In article <3BD984EB.3ABB47A9@noaa.gov>, Paul van Delst
<paul.vandelst@noaa.gov> wrote:

> "Steve Smith" wrote:

[snip]

> You've only deepened my interest now. If Apple systems were/are so great,
> why are PC systems so
> ubiquitous _now_? Solely due to the marketing strategies of Microsoft? I
> thought it had more to
> do with the cost effectiveness of IBM clones. Did Apple see what happened
> to IBM after cheap
> PCs became available in the 80's and decided not to do that?
>
>> Quality of the systems is much easier to control using the Apple hardware
>> philosophy. Apple clones are also available, and are competitve with
>> PC's.
>
> Is this a relatively recent phenomoenon? If not, the same question as
> before pops up: why PC rather than Macs?

   I hat eto get into these religious discussions, especially when it's
not on the right board, but I'll allow myself one digression. (Mea
culpa.)

   Macs made almost everyone unhappy 5 - 6 years ago. It made good
corporate sense then to go with the crowd. The auality of the Mac OS(es)
and hardwareis much better now, but the damage was done --- before 1995.
It was done by IBM introducing the first "business" PV in 1983 (?) and
Apple never bneing able to catch up. For corporate America (don't know
about elsewhere), "No one ever lost his job recommending IBM" as a
corporate ladder-climbing philosophy seamlessly became "No one ever lost
her job by recommending Microsoft." Big business likes big business, and
big business (here, anyway) has never been able to figure Apple out, not
as a produicer of products, not as an investment. Only the consumer
(here) appears to.

>
>> In recent years, I would say that the Macintosh's are actually a better
>> deal in some cases: consider the iBook, can you get G4 500 MHz, firewire,
>> usb, dvd on a PC for $1200?
>
> Yeah, but now all the various software companies are dropping Mac

> support... :o) (no need to
> reply to this last one - it is intended to be flippant.)

   Maybe more to the point for this group, I compared a 1.7 GHz P4 Dell
OptiPlex 400 (256K cache, 4 PCI slots after sound card is installed,
Windows 2000, 3 year hardware and OS software support, 4X AGP 32 Mybte
NVidia 2 card, 17 inch TFT display, 16x "max" CD-RW, 128 Mbyte memory,
40 Gbyte 7200 rpm drive, 10/100 Ethernet, 1 spare drive bay, 4 USB
ports), US federal pricing, to a Power Mac G4 I recently ordered (733
MHz G4 w/AltiVec, 256K cache, 4X AGP Nvidia GeForce 2MX/32 Mbyte, 4 PCI
slots, Mac OS 9.2.1 and 10.1, 3 year AppleCare on hardware and OS, 17
inch TFT Apple Studio Display, 12x10x32 CD-RW, 128 Mbyte memory, 40
Gbyte 5400 rpm drive, 10/100/1000 Ethernet, 2 spare drive bays, 2 USB
ports + 2 on Studio Display, 2 FireWire ports), and the price difference
was < $100 out of ~ $2400.

   One could argue forever about whether the 1.7 GHz P4 or the 733 MHz
G4 was "faster" or "better," over whether Gbit Ethernet is "necessary,"
over whether the Apple Studio Display and its digital interface is
better, and so on and on, but the two systems are pretty comparable. But
who would really choose Windows 2000 over a FreeBSD based system?
Probably only corporate America (and maybe other contries'
corporations), because "You can't lose your job recommending Microsoft."
I'm not saying it's a bad decision, just that it was never made with
much more than a pointy-haired boss's level of insight.

   Of course, now you'll have to "rent" Microsoft's OSes every year in
order to get updates, while Apple will just sell you the update. Maybe
then even hair-acuteness-challenged will take notice.... too late for
most of them.

   It's interesting that the corporate bosses may drive BMW's or
Mercedes products (to which Steve Jobs compares Apple), but they don't
want their IT departments roaring around with anything more fun than a
Ford Contour.

   IMHO, of course,

          Joe Gurman