

---

Subject: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [farren](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 1985 12:00:56 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: well.352  
Posted: Tue Dec 17 07:00:56 1985  
Date-Received: Fri, 20-Dec-85 00:44:25 EST  
References:  
Distribution: net  
Organization: Whole Earth Lectronic Link, Sausalito, CA  
Lines: 47  
Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1186 net.micro.atari:2015

In article , breuel@h-sc1.UUCP (thomas breuel) writes:

[color=blue]> It would be much more helpful if you stated WHY you believe that the[/color]  
[color=blue]> AMIGA is better than the ST. Since I may buy a new computer soon, I[/color]  
[color=blue]> would like to hear real information about the two machines. So far, the[/color]  
[color=blue]> main differences appear to be:[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> (a) the ST is half the price of the AMIGA.[/color]

Approximately true. Depends on whether you want color or not.

[color=blue]> (b) the AMIGA has better special-purpose graphics capabilities than the[/color]  
[color=blue]> ST, but at the expense of main CPU speed.[/color]

Absolutely false. The graphics capability is achieved with co-processors which tend to let the CPU run at full speed much more often than if the CPU were responsible for display updates. Note that the coprocessors also allow I/O to proceed independently of the CPU, as well.

[color=blue]> (c) the AMIGA graphics is said to be not usable at a [/color]  
[color=blue]> resolution of 640x400 for text or serious graphics applications.[/color]

Probably true, but only until monitors become available that address the special problems with 640 X 400 mode (using color - there are monochrome monitors which will work quite well at 640 X 400, and the ST, as I understand it, forces monochrome at that resolution anyway)

[color=blue]> (d) the AMIGA is said to be more expandable than the ST.[/color]

Yes. The AMIGA has the system bus available on a connector on the side of the machine, and expansion cards are already becoming available.

[color=blue]> (e) the AMIGA has a multitasking operating system. Definitely a big plus,[/color]  
[color=blue]> but as soon as OS9 is available for either machine, this does not[/color]  
[color=blue]> matter anymore.[/color]

Perhaps, perhaps not. The Amiga's OS ( NOT the AmigaDOS, but the underlying kernal ) was specifically designed to take advantage of the large amount of intelligence held in the coprocessors. Unless the OS9 implementation is done VERY well, it probably will lose in efficiency. Note that OS9 was probably not designed for a high-power graphics environment, and Amiga's EXEC was.

--

Mike Farren  
uucp: {dual, hplabs}!well!farren  
Fido: Sci-Fido, Fidonode 125/84, (415)655-0667  
USnail: 390 Alcatraz Ave., Oakland, CA 94618

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [freed](#) on Wed, 18 Dec 1985 16:44:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: aum.409  
Posted: Wed Dec 18 11:44:34 1985  
Date-Received: Sat, 21-Dec-85 01:23:32 EST  
References:  
Distribution: net  
Organization: The Aurora Systems Bunch  
Lines: 41  
Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1215 net.micro.atari:2050

[color=teal]>> (b) the AMIGA has better special-purpose graphics capabilities than the[/color]  
[color=teal]>> ST, but at the expense of main CPU speed.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> Absolutely false. The graphics capability is achieved with co-processors[/color]  
[color=blue]> which tend to let the CPU run at full speed much more often than if the[/color]  
[color=blue]> CPU were responsible for display updates. Note that the coprocessors[/color]  
[color=blue]> also allow I/O to proceed independently of the CPU, as well.[/color]

how do you explain the much better drystone results of the ST?  
(the compiler can not be the only thing responsible)

[color=teal]>> (c) the AMIGA graphics is said to be not usable at a [/color]  
[color=teal]>> resolution of 640x400 for text or serious graphics applications.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> Probably true, but only until monitors become available that address[/color]  
[color=blue]> the special problems with 640 X 400 mode (using color - there are mono-[/color]  
[color=blue]> chrome monitors which will work quite well at 640 X 400, and the ST, as I[/color]

[color=blue]> understand it, forces monochrome at that resolution anyway)[/color]

A \*BIG\* point about the ST is that 640 x 400, non-interlaced monochrome creates a very good looking window environment that the AMIGA cannot match.

[color=teal]>> (e) the AMIGA has a multitasking operating system. Definitely a big plus,[/color]  
[color=teal]>> but as soon as OS9 is available for either machine, this does not[/color]  
[color=teal]>> matter anymore.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> Perhaps, perhaps not. The Amiga's OS ( NOT the AmigaDOS, but the  
under-[/color]  
[color=blue]> lying kernal ) was specifically designed to take advantage of the large[/color]  
[color=blue]> amount of intelligence held in the coprocessors. Unless the OS9 imple-[/color]  
[color=blue]> mentation is done VERY well, it probably will lose in efficiency. Note[/color]  
[color=blue]> that OS9 was probably not designed for a high-power graphics  
environment,[/color]  
[color=blue]> and Amiga's EXEC was.[/color]

I do not think that your argument here is complete. It seems that I could argue similarly in favor of the ST.

--

-----  
Erik James Freed

Aurora Systems

San Francisco, CA

{dual,ptsfa}!aum!freed

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [breuel](#) on Wed, 18 Dec 1985 19:36:41 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: h-sc1.845  
Posted: Wed Dec 18 14:36:41 1985  
Date-Received: Fri, 20-Dec-85 05:34:17 EST  
References:  
Distribution: net  
Organization: Harvard Univ. Science Center  
Lines: 45  
Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1208 net.micro.atari:2033

Thank you very much for replying to my questions. Since I believe that other potential buyers might be intersted in this discussion, I am following up to the net.

|(b) the AMIGA has better special-purpose graphics capabilities than the  
| ST, but at the expense of main CPU speed.

| Absolutely false. The graphics capability is achieved with co-processors  
| which tend to let the CPU run at full speed much more often than if the  
| CPU were responsible for display updates. Note that the coprocessors  
| also allow I/O to proceed independently of the CPU, as well.

Let me state the question more precisely: is there any difference in  
speed between the ST and the AMIGA when either machine is just  
displaying a bit image, without any active painting or sound production?

|(c) the AMIGA graphics is said to be not usable at a  
| resolution of 640x400 for text or serious graphics applications.

| Probably true, but only until monitors become available that address  
| the special problems with 640 X 400 mode (using color - there are mono-  
| chrome monitors which will work quite well at 640 X 400, and the ST, as I  
| understand it, forces monochrome at that resolution anyway)

Again, let me state the question more precisely. I thought the problem  
with the AMIGA 640x400 display is that it is interlaced, and that therefore  
every line only gets re-freshed at a rate of 30Hz. The only way to  
'fix' this would be to use high-persistence phosphors, clearly not  
a desirable solution. Is this true? How does the ST deal with  
this problem?

And there are a few more questions that came to my mind in the meantime:

- are there MacWrite type word processors available for either machine?  
How easy are they to adapt to a specific printer?
- what terminal emulators are available for the two machines? Are  
they reliable? What protocols do they support for file transfer?
- what graphics design programs (in the style of MacDraw) are available  
for either machine? How usable are they?
- what is the scoop on the difference between disk capacity and disk  
speed between the ST and the AMIGA?
- are there versions of either machine which will work with BOTH  
120/220V 50/60Hz?

Thanks,  
Thomas.

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [bobh](#) on Thu, 19 Dec 1985 15:53:30 GMT

Article-I.D.: pedsgd.382

Posted: Thu Dec 19 10:53:30 1985

Date-Received: Fri, 20-Dec-85 05:37:57 EST

References:

Distribution: net

Organization: CONCURRENT Computer Corp, Tinton Falls, NJ

Lines: 31

Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1210 net.micro.atari:2035

In article farren@well.UUCP (Mike Farren) writes:

[color=blue]> In article , breuel@h-sc1.UUCP (thomas breuel) writes:[/color]

[color=teal]>> It would be much more helpful if you stated WHY you believe that the[/color]

[color=teal]>> AMIGA is better than the ST. Since I may buy a new computer soon, I[/color]

[color=teal]>> would like to hear real information about the two machines. So far, the[/color]

[color=teal]>> main differences appear to be:[/color]

[color=teal]>> [/color]

[color=teal]>> (b) the AMIGA has better special-purpose graphics capabilities than the[/color]

[color=teal]>> ST, but at the expense of main CPU speed.[/color]

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> Absolutely false. The graphics capability is achieved with co-processors[/color]

[color=blue]> which tend to let the CPU run at full speed much more often than if the[/color]

[color=blue]> CPU were responsible for display updates. Note that the coprocessors[/color]

[color=blue]> also allow I/O to proceed independently of the CPU, as well.[/color]

Granted, the graphics chips relieve the 68000 from dealing with the display, as it must in the Mac, but the 68000 and the various co-processors must still contend for access to memory. YES, I/O can proceed independently, etc., but only ONE of the processors can use memory at a time. This HAS to impact the throughput of the 68000.

BTW, the ST also has an I/O co-processor, so presence vs. non-presence arguments in favor of the Amiga are inappropriate.

Bob Halloran

=====  
===

UUCP: {decvax, ucbvax, most Action Central}!vax135\  
      {pesnta, topaz, princeton}!petsd!pedsgd!bobh

Disclaimer: My opinions are my own.

Quote: "When the going gets weird, the weird turn pro..." -- Hunter Thompson

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA

Posted by [bruceb](#) on Thu, 19 Dec 1985 19:29:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: amiga.421

Posted: Thu Dec 19 14:29:05 1985

Date-Received: Sat, 21-Dec-85 04:42:31 EST

References:

Reply-To: [bruceb@hunter.UUCP](mailto:bruceb@hunter.UUCP) (Bruce Barrett)

Distribution: net

Organization: Commodore-Amiga Inc., 983 University Ave #D, Los Gatos CA 95030

Lines: 40

Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1220 net.micro.atari:2052

In article [breuel@h-sc1.UUCP](mailto:breuel@h-sc1.UUCP) (thomas breuel) writes:

[\[color=blue\]> -- are there MacWrite type word processors available for either machine?\[/color\]](#)

(Answers given for Amiga computer, note my bias)

Textcraft is the only thing I am aware of. It is oriented toward "home" or "new small business" use. On a 256k machine it can handle about 6-10 pages of text. One font in many styles (bold, italics,...) is supported.

[\[color=blue\]> How easy are they to adapt to a specific printer?\[/color\]](#)

Trivial if you select one of the "standard" supported printers:

Alphapro 101, Brother HR15xl, CBM MPS1000, Diablo (630, Advantage, C-150), Epson (fx series and JX80), HP laserjet (and plus), Okimate 20, Qume leterpro 20.

If you do not select any of the above you can select "generic".

NOTE: All "right-thinking" software uses standard Amiga (ISO, DEC, Amiga) escape sequences to the PRT: device. If the attached printer can do the requested operation the Amiga "translates" the command for the printer and issues it. Printer independent software is a snap! (The "generic" printer is assumed to have no features.)

[\[color=blue\]> -- what terminal emulators are available for the two machines? Are\[/color\]](#)

[\[color=blue\]> they reliable? What protocols do they support for file transfer?\[/color\]](#)

Several available, see past postings. Companies posted include:

Micro-Systems Software, IncModem7/Xmodem, XmodemCRC, and

Hayes-Smartcomm file xfer protocols

ELCom's EITerm data communications package. both KERMIT and

XMODEM built in. ansi terminal emulation

Maxicorp, Maxicomm package.

Commodore is marketing one also.

[\[color=blue\]> -- what graphics design programs \(in the style of MacDraw\) are available\[/color\]](#)

[\[color=blue\]> for either machine? How usable are they?\[/color\]](#)

Graphicraft (Commodore Amiga) and Delux Paint from Electronic arts.

Both seem to have the limitation the the painting cannot exceed the size of the screen. EA supports 640x400 (interlaced).

You may want/need more than 512k of RAM.

--BruceB

Disclaimer: I work for Commodore-Amiga. I have played with TextCraft and Graphicraft alot, but not with Deluxe Paint or any of the Comm packages. Everything above is, undoubtedly TM or Registered. I hope all of the above companies prosper and continue to come out with new produces for the Amiga.

---

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA

Posted by [RJ\[1\]](#) on Fri, 20 Dec 1985 20:45:02 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: amiga.425

Posted: Fri Dec 20 15:45:02 1985

Date-Received: Sun, 22-Dec-85 00:11:57 EST

References:

Reply-To: [rj@wizard.UUCP](mailto:rj@wizard.UUCP) (Robert J. Mical)

Distribution: net

Organization: Commodore-Amiga Inc., 983 University Ave #D, Los Gatos CA 95030

Lines: 26

Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1230 net.micro.atari:2060

Summary: Amiga interleaves its bus access

In article [bobh@pedsgd.UUCP](mailto:bobh@pedsgd.UUCP) (Bob Halloran) writes:

[color=blue]> Granted, the graphics chips relieve the 68000 from dealing with the[/color]  
[color=blue]> display, as it must in the Mac, but the 68000 and the various co-processors[/color]  
[color=blue]> must still contend for access to memory. YES, I/O can proceed  
independently, [/color]  
[color=blue]> etc., but only ONE of the processors can use memory at a time. This[/color]  
[color=blue]> HAS to impact the throughput of the 68000. [/color]

This is true. But don't forget that the Amiga interleaves its access to the bus, using every available cycle, even the odd ones, whenever possible. All of the DMA, including the display processors, use the odd cycles. This enormously cuts down the contention for the bus. The result of this is that the 68000 and other co-processors get to run at full speed regardless of display processing. Only when the display gets elaborate -- 640 across (either interlaced or not) and 4 bit-planes (16 colors onscreen) -- is there a significant lag in CPU performance.

The same goes for the other DMA devices: sprite, disk, and audio. With a simple display, a few sprites and some simple tones playing, you can fill a disk buffer and still have truly minimal interference with the performance of the 68000.

-----



- Greetings -
  - =Robert J. Mical= -
  - Commodore-Amiga -
- 

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [knnngt](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 1985 09:27:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: ukma.2425  
Posted: Sat Dec 21 04:27:04 1985  
Date-Received: Sun, 22-Dec-85 00:18:20 EST  
Reply-To: knnngt@ukma.UUCP (Alan Kennington)  
Distribution: net.micro.atari  
Organization: Univ. of KY Mathematical Sciences  
Lines: 50  
Keywords: ST sttalk VT52  
Summary: comments on ST

+++++++Line eaters do not exist any more, do they?+++++++

Just a few comments about the ST.

In answer to question about power supply compatibility with Europe, the story Atari people told me is that since the disk drive and computer run on DC power supplies, there is no problem. You just buy the European power supply (ie device for converting AC to DC) in Europe. I was told they might have a few European power supplies lying around in the US, and that a dealer could get hold of them, probably. The SM124 runs at 70 Hz, a fact that is well documented in magazines etc. It would actually be a good idea to have some sort of listing of all the articles on the ST written in magazines.

I for one would like to know exactly which issue of BYTE had the technical article on the ST. A lot of questions asked here are answered in the articles I read before buying an ST. Now the monitor actually plugs directly into the wall. So I am not quite so clear as to how to adapt the monitor to 50 Hz Power. But at least the sync is not derived from the 60 Hz waveform, which is cause for some optimism in this regard.

The delightful screen quality that results from a combination of 70 Hz scanning + non-reflective screen + etc. etc. is one of the pleasures of the ST. Does anyone know how to spread the dots over the full screen???

On the subject of ST/Amiga comparisons, it certainly is nice to get new information, especially when one is trying to make a decision on a purchase, but questions like which one has the best screen, software etc. are unanswerable. Questions about comparisons should be very specific, and the questioner should invest in copies of the dozen or so articles that have



appeared lately.

Incidentally, I'm using my ST at the moment in VT52 Emulation mode over a phone line to a VAX to write this note. The VT52 Em does 99% of things just as the vi editor on UNIX wants it to. (Sometimes it makes an error counting lines and positions the cursor on the screen one line above where it is in the file.) But I must say that the copy of STTALK I have makes a complete and utter mess of the very same commands from vi.

STTALK is perfect at communicating files via XMODEM, and the CAPTURE mode also works perfectly. But instructions from vi just push the cursor to the right of the screen, from which it never escapes. Hence I have had to leave STTALK for the VT52 emulator to write this note.

The VT52 Emulator has just made the error I mentioned. I escaped from insert mode to replace two erroneous characters. And when I went back to inserting, the cursor appeared one line above where it was (hopefully) in the file. I'll have to check if this is truly so.

Has anybody else found these problems, and if so, do you know the solution(s)?

Another problem is line noise at 1200 baud. Every 15 characters or so at 1200 baud, the VAX seems to receive a ^C from me. (With roughly Poisson distribution of arrival.) So I suffer with 300 baud. This makes reading superfluous info/questions painful.

The version of STTALK I use is V1.0. I also have version 0.95. Has a version later than 1.0 yet appeared?

So long,

Alan Kennington.

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA

Posted by [mjb](#) on Sat, 21 Dec 1985 16:09:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: ecsvax.973

Posted: Sat Dec 21 11:09:29 1985

Date-Received: Mon, 23-Dec-85 04:40:00 EST

References:

Distribution: net

Organization: North Carolina Educational Computing Service

Lines: 18

Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1242 net.micro.atari:2073

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> Granted, the graphics chips relieve the 68000 from dealing with the[/color]

[color=blue]> display, as it must in the Mac, but the 68000 and the various co-processors[/color]

[color=blue]> must still contend for access to memory. YES, I/O can proceed independently, [/color]

[color=blue]> etc., but only ONE of the processors can use memory at a time. This[/color]  
[color=blue]> HAS to impact the throughput of the 68000.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> BTW, the ST also has an I/O co-processor, so presence vs. non-presence[/color]  
[color=blue]> arguments in favor of the Amiga are inappropriate.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> Bob Halloran[/color]

Yes BUT the bus speed of the Amiga is 14.4 MHz as opposed to the ST which is 8MHz. The Amiga's 68000 runs at 7.2 MHz while the Co-processors use the other 7.2 MHz.

Mike Gingell ...decvax!mcnc!ecsvax!mjg

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [bammi](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 1985 03:14:08 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: cwruecmp.1358  
Posted: Sat Dec 21 22:14:08 1985  
Date-Received: Mon, 23-Dec-85 04:29:56 EST  
References:  
Distribution: net.micro.atari  
Organization: CWRU Dept. Computer Eng., Cleveland, OH  
Lines: 58

.....  
[color=blue]> Incidentally, I'm using my ST at the moment in VT52 Emulation mode[/color]  
[color=blue]> over a phone line to a VAX to write this note. The VT52 Em does 99% of  
[color=blue]> things[/color]  
[color=blue]> just as the vi editor on UNIX wants it to. (Sometimes it makes an error[/color]  
[color=blue]> counting lines and positions the cursor on the screen one line above where[/color]  
[color=blue]> it is in the file.) But I must say that the copy of STTALK I have makes a[/color]  
[color=blue]> complete and utter mess of the very same commands from vi. [/color]  
[color=blue]> STTALK is perfect at communicating files via XMODEM, and the CAPTURE[/color]  
[color=blue]> mode also works perfectly. But instructions from vi just push the cursor to the[/color]  
[color=blue]> right of the screen, from which it never escapes. Hence I have had to leave[/color]  
[color=blue]> STTALK for the VT52 emulator to write this note.[/color]  
[color=blue]> The VT52 Emulator has just made the error I mentioned. I escaped[/color]  
[color=blue]> from insert mode to replace two erroneous characters. And when I went back  
[color=blue]> to[/color]  
[color=blue]> inserting, the cursor appeared one line above where it was (hopefully) in the[/color]  
[color=blue]> file. I'll have to check if this is truly so.[/color]

[color=blue]> Has anybody else found these problems, and if so, do you know the[/color]  
[color=blue]> solution(s)? [/color]  
[color=blue]> Another problem is line noise at 1200 baud. Every 15 characters or[/color]  
[color=blue]> so at 1200 baud, the VAX seems to receive a ^C from me. (With roughly[/color]  
[color=blue]> Poisson distribution of arrival.) So I suffer with 300 baud. This makes[/color]  
[color=blue]> reading superfluous info/questions painful.[/color]  
[color=blue]> The version of STTALK I use is V1.0. I also have version 0.95. Has[/color]  
[color=blue]> a version later than 1.0 yet appeared?[/color]  
[color=blue]> So long,[/color]  
[color=blue]> Alan Kennington.[/color]

I agree that the STTALK is totally useless as terminal emulator. But you can still try, remembering that sttalk give you a 21 line vt52 instead of the usual 25. So the TERMCAP entry has to be appro. adjusted (li#21).

I have not encountered the problem with the cursor jumping to the wrong line. I normally use Gnuemacs, not Vi, but I don't think that should matter. It sounds like a character or so is getting dropped. So you may try fine tuning the padding in your TERMCAP entry. I fine tuned my entry so that I get no Xon/Xoff when I hit a ^L in the editor to refresh a screen full (Xon/off's play havoc with emacs). I usually use the St over a 2400 Baud modem with a simple terminal emulator that uses Xbios calls to do output, so the Bios takes care of the Vt52 emulation. I also use the St over a 9600 Baud line, with no problem (ie. after tuning my TERMCAP entry). I have also used the emulator in the 50 Line mode after adjusting the TERMCAP entry (li#50) with no problems.

V1.1 id Sttalk is avail. by sending your original disk and \$2 to them . I received mine a couple of days back. It still has the brain damaged bars, but a lot if the bugs have been cleared, added a coouple of feature, like remembering Baud rates with the Dial Entries, Dial prefixes, Entry A's Baud Rate is the Baud rate it comes up in, etc. etc.

--

Jwahar R. Bammi

Usenet: .....!decvax!cwruecmp!bammi

CSnet: bammi@case

Arpa: bammi%case@csnet-relay

CompuServe: 71515,155

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [knnngt](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 1985 06:55:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: ukma.2430  
Posted: Sun Dec 22 01:55:53 1985  
Date-Received: Mon, 23-Dec-85 00:21:17 EST  
References:  
Reply-To: knnngt@ukma.UUCP (Alan Kennington)  
Distribution: net  
Organization: Univ. of KY Mathematical Sciences  
Lines: 13

&&&&&&&&&&&&& le mangeur des lignes? il n'existe plus! &&&&&&&&&&&&&

The sequence of arguments about relative use of the bus by ST and Amiga has previously appeared at least once, and I think perhaps twice. Last time we were told about how, if necessary, the other chips can steal time when they're in a tight spot. For those Atari users who have only short-term memory, perhaps someone at Amiga should tell us all again about these fascinating phenomena which occur in their wondrous machine.

Actually I have myself made use of such discussions to settle on the ST. But I think discussion should go around in a circle only twice a month at most, rather than the present 4 times.

Felices Pascuas,  
Alan Kennington.

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [freed](#) on Sun, 22 Dec 1985 17:29:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: aum.414  
Posted: Sun Dec 22 12:29:30 1985  
Date-Received: Wed, 25-Dec-85 03:21:11 EST  
References:  
Distribution: net  
Organization: The Aurora Systems Bunch  
Lines: 35  
Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1264 net.micro.atari:2093

[color=blue]> In article bobh@pedsgd.UUCP (Bob Halloran) writes:[/color]  
[color=teal]>> Granted, the graphics chips relieve the 68000 from dealing with the[/color]  
[color=teal]>> display, as it must in the Mac, but the 68000 and the various co-processors[/color]

[color=teal]>> must still contend for access to memory. YES, I/O can proceed independently, [/color]  
[color=teal]>> etc., but only ONE of the processors can use memory at a time. This [/color]  
[color=teal]>> HAS to impact the throughput of the 68000. [/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> This is true. But don't forget that the Amiga interleaves its access [/color]  
[color=blue]> to the bus, using every available cycle, even the odd ones, whenever [/color]  
[color=blue]> possible. All of the DMA, including the display processors, use the [/color]  
[color=blue]> odd cycles. This enormously cuts down the contention for the bus. [/color]  
[color=blue]> The result of this is that the 68000 and other co-processors get to run [/color]  
[color=blue]> at full speed regardless of display processing. Only when the [/color]  
[color=blue]> display gets elaborate -- 640 across (either interlaced or not) and [/color]  
[color=blue]> 4 bit-planes (16 colors onscreen) -- is there a significant lag [/color]  
[color=blue]> in CPU performance. [/color]  
[color=blue]> The same goes for the other DMA devices: sprite, disk, and audio. [/color]  
[color=blue]> With a simple display, a few sprites and some simple tones playing, [/color]  
[color=blue]> you can fill a disk buffer and still have truly minimal interference [/color]  
[color=blue]> with the performance of the 68000. [/color]

I would still like to know why the Amiga even with a 68020 and fast memory still is \*significantly\* slower than the ST. Is there a hardware type out there who can look at the memory cycles and see why the current claims of "no cpu slowing due to graphics chips" seems to not be proved by the real world. If I had one I would do it myself. If possible could a Amiga hardware engineer explain this disparity? It seems very strange. P.S. I know that the clock is slightly slower.

--

-----  
Erik James Freed

Aurora Systems  
San Francisco, CA  
{dual,ptsfa}!aum!freed

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [tim](#) on Tue, 24 Dec 1985 20:19:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: ism780c.193  
Posted: Tue Dec 24 15:19:22 1985  
Date-Received: Wed, 25-Dec-85 23:30:23 EST  
References:  
Reply-To: tim@ism780c.UUCP (Tim Smith)  
Distribution: net

Organization: Interactive Systems Corp., Santa Monica, CA

Lines: 9

Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1283 net.micro.atari:2102

In article freed@aum.UUCP (Erik Freed) writes:

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> I would still like to know why the Amiga even with a 68020 and fast memory[/color]

[color=blue]> still is \*significantly\* slower than the ST.[/color]

Because all the benchmarks are written in C. It appears that the ST has a better C compiler available then the Amiga.

--

Tim Smith      sdcrdcflism780c!tim || ima!ism780!tim || ihnp4!cithep!tim

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA

Posted by [ec150fcy](#) on Fri, 27 Dec 1985 21:16:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: sdcc13.402

Posted: Fri Dec 27 16:16:51 1985

Date-Received: Sun, 29-Dec-85 20:13:18 EST

References:

Distribution: net

Organization: U.C. San Diego, Academic Computer Center

Lines: 36

Xref: linus net.micro.amiga:5202 net.micro.atari:2068 net.micro.mac:3916

Summary: FLAME ON FOOLS

In article , timothym@tekigm2.UUCP (Timothy D Margeson) writes:

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> Hi,[/color]

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> For all you Amiga fans, here's something to flame about....[/color]

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> While all of you are busily discussing whether the Atari or Amiga is better,[/color]

[color=blue]> I am here using my Compaq Deskpro, with lots of off the shelf software, just[/color]

[color=blue]> watching.... Hope you all feel better.[/color]

[color=blue]> [/color]

[color=blue]> -- [/color]

FLAME ON\*\*\*\*

Did the IBM PC have an abundance of software when it was introduced??? NO!!!! Did the MACINTOSH have an

abundance of software when it first came out??? NOOO!!!! In fact, as I recall, the macintosh didn't have an abundance (relative) of software for a whole year. A couple of friends of mine had nothing but macpaint (the drawing program) for a long time.

So give the Amiga a break and wait a year. I am sure the software base will grow exponentially (so sure in fact, that I bought one)

I was over at my local computer store the other day, and they say that the IBM PC'S and the MAC'S are the Amiga's best friend. They told me an amusing story about how this one lady came in to buy a MAC and happened to see the Amiga, with it's limited software base, running some graphics program. So what happened??? She bought the Amiga.

Larry J. MacCaughey (No relation to the MacIntosh)

---

Subject: Re: Reply to: Questions about ST vs. AMIGA  
Posted by [sansom](#) on Fri, 03 Jan 1986 16:30:47 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: trwrba.1761  
Posted: Fri Jan 3 11:30:47 1986  
Date-Received: Sun, 5-Jan-86 01:26:56 EST  
Reply-To: [sansom@trwrba.UUCP](mailto:sansom@trwrba.UUCP) (Richard E. Sansom)  
Distribution: net  
Organization: TRW EDS, Redondo Beach, CA  
Lines: 45  
Xref: watmath net.micro.amiga:1404 net.micro.atari:2170

In article [perry@well.UUCP](mailto:perry@well.UUCP) (Perry S. Kivolowitz) writes:  
[color=blue]> Some people wage religious wars over the silliest things...[/color]

Yourself (and now, myself) included, obviously!

[color=blue]> The debate over which machine is better currently resurging yet again in[/color]  
[color=blue]> this newsgroup is damned silly. Those poor folks who bought atari's have[/color]  
[color=blue]> to justify their brain damage and will do so now matter what arguments[/color]  
[color=blue]> from the AMIGA side are tendered. Leave them alone![/color]



Excuse me, I was unaware that buying a faster (yes, faster!!! 8 Mhz CPU, 16 Mhz memory - not just "fast memory", but the entire addressing range of the computer - 32 Mhz graphics chip) machine for less than 1/2 the price of the \_amiga\_ qualified one for brain damage!

[color=blue]> It is beneath the dignity of owners of the AMIGA P.C. to respond to atari[/color]  
[color=blue]> people's claim of machine supremacy...It's a waste of time:[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> you bought your - they bought theirs [/color]  
[color=blue]> lets say one side (even theirs) is right - are you going to go out[/color]  
[color=blue]> and buy another machine lest ye be cast down by society? Neither are[/color]  
[color=blue]> they.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> Just leave them alone.[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> (as my firend dave (@heurikon) says:[/color]  
[color=blue]> [/color]  
[color=blue]> take a 520 st, put it in a dark closet and leave it alone. when it grows[/color]  
[color=blue]> up it'll be an amiga).[/color]

So which is it? Leave\_them\_alone or sling\_more\_silly\_insults? Make up your mind!!! Maybe the above quote should be re-stated:

take an \_amiga peecee\_ owner, put them in a dark closet. when (if) they grow up they'll be more consistent in their arguments.

I will agree that it is a waste of time to continue this debate over the two respective nets. Why don't we move the discussion to net.silly.insults where it belongs?

Richard E. Sansom  
{decvax,ucbvax,ihnp4}!trwrb!trwrba!sansom