Subject: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by Snipe on Thu, 04 Aug 2011 22:23:03 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just wondering what your guys thoughts are since these easily outdated cards that cost around 200+ for a good one when for that price or a little bit higher you can buy a gaming system. Whats your thoughts? worth it but over priced? they match up to there prices? or rip off?

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by Spyder on Thu, 04 Aug 2011 22:28:04 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I recently bought a 2GB ATI HD6950, works like a charm and is well worth it's price tag.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Thu, 04 Aug 2011 22:36:06 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(SSnipe) -BLU3Y3Z- wrote on Fri, 05 August 2011 00:23Just wondering what your guys thoughts are since these easily outdated cards that cost around 200+ for a good one when for that price or a little bit higher you can buy a gaming system. Whats your thoughts? worth it but over priced? they match up to there prices? or rip off?

If you spend 200 euros on a gfx card when the consoles were released you would have something like a 8800GTS or a HD4870 right? Not sure about the dates.

But if that is true, then you can still perfectly play all games with them. This is due to developers coding for the lesser spec'd consoles. So if you get a 200 euro card now you'll have a much faster GFX card than is possible in consoles. For 125 Euros you have a Ati HD6850 card, which should perform reasonable in most recent games, as in you'll most likely to play at Full HD(+) resolution, and with 60 FPS, at medium or low settings. This is already much better than most consoles, which often do not deliver full HD (yes, it does after upscaling, but that's not true Full HD rendering and can easily done by PC's as well. It also gives you more FPS in some games, were you would get 30 if you're on a console against a steady 60 at the PC.

So yes, you might spend more, but you'll also get a whole lot more. Besides if you want to you can use your GPU for other things after you're done gaming.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by JeepRubi on Fri, 05 Aug 2011 02:49:20 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Think of it this way, most people have a PC. You can spend another \$200 and game on a console, or you can put a \$200 card into your PC and game on it, with higher resolutions, better looking games, free online and any controller you want. (there are ways to get 360, ps3, and wii controllers working on PC.)

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Thu, 04 August 2011 15:36(SSnipe) -BLU3Y3Z- wrote on Fri, 05 August 2011 00:23Just wondering what your guys thoughts are since these easily outdated cards that cost around 200+ for a good one when for that price or a little bit higher you can buy a gaming system. Whats your thoughts? worth it but over priced? they match up to there prices? or rip off?

If you spend 200 euros on a gfx card when the consoles were released you would have something like a 8800GTS or a HD4870 right? Not sure about the dates.

Right, but when the PS3 launched in late 2006, it was \$600, and by the time the average consumer could get their hands on one it was 2007, still \$600. With a \$600 upgrade to the average PC then, it would still perform somewhat decently now.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive? Posted by nikki6ixx on Fri, 05 Aug 2011 03:42:16 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not really. Especially now, where the prices of used cards that are only a generation old can be had for cheap.

One of my PC's has a Radeon 2600 from early 2007'ish. It can still play most modern games at a resolution slightly higher than a console's, with some AA on as well as other effects.

As long as your expectations are realistic, a current card will offer very good performance for at least several years.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Fri, 05 Aug 2011 11:06:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 05 August 2011 05:42Not really. Especially now, where the prices of used cards that are only a generation old can be had for cheap.

One of my PC's has a Radeon 2600 from early 2007'ish. It can still play most modern games at a resolution slightly higher than a console's, with some AA on as well as other effects.

As long as your expectations are realistic, a current card will offer very good performance for at least several years.

Indeed, I dare say that particularly the HD4870 and HD5870 series were extremely cheap at launch for the performance they offer. They launched about 300 Euros AFAIK, which is about 200-300 Euros less than GFX cards in the past, like the Geforce 4 ti4600 and the Ati Radeon

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by danpaul88 on Fri, 05 Aug 2011 19:07:32 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Personally I never buy top of the range graphics cards, I buy the upper mid-range cards which have about 15% less performance for around half the price. My 9600GT still plays all recent games quite happily on mid-high settings.

People who buy these ridiculously priced top of the range cards are just getting ripped off, but you know what they say about fools and their money....

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Fri, 05 Aug 2011 20:09:25 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

danpaul88 wrote on Fri, 05 August 2011 21:07Personally I never buy top of the range graphics cards, I buy the upper mid-range cards which have about 15% less performance for around half the price. My 9600GT still plays all recent games guite happily on mid-high settings.

People who buy these ridiculously priced top of the range cards are just getting ripped off, but you know what they say about fools and their money....

Who are you to judge that they are getting ripped off?

You're not being ripped off when you know you pay a premium for the fastest <whatever>. If you're willing to spend the money on it and do not need that money for primary life items, then what's the problem with that?

There are a lot of ridiculous things one can spend money on, and still people buy them. Are they all fools? I would not say they are, when they carefully judged that choice and stood by it.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by Dave Anderson on Sat, 06 Aug 2011 01:07:12 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree with EvilWhiteDragon. There is not a thing wrong with buying high-dollar and newest stuff. I think its pretty ignorant to call someone a fool just because they choose to spend their money differently than you do.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by R315r4z0r on Sat, 06 Aug 2011 04:08:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

danpaul88 wrote on Fri, 05 August 2011 15:07Personally I never buy top of the range graphics cards, I buy the upper mid-range cards which have about 15% less performance for around half the price. My 9600GT still plays all recent games quite happily on mid-high settings.

People who buy these ridiculously priced top of the range cards are just getting ripped off, but you know what they say about fools and their money....

Exactly, you're playing on mid-high range settings. If you shell out the money, you can play on ultra-high settings for all new games for at least 2 years.

I used to buy mid-range hardware in order to save some money... but I realized that I only just end up spending more money since the hardware I buy doesn't keep up with the new software coming out. I'd spend like \$150 on a graphics card... and then a year later, I'm buying a new one. It just isn't worth it.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive? Posted by HaTe on Sat, 06 Aug 2011 04:55:59 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i have to play on the 2nd lowest settings possible even for Renegade. I'm fine with it though, so yes, they are to expensive.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive? Posted by zunnie on Sat, 06 Aug 2011 06:51:38 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I never buy the most expensive or the currently 'best' gfx card.

The card i'm gonna get for my new pc is most probably this one:

http://www.alternate.nl/html/product/Grafische\_kaarten\_NVIDIA\_GeForce\_GTX/ASUS/E
NGTX570\_DCII-2DIS/523598/?tn=HARDWARE&I1=Grafische+kaarten&I2=PCIe+kaart
en+NVIDIA&I3=GeForce+GTX

Which is 300 euro atm, though its not 100% sure i get that one, i might get another one once i get around to actually ordering a new gfx card...

For 200 you're not gonna get a card that can run the newer games such as Crysis, Crysis2, Unreal Tournament 3 and Renegade-X on high settings with acceptable FSAA enabled and a decent framerate of 60 fps steady.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Sun, 07 Aug 2011 00:51:29 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

zunnie wrote on Sat, 06 August 2011 08:51

. . .

For 200 you're not gonna get a card that can run the newer games such as Crysis, Crysis2, Unreal Tournament 3 and Renegade-X on high settings with acceptable FSAA enabled and a decent framerate of 60 fps steady. And why do you want that? FSAA is nice, but takes quite a hit in performance. It doesn't add much either, just makes lines look a tiny bit smoother, which is IMHO barely a problem at 1920\*1200 or 1680\*1024.

Of course, if you want everything on superduperultradeluxehighultimummaximus, then you do need a high-end and relatively expensive card. However, for most this shouldn't be too interesting, as the last bit of performance is too expensive.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive?

Posted by slosha on Sun, 07 Aug 2011 04:28:37 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Outdated doesn't really mean much since my 5850 which came out almost two years ago and it isn't really having any hiccups at 1920x1200 at high settings with most games.

Subject: Re: Are graphic cards to expensive? Posted by grant89uk on Sun, 07 Aug 2011 13:17:13 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

hell my gtx260 still runs everything on ridiculously high settings albeit at 1680 x 1050...

But this is still very acceptable levels of graphics and performance.