

---

Subject: Apple's cost for Intel processors???

Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 11:01:37 GMT

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

---

<http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>

---

---

Subject: Re: Apple's cost for Intel processors???

Posted by [jjdpro](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 17:04:58 GMT

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

---

Hey James,

I think we al pretty much expected this due to the both Intel's and AmD's Operton dual cores are much more costly even to PC builders than a single core processor.

Personaly, I would like to see Apple build a single core Intel P4 macine for everyday buisness and or low end music video machine. great work still can be done on single core processors. This way, they can gain even more market share.

"James McCloskey" <[excelsm@hotmail.com](mailto:excelsm@hotmail.com)> wrote:

>  
>  
>

><http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>

---

---

Subject: Re: Apple's cost for Intel processors???

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 18:29:35 GMT

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

---

I wonder why they didn't go with AMD. I'll bet they could have gotten a price break from AMD (though that's purely speculation). Perhaps it's an \*image\* thing, but AMD's image is well respected in the AV community and that's where a large part of Apple's market is.

"James McCloskey" <[excelsm@hotmail.com](mailto:excelsm@hotmail.com)> wrote in message  
news:43d20681\$1@linux...

>  
>  
>

> <http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>

---

Subject: Re: Apple's cost for Intel processors???  
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 20:13:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Give it a couple of years for AMD and Apple. I think the reasons Apple went with Intel is, Intel supplies something like 90% of all of the chips used, bigger name recognition. The biggest reason is MOBOs. Last year Apple's chief hardware designer retired from Apple. With Intel's help and their code lock system, Apple could get new systems to market quickest. Apple is a business, and it's all about business.

James

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>I wonder why they didn't go with AMD. I'll bet they could have gotten a  
>price break from AMD (though that's purely speculation). Perhaps it's an  
>\*image\* thing, but AMD's image is well respected in the AV community and  
>that's where a large part of Apple's market is.

>

>

>"James McCloskey" <[excelsm@hotmail.com](mailto:excelsm@hotmail.com)> wrote in message  
>news:43d20681\$1@linux...

>>

>>

>>

>> <http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: Apple's cost for Intel processors???  
Posted by [TCB](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 21:17:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I've wondered the same thing. It looks like they're jumping right now to the least attractive set of technology. Read up on the Cell chips from IBM and they look spectacular, while AMD is currently handing Intel its ass in the spaces where performance and power consumption matter. I assume Apple did what it did because Intel paid them off, er that's illegal, so I assume Intel agreed to extensive mutually beneficial marketing (what Intel does with some other manufacturers like Dell). Where I work we're taking a serious look at a dual core dual processor AMD based server for our next mail server.

TCB

"DJ" <[animix\\_spam-this-ahole\\_@animas.net](mailto:animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net)> wrote:

>I wonder why they didn't go with AMD. I'll bet they could have gotten a  
>price break from AMD (though that's purely speculation). Perhaps it's an  
>\*image\* thing, but AMD's image is well respected in the AV community and  
>that's where a large part of Apple's market is.

>

>

>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
>news:43d20681\$1@linux...

>>

>>

>>

>> <http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>

>

>

---

Subject: Re: Apple's cost for Intel processors???  
Posted by [LaMont](#) on Sat, 21 Jan 2006 22:44:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Agreed. Apple & AMD had a deal 3 years ago. It bben speculated that Intel came to the table with \$\$\$ and Apple renigged of the AMD deal. This has prompted AMD to start litigation against Intel..

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>I've wondered the same thing. It looks like they're jumping right now to the

>least attractive set of technology. Read up on the Cell chips from IBM and

>they look spectacular, while AMD is currently handing Intel its ass in the

>spaces where performance and power consumption matter. I assume Apple did

>what it did because Intel paid them off, er that's illegal, so I assume

Intel

>agreed to extensive mutually beneficial marketing (what Intel does with some

>other manufacturers like Dell). Where I work we're taking a serious look

>at a dual core dual processor AMD based server for our next mail server.

>

>

>TCB

>

>

>"DJ" <animix\_spam-this-ahole\_@animas.net> wrote:

>>I wonder why they didn't go with AMD. I'll bet they could have gotten a

>>price break from AMD (though that's purely speculation). Perhaps it's an

>>\*image\* thing, but AMD's image is well respected in the AV community and

>>that's where a large part of Apple's market is.

>>

>>  
>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message  
>>news:43d20681\$1@linux...  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> <http://cestockblog.com/article/5966>  
>>  
>>  
>

---