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> David\_A.\_Schnider@bmug.org wrote:

> : The real question here in my opinion is what Motorola processors running sy

stem

> : 7 on a MAC are comparable to what Intel processors running Windows on a PC?

I

> [stuff deleted]

> : -David

> --

> Even better than that... how does a 68000-based Amiga 2000 perform in

> daily tasks compared to my 68030-based IIci.

> Answer, except in a very few cases, I get my butt kicked by the Amiga.

> Sure there are other considerations, but it goes to show you how

> proper design from the beginning (in hardware and software) can give

> you great returns. [as well as showing you that if you don't have a

> marketing department to speak of, no one will care how good your system is]

I've had the same experience actually. I love the Mac interface and any number

of the features, but am sorely dissapointed with the speed. I use macs daily

and am a Moc consultant for OSU Statistics department; I'm familiar with almost

every model out there, and my experience is that both the Amiga and the Atari

ST simply "blow the Mac out of the water" in terms of performance. At this time

I would in general say that the other advantages of the Mac outweigh the

advantages of the Amiga or the ST (and Falcon), but I really wish Apple would

get their heads together on speed... :-((((( They could take a real lesson in

muli-tasking from the Amiga OS or the MultiTOS in the Atari Falcons too :-(((

> I'm still happy with my ci, but I don't understand why the performance is

> so bad (comparatively). They could have done multi-tasking \_properly\_.

> They could have done everthing else better -- but apple didn't.

> (of course DOS 6 and windows 3.1 are nothin to write home about either!!)

I just hope that someone comes out with a machine that does \*everything\* well

someday. If I had my choice, I would go with Mac in most aspects, but add the

speed and superior Multi-Tasking of the other platforms.

As for the original topic; Trying to compare \*just the chip\* in a machine seems

almost worthless. A fast 386 with a wiz-bang graphics accelerator will be

faster in productivity for many applications than a even a stock Quadra. Add a

graphics accelerator to a 486 and you \*really fly\*. Of course, add one the the

Quadra and then you're blowing the 486 away... etc...

> Oh well, y'all got $2.00 worth for the price of $0.02

I think mine was only worth $0.01.......

---------------------------------------------------------------------->

|-! -David Butler- dhbutler@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu

"This is not a novel to be tossed away lightly;

it should be thrown with great force." -Dorothy Parker