

Re: Do I need a Page File?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-11/msg05060.html>

- *From:* "Jonny" <billgates@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 Nov 2005 23:12:18 -0500
-

<http://www.support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=kb:en-us:555223&SD=tech>

<http://members.shaw.ca/bsanders/WindowsGeneralWeb/RAMVirtualMemoryPageFileEtc.htm>

By default windows will use the pagefile whether needed specifically for paging out physical memory or not. Was not designed to not use a swapfile, and will slow the system down if not available.

--

Jonny

"Jim" <null@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:YOqhf.33604\\$qw.10572@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:YOqhf.33604$qw.10572@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>

> "Ken Blake, MVP" <kblake@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> [news:eC\\$34ZT8FHA.1028@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:eC$34ZT8FHA.1028@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>> boe wrote:

>>

>>> I have 2 GIGs of ram. I don't think I've ever seen my task manager

>>> tell me I was using more than 1 GIG of RAM. I'd like to avoid it

>>> ever being touched. Can I do that or does Windows XP really need the

>>> page file to run?

>>

>>

>> Yes.

>>

>> Note two important points:

>>

>> 1. Windows preallocates things to memory, before it even needs them; in

> many

>> cases some of those preallocations are never used. Some of those

>> preallocations are made in the page file. If there is no page file, all

>> those allocations which will never be used have to made in real memory.

> The

>> result is that getting rid of the page files means that you will never

be

>> able to use all of your real memory.

>>

>

Re: Do I need a Page File?

- > This is the one topic that always get me riled up. Windows may indeed
- > require the paging file, but it's totally illogical. If our systems had
- > unlimited amounts of RAM, we wouldn't even NEED a paging file. In
- > *theory*, the paging file ONLY exists for paging real memory into virtual
- > memory when real memory is otherwise exhausted. That's the ONLY reason
- the
- > concept even exists! Again, and this is key, if we had oodles and oodles
- of
- > cheap RAM, why in the world would anyone have a paging file? Heck, how
- can
- > it be more efficient EVER to take something OUT of RAM and write to the
- HD,
- > one of the slowest components in the system? That's precisely why we tell
- > ppl to ADD RAM when paging gets out of hand.
- >
- > If I have 500 gazillion bytes of RAM, I sure as heck want Windows to stuff
- > everything it needs in memory into that RAM, not on some slow virtual
- memory
- > paging file!
- >
- > It's NEVER EVER EVER more efficient to take something out of RAM and stick
- > it into a HD's file, EVER. The fact that MS does this is NOT because it's
- > efficient, it's because MS has abused the concept of the virtual paging
- > system for other purposes. In theory, you should be able to completely
- rip
- > out the virtual paging subsystem and continue using the OS normally. The
- > only issue, if you did this, would be, of course, that once RAM was
- > exhausted, you're DEAD. Virtually memory is merely a lifeboat because RAM
- > is not inexhaustable, and until recently, could not be had in great
- amounts
- > at economical prices. But I say for third time, if we had endless amounts
- > of RAM, noone would have invented the virtual paging system at all.
- > EVERYTHING would be loaded into memory and left there, we're it's most
- > efficiently stored and accessed.
- >
- > What has happened is that MS has so distorted the purpose and use of the
- > paging file, that it has now built-in various dependencies, such as
- > described here by the MVP. I've noticed myself that when I have tons of
- RAM
- > available, damn Windows insists on still using of the paging file. THIS
- IS
- > CRAZY! Windows should use RAM period. And if RAM is exhausted, THEN and
- > ONLY then should the virtual memory subsystem page RAM in and out of the
- > paging file. But as I said, it doesn't surprise me that MS has messed up
- > Windows by using the virtual paging system for purposes it was never
- > intended.
- >
- > Sorry folks, but this is one topic I see repeatedly talked about and
- totally
- > misunderstood by even the MVPs. If I have 4GB of RAM on my system,
- there's

Re: Do I need a Page File?

Re: Do I need a Page File?

> no good reason, in theory, if the virtual memory subsystem is being used
> *properly* that I can't disable it. My only disadvantage should be that i
f
> I indeed exhaust RAM, I'm dead. That's the risk I take, and should be the
> ONLY risk I face.
>
>
>> 2. There is no possible benefit to getting rid of the page file. If
> Windows
>> never needs to use it, then it won't (don't mix up allocation to it with
> use
>> of it). Having it there so it's available if you need it can only help
> you.
>> It never hurts you.
>>
>
> Ironically, it's because MS abuses the virtual memory subsystem that
having
> the virtual memory subsystem enabled actually *may* hurt you, at least in
> terms of performance. At least if I disable it, that FORCES Windows to
use
> RAM, not the stupid paging file. If you're telling me that when the
paging
> file is disabled, I won't be able to take advantage of these
> "preallocations", it's only because Windows is coded up to differentiate
> between a pagable and non-pagable system. IOW, when the page file is
> disabled, Windows doesn't preallocate, when paging is enabled, it does.
But
> that's just bad programming, Windows should be allocating RAM as necessary
in
> real memory, ALL THE TIME. The virtual memory subsystem should be
managing
> the memory access, with the understanding that when real memory is nearing
> exhaustion, it's off to the paging file we go (if present), and should be
> completely transparent to Windows generally.
>
> That's why I say, Windows may indeed work the way you describe, but by
doing
> so, it's created a situation that makes it difficult for ppl to disable
the
> paging file, and for no good reason. If Windows actually only used the
> paging file when RAM was truly exhausted, I'd be in FULL AGREEMENT that
> there's no good reason not to have it enabled, just in case. But
> ironically, it's because Windows *does* abuse the paging file, in fact
uses
> it long before RAM is anywhere near exhaustion, that I'm actually MORE
> inclined to disable it, if only to stop Windows from doing this! At least
> it forces Windows to always use RAM.
>
> JMTC
>

Re: Do I need a Page File?

Re: Do I need a Page File?

> Jim

>

>

>> For more information, read this article by the late Alex Nichol, MVP:

>>

>> "Virtual Memory in Windows XP" <http://www.aumha.org/win5/a/xpvm.htm>

>>

>> --

>> Ken Blake – Microsoft MVP Windows: Shell/User

>> Please reply to the newsgroup

>>

>>

>

>

.

• **References:**

◆ ***Do I need a Page File?***

◇ *From:* boe

◆ ***Re: Do I need a Page File?***

◇ *From:* Ken Blake, MVP

◆ ***Re: Do I need a Page File?***

◇ *From:* Jim

• Prev by Date: ***Re: Screen Saver My picture show***

• Next by Date: ***Re: NTFS***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: Do I need a Page File?***

• Next by thread: ***Re: Do I need a Page File?***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***