsoft's site.

- >>- *Intel will start producing AMD/64 compatible chips, gnashing*
- >> *their teeth. And finally implement an integrated memory*
- >> *management unit after paying a license fee to AMD.*
- >
- >
- > *I'm sorry, haven't they already announced they are going to do this?*

Announced, yes, but so far it's vaporware. No chips in sight, no motherboards in sight. Windows XP/64 is going to be ready before Intel have their stuff ready. Eight months to go before christmas and the clock is ticking...

- >>- *Visual Studio .NET 2004 or 2005 contains at least one native*
- >> *compiler for AMD/64.*
- >
- > *Doubt it. Maybe a .Net assembly for the AMD.*

Microsoft already uses the 64-bit C++ compiler internally to compile Windows XP/64. The code name of the product is "Whidbey".

See:

<http://msdn.microsoft.com/vstudio/productinfo/roadmap.aspx#language>

- >
- >>- *MSOffice 2005 will appear in two *native* versions, 32-bit*
- >> *and 64-bit. Definitely not good for the credibility of the*
- >> *.NET platform.*
- > *Absolutely not. If it was going to happen, it would already have been*
- > *announced and/or rumoured. It will still be 32 bit and will be the final*

> *non .Net version.*

Porting MSOffice to .NET just for the sake of .NET makes little sense. Too many existing applications depend on the COM interfaces in Office.

Moreover, "managed C++" has little appeal over "normal" C++ and a porting to C#, the .NET language of choice, would take a lot of time.

OTOH, porting MSoffice to the 64-bit world shouldn't be too difficult, the API's are almost identical. MS has plenty of experience with that process (even Windows 2000 exists in a 64-bit variety).

Is .NET so sexy, then?

.Net may be a great innovation in the eyes of developers, but it has *zero* sex appeal to the average computing person. Yet Another Kludge from Microsoft. Every "innovation" from Microsoft so far only made the operating system bigger, slower and bulkier.

Currently many of us give away 50% or more of our CPU- and hard disk power to an anti-virus program and personal firewall only because the operating system, e-mail client and browser are as leaky as a bucket. What a *waste* of money and resources!

And haven't you noticed, the very moment you start Internet Explorer it begins trying to sell you stuff. This will only become worse if websites start to communicate among each other through dotnet applets. The true purpose of .NET is to transform the internet into a huge sales platform.

> *These are the same organisations that sell crap PCs with Video Cards good enough to play Doom 1 on? Autocad might be a killer version, but how many people will use it?*

64-bit PC's are especially good on matrix operations and memory management. We're all in the Matrix... Applications that profit from this are stuff like games, video- and 3d apps.

The 64-bit killer apps for the home user will certainly be video games and video authoring software. For the professional "workstation user" it is Autocad.

For the average "office user" bashing in letters and spreadsheets it is totally uninteresting wether his PC runs at 32 or 64 bits or if the graphics card supports 3d or not.

> *Centrino technology will take over, with more core tasks integrated into a low voltage CPU set, including a minimal subset of AMD 64 bit commands.*

- > *This will become the baseline ubiquitous computer as people realize that the*
- > *current 32 bit power they have is sufficient for most tasks and they don't*
- > *need a million megahertz to get jobs done.*

My workhorse is already a Centrino 1.3 GHz notebook. I love the Centrino. Should 64-bit become mainstream, I'll only need the 64-bit command set for development, not for speed. For the rest, I'm perfectly satisfied with Centrino power and -consumption. It's the best CPU ever designed as far as I'm concerned. On my 2.4 GHz home PC, however, I do a lot of home movie processing, it often spends the whole night rendering mpeg-2. I really wouldn't mind a few more frames per kilowatt.

And do not underestimate the *gamers*. I mean the guys who watercool their PC's and put in neon lights. They're a *very* profitable market. They are the key target. They'll buy a new PC because it runs DOOM at 400 frames per second rather than 200. A 64-bit PC is a perfect phallic symbol.

- >>- *Some company or maybe the open source community will make*
- >> *native versions of C# and parts of the .NET framework*
- >> *"because the language is so elegant".*
- >
- >
- > *Isn't that already happening?*

No. The open source community is developing a Linux version of Dotnet AKA Mono. What I'm talking about is a C# compiler that produces native 32 or 64 bit code rather than MSIL.

--

Arthur Hoornweg
(please remove the ".net" from my e-mail address)