

---

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.

---