
Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Tue, 31 May 2005 20:58:05 GMT

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

This is a media player that Aurora showed me. I was wondering if any of you used it or knew anything about it. I'm looking for good "components" to mod it out with. It seems really expandable. If you don't know what it is maybe check into it here: <http://www.foobar2000.com> It's kinda a replacement for Winamp. It uses less processor time so I figure it might be good for me to listen to my tuneskis during Source or World of Warcraft.

Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 06:28:02 GMT

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

I use it. It's great. :thumbsup:

Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 07:03:37 GMT

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

It uses 6mb of memory when Winamp uses 7mb. The difference is extremely small, so I'm sticking with Winamp. It doesn't even matter anyways since I have 1gb of memory.

Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [xptek](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 07:14:54 GMT

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

I'll stick with Winamp. It has all the lovely little plugins.

Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 12:15:22 GMT

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

Foobar has a ridiculous amount of plugins too but, they are kinda complicated. There's also a bridge so any winamp plugin works in Foobar2000.

Subject: Foobar2000

Posted by [Doitle](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 12:23:47 GMT

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

Actually with big lists of songs Foobar is way more efficient. I put in about a thousand songs in Foobar2000 and had a memory usage of 10-12K, then I put 500 songs in Winamp and had a usage of 17-20K.

Subject: Foobar2000
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 14:45:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah, I'll stick with WinAmp -- 1200 songs, 8-9MB of RAM.

Subject: Foobar2000
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 01 Jun 2005 21:23:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Like I said, it doesn't even matter with the amount of memory I have.

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [Dan](#) on Thu, 02 Jun 2005 14:38:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Windows Media Player for the win!

I dont know why, but I prefer it over the rest!

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [Dave Mason](#) on Thu, 02 Jun 2005 16:38:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Media Player uses as much RAM as foobar and winamp put together.

still, I have no room left on my harddrive for programs I don't need so sorry winamp, foobar. I'll stick with media player.

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [Renx](#) on Fri, 03 Jun 2005 21:26:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Then again WMP has more features.

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [flyingfox](#) on Fri, 03 Jun 2005 22:23:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

How much does realone player use?

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 00:12:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RealOne sucks, so does RealPlayer. I'm going to reformat, install Linux, and use it full-time. I'll be using either the Linux version of Winamp here: <http://software.deviantart.com/details/225/> or XMMS.

Subject: Re: Foobar2000
Posted by [Doitle](#) on Sat, 04 Jun 2005 00:23:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Foobar 2000 has infinite features. But they are a tad complicated. It's designed with an open component implementation so you can make plugins for it that do whatever.
