
Subject: New Computer

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 07:32:48 GMT

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

Ok as I have mentioned in another thread I am building a new computer. Certain things have already been decided such as the memory, mobo, video card, power supply, and case.

I need the people with half a fucking brain to help me decide whether I should get a Core 2 Duo E6850 or a Q6600 Quad.

This system is being built for the Crysis Engine.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 07:35:43 GMT

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

Well, if you're planning to do several processor-intensive programs at one time often, you'll want to opt for the quad. If not, dual-core will be fine (it's also faster in this case).

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [AmunRa](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 07:39:01 GMT

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

core 2 duo.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Goztow](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 07:42:05 GMT

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

Quad cores = servers (or maybe GFX processing, though a dual should be ok there already).

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 09:00:07 GMT

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

Dont bother going quad until theres more than one game that you play that actually supports it, or you need to render special effects for the next hollywood blockbuster while you play a game and record it with fraps.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 17:15:28 GMT

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

I just bought a quad. For the minor price difference it doesn't pay to get the duo.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Blazer](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 19:21:37 GMT

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

Eh, I'd rather have faster cores that I am using, than surplus slower cores that are idle

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Tue, 31 Jul 2007 20:57:55 GMT

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

I see your point but when your only talking a few hundred megahurtz and \$50 it really doesn't matter. That and 4 cores is just cooler that 2

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 00:47:56 GMT

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

You can overclock the E5850 to 3.8ghz on stock cooling. I'll pass on the quads till the Yorkfield cores come out. My board I purchased supports both.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Aprime](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 04:23:11 GMT

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

Just get the E6600 and overclock it, I wouldn't bother with the updated series nor paying that much more for performance I can get with a simple clock change (the higher FSB will give you a boost... of 1% (benchmarked, lulz) - it's simply not worth it).

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [troopr02](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 13:54:18 GMT

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

Niether. AMD has already outshot the core 2 duo cpu's with semi-old models. I recently built myself a new comp too, and its not worth the \$\$ to get a shitty cpu. Mine is the AMD Athlon 64 4000+ @ 2.5Ghz, out benchmarks most dual core cpu's, so got new mobo and took it.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 14:20:39 GMT

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

troopr02 wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 08:54Niether. AMD has already outshot the core 2 duo cpu's with semi-old models. I recently built myself a new comp too, and its not worth the \$\$ to get a shitty cpu. Mine is the AMD Athlon 64 4000+ @ 2.5Ghz, out benchmarks most dual core cpu's, so got new mobo and took it.

lol? AMD has the worst CPU crashes AND they have low L2 Cache. Core 2 Duo has 2MB-4MB
AMD has 1MB-2MB

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 14:59:28 GMT

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

troopr02 wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 09:54Niether. AMD has already outshot the core 2 duo cpu's with semi-old models. I recently built myself a new comp too, and its not worth the \$\$ to get a shitty cpu. Mine is the AMD Athlon 64 4000+ @ 2.5Ghz, out benchmarks most dual core cpu's, so got new mobo and took it.

You don't have any fucking idea what you're talking about so shut up.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Chuck Norris](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 15:55:22 GMT

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

sadukar09 wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 10:20lol? AMD has the worst CPU crashes AND they have low L2 Cache. Core 2 Duo has 2MB-4MB AMD has 1MB-2MB There's more to it than that. While I agree that the Core 2 CPUs are better than AMDs current offerings, especially if you're overclocking, it's not an apples to apples comparison. They're two different CPUs, two different cores, so you can't say it's better because it has more L2 cache. Look at the P4. The Prescott had 1MB cache vs the Northwood with 512k. The Northwood was slightly better. Remember when everyone thought the P4 was better than the Athlon line because it had a greater frequency? It's the same thing. There's so much more at work. The Core 2 is simply a better architecture. That's the real reason it's better. Comparing L2 cache and frequency ONLY works COMPLETELY if you compare it amongst CPUs of the same line.

If you're goin new, Intel is the way to go. If you already have an AM2 board and don't have the money to spend or care about overclocking, AMD is still a good choice. The 6000+ equals a E6600 (though the E6600 can be overclocked FAR better). They're going to roll out a 6400+ soon too, but that's only a 6000+ with an extra 200MHz. The Athlon line is at it's end, and AMD needs to come up with something new, but AMD still has it's place. It might not be first place, but overclockers and people with alot of money to spend on computers (i.e., enthusiasts) aren't the majority.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [jnz](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 16:08:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

multi core = crap and slow
single core = win

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 16:57:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

^ why the fuck do you people think you know what you're talking about?

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 17:37:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amd has the x2s which are the dual core... and there are 6000x2 which are awesome, i however am still enjoying my almost 2 yearold 4000, which is at 2.4ghz with not overclocking. which reminds me i prob will be buying more ram soon and overclocking it aswell. troop what kind of hardware do you have? since when we were playing yesterday you clearly had a hardware advantage over me... you moved out and back behind the wall b4 i could even see you let alone shoot. and we are both in canada so im just wondering...

i got 2x512mb ram in dual channel mode, athlon 4000 2.4mghz, ati 800xt and sata hd if that makes any diff

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 19:24:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

romaner your flag says you are in US
Well no Athlon then there is always Opteron

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Viking](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 19:52:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Tue, 31 July 2007 02:32Ok as I have mentioned in another thread I am building a new computer. Certain things have already been decided such as the memory, mobo, video card, power supply, and case.

I need the people with half a fucking brain to help me decide whether I should get a Core 2 Duo E6850 or a Q6600 Quad.

This system is being built for the Crysis Engine.

NOOOO! Wait and get a AMD Barcelona! They are gonna KICK ASS!
Also, 8800.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 19:53:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Viking, please stop mentioning your 8800, you're not the only one...

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 19:58:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I was a die hard AMD fan and a die hard ATI fan for many years. Every computer I have owned has had those two components in it. However this one I just bought has neither. The simple fact is AMD can not compete with intel and will always be a step behind and a dollar more. I need the most bang for my buck I can get. Intel provides that. Plain and simple.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 20:10:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sadukar09 wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 13:24romaner your flag says you are in US
Well no Athlon then there is always Opteron

when i post from work it shows US flag since our server is located in US.... but im in Canada. and when i post from home it shows a canadian flag. its kinda funny i can post from work then post from home 10 mins later (i work really close to home) and its as if i went to different coutry

also isnt athlon better then opteron?

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 20:12:54 GMT

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

Opterons a Quad Core processor (though formerly dual core) for servers/workstations

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Viking](#) on Wed, 01 Aug 2007 20:22:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I am NOT going to stop posting that I have a 8800 because soon it is going to be out of date when the 9800 comes out. *cries*

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 03:19:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, nice to know the dumbasses have arrived. The next person that posts that single core procesors are better is going to get kicked in the throat. In other news, I canceled my order for my 8800Ultra seeing as the 9800GTX is going to be the same price and 2x the power.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 06:33:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoShamBo wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 18:08multi core = crap and slow
single core = win
We'll see that when your virus scanner is updating / scanning while you play a game...

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Renerage](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 06:34:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Thu, 02 August 2007 02:33RoShamBo wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 18:08multi core = crap and slow
single core = win
We'll see that when your virus scanner is updating / scanning while you play a game...

Agreed, my duo core kicks the shit out of my 3.0 Ghz.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 09:03:09 GMT

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

I got worse performance from my P4D 2.6 Ghz at first (compared to my single core P4 2.0 Ghz), then I got a motherboard that didn't have a VIA chipset.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 11:51:54 GMT

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

RoShamBo wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 18:08multi core = crap and slow
single core = win
And you phail miserably.

Dualcore certainly has it advantages. Yes in single threaded applications it might be slower (if the megahertz are lower) but, since we don't work in dos any more and do things like multitasking, you'll benefit from a dualcore even if you're just running single threaded apps. Everything *feels* faster, even in just plain old windows. Also, if one application hangs and uses 100% of 1 core, you can still run taskmanager etc to kill it, on a dual core. Try that on a single core and you'll fail, miserably again.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 13:38:41 GMT

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

Soon we will go to the age of hexcore...

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 14:22:21 GMT

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

People dont know too much which is what I see from what I have read:
-Double core does help in multitasking but thats only useful if the actually app or game or w/e it programed to run from 2 memory locations. Theres limited stuff that uses 2 cores, but more and more stuff is.
-L2 cache all varies with amd, heres a little explaining why less is more with AMD:

<http://img527.imageshack.us/img527/4900/amdathlon64chartcl9.jpg>

Also, there are a few CPU's that can out run my single core CPU, like the core 2 duo E65 (If i remember the # corretly), but my CPU isn't even the highest available. The current TOP performance cpu is STILL AMD. The FX-62 which outclocks even the best core 2 duo. The only thing im not sure about is those new core 2 extreme edition because I havent read up on em, but

my guess is intel just up'd the bus speed and remarketed them

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 20:02:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...

Intel's Core 2 Duo has a faster architecture than the Athlon X2 (or FX), so it doesn't matter that AMD's CPU has a higher clock speed.

The Athlon 64 X2 6000+ runs at 3 GHz, but it's still slower than the 2.4 GHz E6600.

As much as you'd like to imagine that you know what you're talking about, troop, you don't. So shut up.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 20:25:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Wed, 01 August 2007 23:19Well, nice to know the dumbasses have arrived. The next person that posts that single core procesors are better is going to get kicked in the throat. In other news, I canceled my order for my 8800Ultra seeing as the 9800GTX is going to be the same price and 2x the power.

Wait, you were planning to buy an Ultra?

Give me your wallet - you seem to enjoy wasting money (SEE: BENCHMARKS)

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 21:01:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

When dual-core technology first arose each core wasn't much faster than a single-core processor, but thats completely changed now as the technology improves and the cores are much faster. Granted that not very many programs take advantage of both cores yet, but that will change in a short while as well. I doubt you will find a single-core processor that is faster than a dual-core nowadays. Dual-core technology will be truly awesome when it is truly two cores. Right now it is two cores on the same die, though, AMD claims to have created a true dual-core processor, I would sure like to see that.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Aprime](#) on Thu, 02 Aug 2007 23:30:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Entry-level AMD dual-cores are still worthless. At least, that's what I think, from personal experience.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 02:34:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anyone that thinks dual core processors are useless for gaming haven't been reading about any of the new games coming out.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 02:59:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree. New games coming out are definitely taking advantage of both cores. Real time strategy games are a great example; [CORE-1: PLAYER-LOGIC][CORE-2: AI-LOGIC]. I believe Supreme Commander does this and from what I have heard it works well.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 09:30:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unreal Tournament 3 will take advantage of both 64-bit and dual core techs.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 09:44:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dave S. Anderson wrote on Thu, 02 August 2007 23:01 When dual-core technology first arose each core wasn't much faster than a single-core processor, but that's completely changed now as the technology improves and the cores are much faster. Granted that not very many programs take advantage of both cores yet, but that will change in a short while as well. I doubt you will find a single-core processor that is faster than a dual-core nowadays. Dual-core technology will be truly awesome when it is truly two cores. Right now it is two cores on the same die, though, AMD claims to have created a true dual-core processor, I would sure like to see that. 2 "cores" on 1 die is actually more efficient than 2 cores just connected by the CPU package. both on 1 die means higher connects, less latency, and the connects can run at higher speed

thanks to the higher quality of the links. Also this enables shared cache and shared memory controller, which is faster than having both cores to talk to each other by FSB.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 15:09:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 02 August 2007 21:34: Anyone that thinks dual core processors are useless for gaming haven't been reading about any of the new games coming out.

That's exactly the thing. They are useful, and better than single core CPUs when the actual things you're running (games, media apps, etc) support it. The problem now is that not too many things do, although more and more stuff is. I went with single core because I know it will still be a while when dual goes mainstream and everything is based on that technology.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 16:42:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

98% of all computers sold in retail stores like Best Buy or Circuit City are dual core systems. Don't tell me they aren't mainstream.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 17:00:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote: 2 "cores" on 1 die is actually more efficient than 2 cores just connected by the CPU package. Both on 1 die means higher connects, less latency, and the connects can run at higher speed thanks to the higher quality of the links. Also this enables shared cache and shared memory controller, which is faster than having both cores to talk to each other by FSB.

And that is exactly why it is not a true dual-core processor. I would presume that true dual-core processors may have a slightly different purpose than your average dual-core processor.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 17:58:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

dual-core means two cores, which Athlon X2s/Core 2 Duos have

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 20:08:01 GMT

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

Yes, but they will not be true dual-core processors until they have a each core on its own die. As I said in a previous post, AMD claims to have a true dual-core processor, but I have yet to see it.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 20:59:17 GMT

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

Quote:A dual-core CPU combines two independent processors and their respective caches and cache controllers onto a single silicon chip, or integrated circuit.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 21:11:51 GMT

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

After some much needed research it appears you're right. A true dual-core processor does indeed include two cores on the same die. Quad-core processors do have two dies though, each holding two cores.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 21:23:52 GMT

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

I got my new PC set up last night. I can tell you that my quad core (2.4) is fucking insane. I have had it running a day and already I know I can never go back. And I have not even over clocked it yet ...

(The 4Gb of ram, FXF 640Mb DDR3 Nvidia card, and WD 10,000rpm 16Mb cach raptor don't hurt either)

... now where is that supreme commander disk? I'm going to eat this fucking game for breakfast.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Fri, 03 Aug 2007 21:37:12 GMT

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

troopr02 wrote on Fri, 03 August 2007 10:09DarkDemin wrote on Thu, 02 August 2007

21:34 Anyone that thinks dual core processors are useless for gaming haven't been reading about any of the new games coming out.

That's exactly the thing. They are useful, and better than single core CPU's when the actual things you're running (games, media apps, etc) support it. The problem now is that not too many things do, although more and more stuff is. I went with single core because I know it will still be a while when dual goes mainstream and everything is based on that technology.

Sure, not single applications, but multiple applications can be distributed among the cores to lighten the load and thus get more done.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 07:43:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dual core is definitely useful..

Running games with normal FPS while running fraps in the background, do anti-virus and so on.

A year ago people would say "Dual core is still useless because it isn't supported by programs yet". Now dual-core is getting mainstream and you don't hear them complaining anymore, they probably even own one themselves.

Same is going on for quad core now really. You can get a Q6600 for a bit more than a dual core. And in the future it will give benefit. (and maybe even now it depends on what you're doing.)

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 09:11:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you run lots of applications, more cores help. Sometimes I have 3DS max, Unreal edit (another 3D editor, so lots of memory and CPU usage) and then media player and Firefox etc. My single core would've died under that load, and a Celeron could forget it.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 17:12:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Your single-core processor must have been pretty weak. :\

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [luv2pb](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 17:46:02 GMT

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

mrpirate wrote on Fri, 03 August 2007 13:58 dual-core means two cores
Did you just actually type that out?

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [mrpirate](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 18:11:10 GMT

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

taken a bit out of context but pretty funny none-the-less

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 18:22:16 GMT

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

I thought this was so neat, it was worth posting. Below is an image of the AMD Phenom Quad-Core Die. Quite the eye-candy if you ask me.

Clicky!

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 18:36:57 GMT

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

Dave S. Anderson wrote on Fri, 03 August 2007 23:11 After some much needed research it appears you're right. A true dual-core processor does indeed include two cores on the same die. Quad-core processors do have two dies though, each holding two cores. Yes, but those aren't "real" quadcores, according to the definition of a dualcore having 2 cores on 1 piece of silicon. A "real" quadcore should have 4 cores on 1 piece of silicon.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [Dave Anderson](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 20:32:59 GMT

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

Did you view that image I posted? Its a true Quad Core.

Subject: Re: New Computer

Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sat, 04 Aug 2007 20:45:53 GMT

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

I did notice that, but I thought I'd post that anyway, just to clarify.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 02:50:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Yorkfield Quad Cores will be TRUE quad core processors. Way to jump the gun luv2pb.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 03:39:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think that people only think duel core processors are better just because of the placebo effect. The power of suggestion, which is very powerful and you don't know that it has taken hold of you. There are only certain people who are not affected by it (as much).

Duel core processors will only make your computer fast if you run a server type application that utilizes duel core tech. "I run 3DS max and visual studio" is an example of when a duel core processor would NOT make a difference.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 03:45:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoShamBo wrote on Sat, 04 August 2007 23:39 I think that people only think duel core processors are better just because of the placebo effect. The power of suggestion, which is very powerful and you don't know that it has taken hold of you. There are only certain people who are not affected by it (as much).

Duel core processors will only make your computer fast if you run a server type application that utilizes duel core tech. "I run 3DS max and visual studio" is an example of when a duel core processor would NOT make a difference.

I can officially say you're a moron and prove it.

File Attachments

1) [c_3dmax.png](#), downloaded 436 times



3D-Studio Max 9
Rendering HDTV 1920 x 1080

Kentsfield Core 2 Extreme QX6800	0:39
Kentsfield Core 2 Extreme QX6700	0:43
Kentsfield Core 2 Quad Q6600	0:47
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6850	1:09
Conroe XE Core 2 Extreme X6800	1:11
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6750	1:16
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6700	1:18
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6600	1:26
Windsor (F3) Athlon 64 X2 6000+	1:27
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6650	1:27
Windsor (F3) Athlon 64 X2 5600+	1:32
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 FX-62	1:32
Windsor-512 (F3) Athlon 64 X2 5400+	1:33
Allendale Core 2 Duo E6400	1:36
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6420	1:37
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 5200+	1:39
Windsor-512 (F2) Athlon 64 X2 5000+	1:40
Windsor (F3) Athlon 64 X2 5200+	1:40
Windsor-512 (F3) Athlon 64 X2 5000+ EE	1:41
Brisbane (G1, 65nm) Athlon 64 X2 5000+ EE	1:42
Brisbane (G1, 65nm) Athlon 64 X2 4800+ EE	1:46
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4800+ EE	1:47
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4800+	1:47
Windsor-512 (F3) Athlon 64 X2 4600+ EE	1:47
Windsor-512 (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4600+	1:49
Conroe Core 2 Duo E6320	1:50
Allendale Core 2 Duo E6300	1:50
Brisbane (G1, 65nm) Athlon 64 X2 4400+ EE	1:54
Conroe-L Pentium Dual Core E2160	1:54
Allendale Core 2 Duo E4300	1:54
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4400+ EE	1:56
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4400+	1:56
Windsor-512 (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4200+	1:59
Windsor-512 (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4200+ EE	1:59
Presler Pentium EE 965	2:01
Brisbane (G1, 65nm) Athlon 64 X2 4000+ EE	2:05
Brisbane EE (G1) Athlon X2 BE-2350	2:05
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4000+	2:08
Presler Pentium D 960	2:08
Windsor (F2) Athlon 64 X2 4000+ EE	2:08
Conroe-L Pentium Dual Core E2140	2:09
Windsor-512 (F2) Athlon 64 X2 3800+	2:09
Windsor-512 (F3) Athlon 64 X2 3800+ EE	2:09
Presler Pentium EE 955	2:11
Smithfield Pentium EE 840	2:16
Presler Pentium D 950	2:18
Brisbane EE (G1) Athlon X2 BE-2300	2:18
Brisbane (G1, 65nm) Athlon 64 X2 3600+ EE	2:18
Smithfield Pentium D 840	2:23
Presler Pentium D 940	2:26
Smithfield Pentium D 830	2:33

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [jnz](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 03:50:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Sun, 05 August 2007 04:45RoShamBo wrote on Sat, 04 August 2007 23:39I think that people only think duel core processors are better just because of the placebo effect. The power of suggestion, which is very powerful and you don't know that it has taken hold of you. There are only certain people who are not affected by it (as much).

Duel core processors will only make your computer fast if you run a server type application that utilizes duel core tech. "I run 3DS max and visual studio" is an example of when a duel core processor would NOT make a difference.

I can officially say you're a moron and prove it.

Thats proves shit, lol.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 03:54:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The fastest single core processor is a full 2 minutes slower than the fastest dual core processor when rendering in 3DSMax now stop acting like a moron and read more.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [cmatt42](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 04:04:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

RoShamBo wrote on Sat, 04 August 2007 22:39I think that people only think duel core processors are better just because of the placebo effect. The power of suggestion, which is very powerful and you don't know that it has taken hold of you. There are only certain people who are not affected by it (as much).

Duel core processors will only make your computer fast if you run a server type application that utilizes duel core tech. "I run 3DS max and visual studio" is an example of when a duel core processor would NOT make a difference.

How can you expect us to believe you when you're using "duel" instead of the correct "dual"? Anyway, other than the benchmarks that prove you're a blithering idiot, I've already addressed the whole "there are no programs that use it" part. Here, read it again:
cmatt42 wrote on Fri, 03 August 2007 16:37

Sure, not single applications, but multiple applications can be distributed among the cores to lighten the load and thus getting more done.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [Romaner](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 04:32:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i got a question, should i get the 2x6000 athlon or should i wait till amd comes out with quad core?

does anyone here know when they will be in stores and how expensive of a motherboard you will need for them?

thanks in advance

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 05:04:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

AMD is falling far behind, buy an Intel processor.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Sun, 05 Aug 2007 08:43:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DarkDemin wrote on Sun, 05 August 2007 07:04AMD is falling far behind, buy an Intel processor. Well, the new phemon looks awesome to bad that it won't be here till Q3 or so.

Subject: Re: New Computer
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2007 00:00:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So here it is in all its glory.

File Attachments


1) [newsystemp.jpg](#), downloaded 568 times

CPU-Z

CPU | Cache | Mainboard | Memory | SPD | About

Processor

Name	Intel Core 2 Duo E6850		
Code Name	Conroe	Brand ID	
Package	Socket 775 LGA		
Technology	65 nm	Voltage	1.248 v



Specification: Intel(R) Core(TM)2 Duo CPU E6850 @ 3.00GHz

Family	6	Model	F	Stepping	B
Ext. Family	6	Ext. Model	F	Revision	G0

Instructions: MMX, SSE, SSE2, SSE3, SSSE3, EM64T

Clocks (Core#0)

Core Speed	3000.2 MHz
Multiplier	x 9.0
Bus Speed	333.4 MHz
Rated FSB	1333.4 MHz

Cache

L1 Data	2 x 32 KBytes
L1 Code	2 x 32 KBytes
Level 2	4096 KBytes
Level 3	

Selection: Processor #1 | Cores: 2 | Threads: 2

Version 1.40.5

CPU-Z [OK]

CPU-Z

CPU | Cache | Mainboard | Memory | SPD | About

Motherboard

Manufacturer	ASUSTeK Computer INC.		
Model	P5N32-E SLI PLUS		1.XX
Chipset	NVIDIA	650i SLI SPP	Rev. A2
Southbridge	NVIDIA	nForce 570 SLI	
Sensor	Winbond	W83791D	

BIOS

Brand	Phoenix Technologies, LTD
Version	ASUS P5N32-E SLI PLUS ACPI BIOS Revision 0501
Date	02/07/2007

Graphic Interface

Version	PCI-Express		
Link Width	x16	Max. Supported	x16
Side Band			

Version 1.40.5

CPU-Z [OK]