

## Re: 2 monitors, one 22" wide ?

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2008-07/msg05094.html>

---

- *From:* "dadiOH" <dadiOH@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 27 Jul 2008 18:11:34 -0400
- 

Leythos wrote:

In article <uPI5AFB8IHA.3724@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, dadiOH@xxxxxxxxxxxx says...

You're missing the fact that a 22" "wide screen" monitor displays things only slightly larger than a 17" monitor that has the regular 4:3 ratio.

"Wide screen" is a joke unless you like to watch wide screen movies on your computer; otherwise, the benefit is to the manufacturers' profits.

And you're missing the fact that it's 1680 wide, with is about 656 pixels of are you can put other things on the screen without covering them.

Not everyone runs apps FULL SCREEN, so you could have your email client open and your Usenet client or web browser open at the SAME time and not have one blocked, or at least have both mostly fully visible.

Many people that don't run apps full screen find they get a lot more work done by placing apps where they can see them both.

Mine are never full screen. If one is "too covered" to click it active I just Alt Tab.

I can see the usefulness of having more width available when multi-tasking. My only beef is because the way monitors are measured – diagonally – leads people to think that "upgrading" from, for example, a 17" 4:3 ratio monitor to a 22" 16:9 one is going to get them a nice big image.

—

dadiOH

Re: 2 monitors, one 22" wide ?

---

dadiOH's dandies v3.06...

....a help file of info about MP3s, recording from  
LP/cassette and tips & tricks on this and that.

Get it at <http://mysite.verizon.net/xico>