

Re: help with huge memory consumption??

## Re: help with huge memory consumption??

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.linux.development.system/2007-03/msg00155.html>

---

- *From:* "David Schwartz" <[davids@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:davids@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 12 Mar 2007 01:56:48 -0700
- 

On Mar 11, 12:17 pm, Rainer Weikusat <[rainer.weiku...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rainer.weiku...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

"David Schwartz" <[dav...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dav...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> writes:

On Mar 9, 6:07 am, Rainer Weikusat <[rainer.weiku...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rainer.weiku...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Trivial counterexample:

Your trivial counterexample is completely non-optimized.

It didn't have a purpose except demonstrating that your general statement is logically wrong.

It's the exception that proves the rule. You have to be completely unrealistic to come up with a counter-example.

I'm not denying that you might be able to come up with some totally unreasonable and unrealistic situation in which what you say is the case. I'm saying that saying what you said in the context in which you said it is unreasonable and likely to mislead.

When people are talking about multi-threaded versus multi-process approaches, it is completely nonsensical to compare the cost of creating a thread to the cost of creating a process. There is virtually no realistic case where you can either do one of one or one of the other. Dozens of performance issues would come first, yet for some reason, everyone brings this stinker up as if it had any real relevance.

It is purely misleading.

DS

Re: help with huge memory consumption??

Re: help with huge memory consumption??