
Subject: Nice Roger Nichols tips
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Sat, 16 Sep 2006 02:47:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

or Code
18/12

I did some testing and both multi pin cables are good and both MECs get recognised individually by Card A but neither MEC is recognised individually by Card B

Any ideas as to what is going on?

Don18/12 is an ADAT module error IIRC. Are you running Paris on Win XP? If so, do you have more than one ADAT module "per MEC"? If this is the case, this is the problem. If you've only got one ADAT module, make sure it's in the MEC attached to Card A.

Deej

"Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:451ea4da@linux...
> Okay here's where I am so far
>
> 2 EDS cards - Both functioning when Card A is connected to single MEC A -
> this has been my set up for several years now.
>
> So I buy a second MEC and ADAT card..check to see that both MEC and ADAT
> card are functioning by connecting them to Card A...I didn't try sending a
> signal to my machine with the Dakota card so I am in fact assuming they
both
> work BUT this new MEC setup was recognised by Paris and showed up
correctly
> in the Patch bay window
>
> So I....
>
> Wired MEC A via multi pin cable to Card A
> Wired MEC B via multi pin cable to Card B
> Link the two MECs via the word clock cable I bought from you...MEC A -WC
out
> to MEC B WC in
>
> Start Paris - Get message - Error in initializing Paris Engine Error Code
> 18/12
>
> I did some testing and both multi pin cables are good and both MECs get
> recognised individually by Card A but neither MEC is recognised
individually

> by Card B
>
> Any ideas as to what is going on?
>
> Don
>
>
>Pretty kewl stuff, Kim!

"Good on ya, mate!" :)

Neil

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>
>For anyone who wants to check out some tunes from your favourite newsgroup
>host, please check out:
>
><http://www.myspace.com/drschnauberg>
>
>I'm in the midst of a work ethic/method revolution, where I try and produce
>songs within the space of only a couple of hours. All these tunes are recorded
>mostly on my GNX-4 looper, then transferred to Paris and vocals and solos
>are added. It's usually about a 2-2.5 hour turnaround for a complete song.
>
>And yes some of the recording methods are dodgy... yes I need to get a
pop
>filter for the mic, and yes the harmonies in Revision need work, but hey,
>it's music, I'm getting it done quickly, and I'm having fun, and I think
>the vibe is there. :o)
>
>Tell me what you think...
>
>Cheers,
>Kim.2 MECs with one ADAT module per MEC

D

"DJ" <notachance@net.net> wrote in message news:451ea7e4@linux...
> 18/12 is an ADAT module error IIRC. Are you running Paris on Win XP? If
> so,
> do you have more than one ADAT module "per MEC"? If this is the case, this
> is the problem. If you've only got one ADAT module, make sure it's in the
> MEC attached to Card A.
>

> Deej
>
> "Don Nafe" <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote in message news:451ea4da@linux...
>> Okay here's where I am so far
>>
>> 2 EDS cards - Both functioning when Card A is connected to single MEC A -
>> this has been my set up for several years now.
>>
>> So I buy a second MEC and ADAT card..check to see that both MEC and ADAT
>> card are functioning by connecting them to Card A...I didn't try sending
>> a
>> signal to my machine with the Dakota card so I am in fact assuming they
> both
>> work BUT this new MEC setup was recognised by Paris and showed up
> correctly
>> in the Patch bay window
>>
>> So I....
>>
>> Wired MEC A via multi pin cable to Card A
>> Wired MEC B via multi pin cable to Card B
>> Link the two MECs via the word clock cable I bought from you...MEC A -WC
> out
>> to MEC B WC in
>>
>> Start Paris - Get messa

Subject: Re: Nice Roger Nichols tips
Posted by [emarenote](#) on Mon, 18 Sep 2006 15:00:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>situation. Apple knows Intel is going to rock in to the future. I'm
sure
>>>Apple is also working with AMD, but I think they signed an exclusive with
>>>Intel. When that's up, I think you'll see Apple AMD machines also. You
>>>may also see Apple IBM machines in the future, but I think it depends
on
>>>IBM, and price/proformance.
>>>
>>>As long as MS plays nice with Apple I don't think you will see OSX on
PC
>>>hardware, but again anything is possible. Apple makes too much money
on
>>>hardware and they would lose hardware sales if they did this. Not a smart
>>>business plan for Apple. There would be too much cost to support all
of
>>>the PC hardware out there. If they sold an OS version with out support

>>they
>>>might be able to make some money, but it would still hurt hardware sales.
>>> If they ever get their hard ware closer to the end user cost of PC hardware,
>>>it might be more possible. I don't think that will happen any time soon,
>>>besides they will never get anywhere near the cost to build your own PC.
>>> Besides, you can already hack the OSX and run it on a PC. I think
it
>>>would just hurt Apple.
>>>
>>>What I'd like to see, is lower hardware prices from Apple, and the ability
>>>to run any Windows PC software on Mac OSX. That would be a lot better
>solution.
>>> Mac users really don't want the Windows viruses on our Macs! Apple is
>>a
>>>hardware and software company, I think they would like you to buy both
>from
>>>them.
>>>
>>>Although, if the gloves ever come off, and the average guy finds out the
>>>truth that Mac OSX is less expensive and easier to deal with and does
the
>>>same things, Microsoft will have some serious competition on the computing
>>>home front.
>>>
>>>Mac OSX on a PC would be a bad thing for Microsoft, and MS would definitely
>>>try to stop it. Apple is doing fine, and I think that nobody really wants
>>>to poison the well they all drink from.
>>>
>>>That's my take on it.
>>>
>>>Any thing is possible, only time will tell.
>>>
>>>James
>>>
>>>
>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>I dont know about the "Ain't going to happen. Let's take a look.
>>>>They dump the IMB-Motorola Processor(Thank God) for some real power(Intel's)..
>>>>That one event opened up "Pandora's Box) into Microsoft all over again
>>:)
>>>>
>>>>Thus, it was inevitable that running windows on a Mac would soon follow
>>>and
>>>>it happened (fast) I might add..BootCamp and other hacked versions..
>>>>

>>>>Being that there are more windows users in the world, how many Ipods would
 >>>>you say were Windows version of IPods versus Mac Ipods?? Itunes is the
 >>prefered
 >>>>media player on both Macs and Window PCs.
 >>>>I really do think it's only a matter of time before we a cross-platform
 >>>of
 >>>>Logic.
 >>>>
 >>>>Question: James M or Jamie.. The big rumor is that Apple will release
 >a
 >>>vrsion
 >>>>of OS-x for any PC?? Is this true. If it is, wonderful.. Also, that DELL
 >>>>and Hp are signed on to become OEM vendors.Offering a user to either
 have
 >>>>Windows or OS-x as their prefered OS.???

>>>>
 >>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>>> > Just be glad Gibson didn't buy Logic!!!
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Oh great, now I'm going to have nightmares! ;^)

>>>>>
 >>>>>It will be interesting to see what refinements end up in future versions
 >>>>>
 >>>>>of Logic. I'm personally glad it's already come so far, and is now not
 >>>>
 >>>>>only feature-rich but much more reliable. The hardware and OS it runs
 >>on
 >>>>
 >>>>>is plenty fast and reasonably elegant.
 >>>>>
 >>>>>I'm glad we have choices, too. For anyone who wants Nuendo, Pro Tools
 >>or
 >>>>
 >>>>>is limited to running on MSWindows, clearly you should not buy Logic.
 >>
 >>>>>Apple will be OK without your money.
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Of course it _would_ be great if Logic were multi-platform but the
 >>>>>reality is that ain't gonna happen.
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Cheers,
 >>>>> -Jamie
 >>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>James McCloskey wrote:

>>>>> Hey
