
Subject: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 28 Nov 2007 23:10:07 GMT

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

that
great, but it's an older Dell.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

TCB wrote:

> Just to further cloud the issue of what costs too much in the computer department,
> I ordered a new laptop today. It's going to be a combination office and DJ
> machine for me. I WANTED hefty and big, more screen space for writing/testing
> code and more weight to make it harder to knock off the table while I'm working
> the wax.

>
> So, Dell Inspiron 1720. 17" wide screen display, I upgraded to a 1920 x 1200
> resolution, Core 2 Duo at 2.0 Ghz, 256 MB nVidia 8600m GT video card, 1 GB
> of memory (I'll upgrade that with Crucial after the fact), 120 GB SATA drive
> (again, I'll upgrade that later).

>
> \$1280 including tax and shipping.

>
> Opinions?

>
> TCBHey Jamie - I really didn't intend to get this far into this, and don't
really have time
to continue much more. I was just sharing my opinion on Shelly Palmer's
report
saying that while I'm sure there was quite a bit of tongue in cheek to his
opening comments,
he at least was pointing out why people spend more on Macs when they could
get the
job done for much less - marketing, pure and simple.

Just to get more to the point of options - show me where I can get a Mac
desktop tower with a single quad
core cpu system. It's faster than a dual dual core, but much less
expensive - why it isn't a sweet spot for
off the shelf systems is a mystery. It's really popular with a lot of
Nuendo guys (I'm upgrading my core 2
to a quad - just drop it in and double the power - nice - doesn't happen
that easily too often). Probably
one that just didn't have mass quantity build appeal for whatever reason -
supply of cpus, boards - who knows.

Btw - I was in Best Buy today - there were probably 20 different laptop models, and 30 desktop models there to choose from. 2 iMacs, 1 desktop, and 3 laptops. Regardless of preference, the distinct differences imho, are 1) that Apple sells "cool" better than anyone, and 2) that the others sell "choice" much better simply but putting more obvious choices in front of you (most of which are at least partially redundant of course, but it's still a marketing tactic - and HP and Sony have some seriously cool looking self-contained monitor/cpu systems with very nice wireless keyboards - including a touch screen model from HP for about \$1500 that is a blast to use). Again, just an observation.

If I could get a MacMini with the option to trick it out with 8G and a second SATA drive it would be seriously enticing for peripheral sample libraries (you need to come down and see this in action - it's a beautiful thing to offload that much processing). I know other composers that would have gone that route as well, were it not for the ram limitation. Seriously - it's a good deal for that purpose since it isn't overstocked with extras one wouldn't need for such a use, and the form factor would be really nice for stacking away in a computer room.

Thanks,
Dedric

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4791204e@linux...

> Dedric Terry wrote:

>> Now why did you think I was criticizing Apple with hyperbole? Could it
>> be

>> that Apple skin is just a little thin? And... I don't recall a desktop
>> release with more than

>> 3 models... so, "every" means "every". That's not called hyperbole, it's
>> called history. ;-))

>

> Maybe I misunderstood you. I saw "hyperbole" in your statement only
> because you switched from talking about laptops, to talking about "desktop
> models," claimed they were only 2K and up, and said there's no range below
> that for people who don't need "blinding speed" to write book reports.

>

> In fact there is a range of suitable Macs below that. In both laptops and
> "desktops." Plenty fast for writing reports. Overkill even.

>

> BTW, both iMacs and Mac Minis are desktop machines.

>

> Now about that skin thing. I don't know how thick Apple's skin is, but on
> a regular apple it's thin enough to eat. Thinner than a Macbook Air. ;^)
>
> I personally

Subject: Re: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP
Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 29 Nov 2007 00:42:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

don't care if you criticize Apple. I love that you buy
> non-Mac boxes, somebody has to.
>
> But if your claims aren't consistent, logical and true then I can't
> protect you in the wild world of time wasting computer bashing
> conversations. :^)
>
> There are plenty of criticisms to be made without hype. For example, the
> lack of firewire on the Air limits its market. Also, and this is my
> biggest criticism right now, WHERE'S MY #(*\$&@\$ing UPDATED MACBOOK PRO
> WITH THE LED BACKLIT 17" HD SCREEN!!!!!!???? :^)
>
>
>> By "blinding speed" I seriously meant a dual quad in general - any dual
>> quad. You are missing
>> the whole market of families that on average probably have about \$1k to
>> spend on a computer to serve
>> everyone, and when faced with a full desktop with monitor included, or a
>> cube with limited expansion and
>> I/O capabilities, and monitor additional, where do you think they will
>> go?
>
> Well lessee, I'm not missing any markets. I don't sell computers.
>
> If I were that struggling young family I'd buy a Linux box and be done
> with it.
>
> So it sounds like what you would like to see is a Mac under \$1000 with
> dual quad chips? In time we'll probably see that. But right now, not.
> However, the core 2 duos in the low end Macs are no slouches.
>
>
>> Just sayin' that the PC aisle at CompUSA
>> and BestBuy are always busier than the Apple sections, and the number of
>> PC options dwarfs the Mac shelves
>> significantly. This isn't our market, so it's easy to overlook it.
>
> I haven't overlooked the obvious. I'm not arguing that point. Did you

> think I was claiming that Macs outsell all other computers? Not hardly.
>
> But as long as we're digressing, notice that the aisles at CompUSA are
> shrinking fast, while Apple stores are popping up like flies. Apple's
> market share is growing, FWIW. It's scary. PEOPLE, STOP BUYING MACS! :^)
>
>
>> Nothing wrong with Macs,
>
> LOL! OK, that's BS. :^)
>
> There's plenty wrong with Macs. Just less than some of the other options,
> depending on your needs.
>
>
> > but you have to admit that the general culture
>> and approach of Apple is "build loyalty by limiting choices
>> both on the way in and when it comes time to upgrade".
>
> Heh. Now I think you're projecting because you choose to use MSWindows,
> from a company that has been _convicted_ of limiting choices in the
> marketplace.
>
> How far off topic are we now? This is turning into a boring PC/Mac
> bashfest. Woo.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>
>> DT
>>
>>
>> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:4791026d@linux...
>>> Dedric Terry wrote:
>>>> I was actually just referring to the fact that with every Mac release,
>>>> there are three desktop models,
>>>> usually starting at \$2k and going up - this round, \$2799 is the
>>>> starting price, and only options for dual quad cores,
>>>> no range below that for people who don't need "blinding speed" to write
>>>> book reports ;-).
>>>
>>> Sure, but you don't need a tower to write book reports. A Mac Mini will
>>> do fine for under \$1k.
>>>
>>> It's entirely possible to criticize the Mac without hyperbole, ya know.

>>> :^)
>>>
>>>
>>>> There are 2 laptop model choices, ranging between \$1100 and \$2800 for
>>>> one of the six base models. In the PC world
>>>> there are choices in each category at pretty much every \$100 increment,
>>>
>>> Right, because there are more companies making hardware for MSWindows
>>> boxes. That's an advantage because there is more range of choice, and a
>>> disadvantage because they all have to dance to the MSWindows beat.
>>>
>>> Apple has fewer boxes but they control everything on those boxes. That's
>>> a disadvantage because of the fewer choices, and an advantage because
>>> there is less to go wrong or be incompatible, and if anything does goes
>>> wrong, a single company can fix it.
>>>
>>>
>>>> starting at \$300 and going up to \$10k+. Not that I would buy a \$300
>>>> desktop, but I still come back to the laptop I'm typing this on,
>>>> costing significantly less than the least expensive Macbook (current)
>>>> and only a slightly slower cpu (since it's a model from early last
>>>> year), for \$400 less than the comparable Macbook, but otherwise, pretty
>>>> much identical (it does have a partially aluminum case
