

## Re: Alpha remembrance day

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2006-08/msg02127.html>

---

- *From:* "Andrew" <[andrew\\_harrison@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:andrew_harrison@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 29 Aug 2006 09:22:57 -0700
- 

Bill Todd wrote:

Andrew wrote:

...

Sorry wrong again.

At the risk of being pedantic, to be wrong 'again' I would already have had to have been wrong in the current discussion at least once.

Well if you can point to one single part of this thread where you have been right then I will be happy to buy you a sweet.

How about the fact that Win2K, contrary to your assertions, indeed *\*does\** support a full 64 GB of RAM? Not that you appear to have managed to understand even that simple a correction below, so I won't bother creating a full (and rather lengthy) catalog of the other instances in this thread where not only I have been right but you have been either dead wrong or utterly irrelevant to the subject at hand.

Does it really. Windows 2003 does we know that but can you provide a Microsoft reference for 64GB support in Win2K.

...

The Pentium may well have supported 64GB of RAM in