
Subject: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongle demon.
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 15:42:16 GMT

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

between the tweeter and the woofer.

I wrote to Mackie and there response was:

"As long as you are a descent distance away from the cabinets, a meter or so, I don't think it matters. Put them in a horizontal plane with your head and stay a good bit away from them. You should be fine. msp"

This response goes against how the speakers were designed to be mounted and listened thru.....So.....

Does anyone know the optimal positioning?and why?

Thanks,

BrandonIdeally, the speaker should be as far away from your ears as they are apart from each other (equal sided triangle). Also, the cabinets should be aiming at you with the center of the cabinet at right angles to your head. This means that if you have the cabinets sitting lower than your head, you should tilt them up slightly, and tilt down if they are over your head.

Just a rule of thumb... YMMV

David.

Brandon wrote:

> Hi All,

>

> According to the manual these were designed to be placed in a vertical
> position. I have read articles on speaker placement and they say most speakers
> are designed to have the listeners ear at a level height with the tweeter
> OR level with the space between the tweeter and the woofer. I notice that
> the phantom center shifts up and down in front of me as I change my ear level
> in relation to the tweeters. It is written that there is an optimal listening
> position when considering phase relation between the tweeter and the woofer.
> I wrote to Mackie and there response was:

>

> "As long as you are a descent distance away from the cabinets, a meter
> or so, I don't think it matters. Put them in a horizontal plane with
> your head and stay a good bit away from them. You should be fine. msp"

>

> This response goes against how the speakers were designed to be mounted and
> listened thru.....So.....

> Does anyone know the optimal positioning?and why?

>

> Thanks,

> Brandon Horizontal plane is not the same thing as place them horizontally.

Still, the guy who answered obviously was far from expert. Some tips from my experience:

If possible a yard from front wall

Equilateral triangle

Remove any objects from the space in the triangle and as much as you can remove any objects from the plane of the triangle

Aim the tweeters at ear.

Bill

"Brandon" <a@a.com> wrote in message news:4481a5f0\$1@linux...

>

> Hi All,

>

> According to the manual these were designed to be placed in a vertical

> position. I have read articles on speaker placement and they say most

> speakers

> are designed to have the listeners ear at a level height with the tweeter

> OR level with the space between the tweeter and the woofer. I notice that

> the phantom center shifts up and down in front of me as I change my ear

> level

> in relation to the tweeters. It is written that there is an optimal

> listening

> position when considering phase relation between the tweeter and the

> woofer.

> I wrote to Mackie and there response was:

>

> "As long as you are a descent distance away from the cabinets, a meter

> or so, I don't think it matters. Put them in a horizontal plane with

> your head and stay a good bit away from them. You should be fine. msp"

>

> This response goes against how the speakers were designed to be mounted

> and

> listened thru.....So.....

> Does anyone know the optimal positioning?and why?

>

> Thanks,

> Brandon

>Well, duh. I knew that!

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message news:4480cb73\$1@linux...

> Don't run a 15' WC cable from your master clock module to two distro

> modules, then use another short WC cable to link the distro modules

> together

> and then run other WC cables of differing lengths to 3 x RME interfaces
> and
> 3 x MECs while also running ADAT sync cables from 3 x Paris ADAT modules
> to
> the ADAT sync inputs of the 3 x RME cards while the digital I/O of the RME
> cards, the Paris modules, all of your external spdif gear and ADAT gear is
> all patched into three different M-Audio Digipatch units which are daisy
> chained to each other using spdif cables in an attempt to allow
> simultaneous
> clocking of everything from two different sources derived from the same

Subject: Re: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongledemon.
Posted by [Chris Ludwig](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 16:23:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ugs.
>
>Deej
>

The UAD-1 1073 is quite good. I'm in.
GeneSequoia installed it's own burn routines and limited my Plextor DVD/CD drive to 12x or higher (in every application, not just Sequoia). Frustrating, and a bit perplexing. I had 1-8x before in other apps (including Nero) and never burned anything faster than 4 or 8x. Masters have always been at 1 or 2x on Apogee discs. (I had to install another Plextor CD writer to get 1x (no 2x) until I sort out the dll issues).

I have no doubt that the data from any speed disc will cancel when phase reversed with the original in a DAW as a DAW should be able to rip data without errors since there is no synced streaming requirement, but that doesn't account for reading, error correction/failure due to elliptical burns, etc. when a CD player is attempting to translate in realtime.

Regards,
Dedric

On 6/3/06 4:59 AM, in article 44816b7d\$1@linux, "Warren"
<tonetemple@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
> Call me superstitious but I will only ever burn important masters at 1x on
> an old scsi burner. I have some old masters burnt on a 16x ide drive burnt
> at speeds ranging from 4x to 16x that sound like 2nd generation cassette
> copies in comparison to the 1x. Maybe it's just my particular gear but I
> can hear the difference between 1x and 2x burns, not significant but I can
> hear it .. blind. I used to think this whole argument was rubbish until I

> compared these old discs with newer ones I burnt of the same files. Instantly
> converted.
> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>> Yes, a burn at 40X when analyzed will show higher error rates than one burned
>> at 4X. But the 40X CD will still have error rates below what industry
>> standards
>> accept for pressed CDs, and the error correction in those (actually quite
>> rare) situations wil

Subject: Re: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongle demon.
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 16:38:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ta. Some people still burn slower when they are sending things to be
>> duplicated
>>>> but as far as I'm concerned that's like clicking slower because the link
>>>> goes to your bank account balance. As long as your burner isn't generating
>>>> errors it's all the same.

>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Here is the catch. Almost all burners do generate errors and the error
> rate
>>> is far worse at higher rates.
>>>
>>> The primary difference between data CDs and audio CDs is that data CDs
> will
>>> error check and keep recalling the same data in an attempt to get perfect
>>> copies. In most cases a few retries will succeed and the only negative
> effect
>>> is a slight delay in transfer.
>>>

>>> Reed-Solomon Error Correction is the most common for CDs and DATs. A good
>>> (but highly technical) explanation is here:

>>> <http://www.ddj.com/184410107>

>>>

>>> Error correction is better than nothing, but does deteriorate the audio

>> and

>>> sometimes it murders the audio.

>>>

>>> solutions

>>> that give detailed and accurate error rates and can certify disks for use

>>> as masters.

>>>

>>> All this is much more important for dealing with critical masters than

> just

>>> normal CD copies for clients, but the issues remain.

>>>

>>> If you care about the quality of your audio copies and their longevity,

>> you

>>> should:

>>> 1. Qualify your burner by checking errors using a trusted method.

>>> 2. Burn at slower speeds.

>>> 3. Use high quality blanks.

>>>

>>> for most of my non-critical work.

>>>

>>

>The external clock sounds noticeably better than the Paris clock. The Mytek does add a bit of additional clarity to the conversion process and I may go back to it. I'm still testing. The Lucid is doing a fine job right now clocking the system during mixing and though I'm using AD/DA conversion with the Multiface patched to external gear in Cubase when clocked to the Lucid, the sound I'm getting is very good.

Deej

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote in message
news:44817d73\$1@linux...

>

> Hey deej, I thought at one time you were thinking that clocking with the mytek

> as master sounded noticeably better. Was that just wax in your ears?

Subject: Re: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongledemon.
Posted by [jef knight\[1\]](#) on Wed, 10 May 2006 21:12:54 GMT

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

burn and the burn length.

>
>My Yamaha F1
>CD writer has a function called AAMQ which lengthens the burns and
>test the disc to optimize the laser strength. It works. When using it
>on something I know really well, that I have been mixing and
>mastering for weeks, I can hear the difference when playing back
>CD's of the sessions, and I could do so in a double-blind test.
>
>How do you explain this?
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>I'd say this means you have a nearly faulty CD player, but that's me.
>>
>>Remember Derek, who used to hang out here? We went over this once ad infinitum
>>and Derek and I tested this way. We ripped and burned the same track over
>>and over again. Like twenty rips and then twenty burns, one was burned
at
>>
>X and one at 32X. After the last rip we did the flip the phase trick and
>>heard . . . nothing. These days I could probalby run a diff on the audio
>>files to compare them bit for bit, but that's enough proof to me that a
>properly
>>functioning CD player will get the same data off of CDs that are properly
>>burned, regardless of speed.
>>
>>Also, if this is true, why don't faster hard drives involve more errors
>that
>>slower ones? They have to write data just like CD burners do.
>>
>>TCB
>>
>>"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>Whether or not I can hear anything, here is all the proof I need: My car
>>>
>>>deck is slowly making it's way to the graveyard. Faster burns won't play
>>in
>>>it. Slower ones do. That says to me w/o any doubts that the faster burns
>>are
>>>either mishapen (more elliptical) or they have higher errors or both.
>>>I burn 'em slow for masters.
>>>
>>>AA
>>>
>>>
>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:44808fe2\$1@linux...
>>>>

>>>> I can't.
>>>>
>>>> "DC" <dc@spamyermama.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>When prepping CDs for duplication I usually burn slower, at 4X or 8X,
>>but
>>>>>>I think that's largely superstition.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>It's not. Most people can clearly hear the difference between a
>>>>>>CD written at 24 or higher and one written at 4 or lower.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>DC
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I choose Polesoft Lockspam to fight spam, and you?
>>>><http://www.polesoft.com/refer.html>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>My point is that you can't take a faulty instrument and extrapolate from it
how non-faulty gear will work. I've seen CD drives that won't boot off a
CD that boots on 90% of the machines I deal with at work, I don't extrapolate
from this that my bootable ISO image or my CD burner isn't working, I extrapolate
that the drive in the machine that won't boot the CD is FUBAR.

I never said that every burner will produce the exact same number of errors
at all different speeds. It's doubtless that some produce more errors at
different speeds, though it's not always 'slower is better.' My point was
that any correctly working burner will produce errors that are statistically
and audibly meaningless, at whatever speed is being used.

If other people want to wait longer for CDs that's absolutely fine with me.
I just gave an example that I used that, while not precisely scientific,
I think is rigorous. That's the rip and burn and flip the phase test. That
test dovetailed with my understanding of how CD readers, writers, and players
should work in the real world. So, if Don or someone else can produce repeatable
double blind tests in which the fast burned CD can be ABY picked with statistically
significatn variance from the expected 50/50 result, I'll get interested
again. But everyone should use whatever burn speed they think is best which
in my case is the one that spits it out of the computer the fastest.

TCB

"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>Well, it is faulting.. I established that already. However, regarding that

>fact, why am I consistently seeing the errors on 'only' the fast burned
CDs?

>The obvious fact is that there are more errors. My burner is at best a year

>old, and this seems to be consistent across several of my burners, using
a

>multitude of different programs. While not exactly scientific, it's just
not

>worth it when it's proven in my mind that it creates problems. The other

>factor I'm thinking here is you are likely using good CD players and

>convertors. Have you tried this test with a cheapo player to see if it's

>still the same result?

>

>AA

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4480a7e0\$1@linux...

>>

>> I'd say this means you have a nearly faulty CD player, but that's me.

>>

>> Remember Derek, who used to hang out here? We went over this once ad

>> infinitum

>> and Derek and I tested this way. We ripped and burned the same track over

>> and over again. Like twenty rips and then twenty burns, one was burned

at

>> 2X and one at 32X. After the last rip we did the flip the phase trick

and

>> heard . . . nothing. These days I could probalby run a diff on the audio

>> files to compare them bit for bit, but that's enough proof to me that

a

>> properly

>> functioning CD player will get the same data off of CDs that are properly

>> burned, regardless of speed.

>>

>> Also, if this is true, why don't faster hard drives involve m

Subject: Re: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongle demon.
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 05:30:18 GMT

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

some different options, but I never really push the
> issue except if something is really bothering me or if I find
> it grating.

>
> For example, I'm going to try one more time to see if they'll
> be amenable to dropping the vocal level in the harder sections
> of "What This", because I think it's a bit too hot, and also
> could use just a touch of ambience - even something as small as
> a closet... or a shoebox; it's utterly too dry in those
> sections, IMO; so maybe after listening to it for a couple of
> days, they'll agree to it, but if they're reluctant, I'll leave
> the issue alone. There's no way I'm going to have them saying
> later: "Damn, I wish we hadn't let Neil talk us into that".
>
> So, even though you don't get to play "producer" in these kinds
> of sessions, I find they can be fun... it's a challenge to help
> them come up with "wierd". LOL Like the e-bow part on "Bitch
> Liberte" - that was my idea... Danny (the lead guitarist) had a
> similar, picked, riff that he wanted to put there, and it was
> coming across "ok", then I noticed that the other guitarist had
> an E-Bow sitting in his goodie bag, so I said: "Hey why don't
> you try that part with the E-bow?", so he modified the riff a
> bit so he could do it on the e-bow, and they all LOVED it.
> Same thing with the solo on that song... he had one more or
> less worked out, but when he laid it down & listened back, he
> wasn't too thrilled, but wasn't sure what he wanted to do to
> change it, so I copied pasted some sections of it in a
> different order, flipped one part around in reverse (the little
> bit right at 2:46), and bingo! Just weird enough! lol
>
> Stuff like the subtle little inhale/exhale right before the
> quiet part in "What This" took the singer several attempts at
> the mic, plus a long crossfaded edit, to get just the way they
> wanted it, and doing ten or twelve takes of feedback just to
> get the right feel might bother some people, but I think it's
> kinda fun, and just another part of the process for this kind
> of music. These guys are meticulous in an interesting sort of
> way... little noises that other artists might want edited out,
> these guys want left in sometimes, a pitch issue on a vocal
> might be "ok" in one section ("No, no, don't fix it... leave
> it - it sounds cool there!"), but "not OK" in others ("Lemme do
> another take on that." "That's not very far off, want to see if
> Auto-Tune will take care of it?", "No, not that one, lemme do
> it again"). So, it's different, and I think some recordists
> might find it frustrating, but I find it interesting.
>
> NeilAs an accordion player, I am *so* tired of hearing these *lame* jokes told
as *lame* attempts at humor. I mean, really.

That's not even the correct definition, since only those tiny toy accordions
would fit in a toilet.

Perfect pitch:

1) throwing an accordion into a dumpster and hitting the banjo lying in the bottom, without hitting the sides of the dumpster

or

2) throwing a banjo into a dumpster, and, without hitting one of the sides, hitting directly the accordion already on the bottom.

Bag pipes cannot be rationally discussed in the same sentence as either banjos or accordions.

Now, can we just get along? ;^)

-steve

"tonehouse" <zmcleod@comcast.net> wrote:

>Perfect pitch is "tossing an accordion in the toilet without hitting the
>rim"

>> >

>> >

>> >Well I'm still working on it, and I seem to be progresing fairly well

I

>think.

>> >

>> >I bought this little program for \$12:

>> ><http://www.brenthugh.com/earrest/>

>> >

>> >It simply throws notes at you. I've now got it hooked up through my fave

>> >digital piano with MIDI. It plays a note on my piano, and I have to try

>and

>> >hit that note. It doesn't care if I get the octave right, but I try and

>do

>> >that anyhow.

>> >

>> >You can decide how many/which notes you want it to test you on, and

>weight

>> >them so that some play more than others according to what you're bad
at.

>> >I'm currently using the entire C major scale, and I'm getting about 98%

>correct

>> >when I'm not hung over. ;o) Earlier today I got over 100 questions

>correct

>> >in a row. Generally I get about 50 right and get overconfident or lose

>concentration
>> >and stuff one up, but if I'm concentrating I can get them pretty much all
>> >right.
>> >
>> >I've read a few tips about the place net. It seems the skills generally >come
>> >first to you on your natural instrument, and then slowly migrate over to
>> >others. Having said that I just had my first experience of what I'd call
>> >"real" perfect pitch earlier today, when, in between tests, while
>plugging
>> >in some MIDI stuff, my phone beeped an SMS and I went "Hey, that's F!!".
>> >;o) I don't find I recognise the keys and notes in songs on the radio yet
>> >however, but no doubt that will come.
>> >
>> >My aim is to get up to 98% averages on the entire chromatic scale at >440Hz
>> >by the end of the month, and then I'll start to worry about translating >that
>> >on to tunes on the radio. I figure when you hear someone sing a note, >it's
>> >not hard to imagine a piano playing the note, so if that's what I have to
>> >do to start with, so be it.
>> >
>> >The good thing is I'm growing increasingly confident that it's working, >and
>> >I'm pretty stoked about that. :o)
>> >
>> >Cheers,
>> >Kim.
>>
>
>Kim,

Are you sure you really want perfect pitch? Not me, jeez, I have to throw away half of my favorite records. :)

Sarah
www.sarahtonin.com/wayward.htm

"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:44828928\$1@linux...
>
>
> Well I'm still working on it, and I seem to be progresing fairly well I

> think.
>
> I bought this little program for \$12:
> <http://www.brenthugh.com/earrest/>
>
> It simply throws notes at you. I've now got it hooked up through my fave
> digital piano with MIDI. It plays a note on my piano, and I have to try
> and
> hit that note. It doesn't care if I get the octave right, but I try and do
> that anyhow.
>
> You can decide how many/which notes you want it to test you on, and weight
> them so that some play more than others according to what you're bad at.
> I'm currently using the entire C major scale, and I'm getting about 98%
> correct
> when I'm not hung over. ;o) Earlier today I got over 100 questions correct
> in a row. Generally I get about 50 right and get overconfident or lose
> concentration
> and stuff one up, but if I'm concentrating I can get them pretty much all
> right.
>
> I've read a few tips about the place net. It seems the skills generally
> come
> first to you on your natural instrument, and then slowly migrate over to
> others. Having said that I just had my first experience of what I'd call
> "real" perfect pitch earlier today, when, in between tests, while plugging
> in some MIDI stuff, my phone beeped an SMS and I went "Hey, that's F!!".
> ;o) I don't find I recognise the keys and notes in songs on the radio yet
> however, but no doubt that will come.
>
> My aim is to get up to 98% averages on the entire chromatic scale at 440Hz
> by the end of the month, and then I'll start to worry about translating
> that
> on to tunes on the radio. I figure when you hear someone sing a note, it's
> not hard to imagine a piano playing the note, so if that's what I have to
> do to start with, so be it.
>
> The good thing is I'm growing increasingly confident that it's working,
> and
> I'm pretty stoked about that. :o)
>
> Cheers,
> Kim.Sounds like you're really enjoying yourself.

DOn

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:44831c10\$1@linux...

>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>I checked out the second one, the drummer's right. Seems like he could
>>have chosen more convincing sounds (you sure that wasn't a TD10?), but
>>since the MIDI tracks are available drum sample replacement should be no
>
>>prob. Or maybe he likes those sounds, who knows. As long as the client
>>is happy.
>
> Yeah, they're very happy. Like I said, I've got a couple
> of suggestions that I think might make them even happier, but
> I'm certainly not gonna push it. These guys don't care if
> something sounds real or not real or from outer space; they
> just want it to sound like they want it to sound... you should
> hear the third song (which I'll post once we get it in the
> ballpark - it's kinda interesting); it's got a sample from a
> movie, a sample from "Aqualung", two sections with some
> effected white noise underneath a spook

Subject: Re: Well, I've narrowed down the search for the Cubase SX dongledemon.
Posted by [jef knight\[1\]](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 17:43:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

uot;Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:44845a41\$1@linux...
>>
>> Hi,
>> Wires is for Me too !!
>> Just run minimum setup exe.
>> Regards,
>> Dimitrios
>>
>> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >What uses do you have for wires? Below are a couple.
>> >
>> >
>> >Input Wire receives audio from other channels or plugs
>> >
>> >Output Wire sends audio to other channels or plugs. It passes through
>> audio
>> >to the channel it is instantiated on AND also sends it to a virtual wires
>> >channel. Other plugs such as Key Gate can receive this audio signal
>> and
>> >use it for processing.
>> >
>> >

>> >I've used it to route Aux FX back to strips for added EQ and Panning etc.
>> > ie: chorus on an acoustic 12 string guitar panned to the opposite side
>> >
>> >I've also tried sending all the drums to two Aux (via the Aux send) then
>> >returning the two Aux to two strips (a cheezy drum buss) via wires.
>> >
>> >It's to bad Paris's architecture doesn't allow jumping between
>submixes....now
>> >that could be fun.
>> >
>> >using wires can help...set Aux 1 send to post - put a "wires out" on that
>> >Aux and a "wires in" to a free channel, put that channel into record
>mode
>> >and record away
>> >
>> >I'm pretty sure that will capture everything
>> >
>>
>
>Dimitrios, you knew about wires already right?

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:

>
>Hi,
>Wires is for Me too !!
>Just run minimum setup exe.
>Regards,
>Dimitrios

>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>>
>>What uses do you have for wires? Below are a couple.
>>
>>
>>Input Wire receives audio from other channels or plugs
>>
>>Output Wire sends audio to other channels or plugs. It passes through audio
>>to the channel it is instantiated on AND also sends it to a virtual wires
>>channel. Other plugs such as Key Gate can receive this audio signal and
>>use it for processing.
>>
>>
>>I've used it to route Aux FX back to strips for added EQ and Panning etc.
>> ie: chorus on an acoustic 12 string guitar panned to the opposite side
>>

>>I've also tried sending all the drums to two Aux (via the Aux send) then
>>returning the two Aux to two strips (a cheezy drum buss) via wires.
>>
>>It's to bad Paris's architecture doesn't allow jumping between submixes....now
>>that could be fun.
>>
>>using wires can help...set Aux 1 send to post - put a "wires out" on that
>>Aux and a "wires in" to a free channel, put that channel into record mode
>>and record away
>>
>>I'm pretty sure that will capture everything
>>
>And do you know where I can download this thingy?
Bjorn R

"John" <no@no.com> wrote in message news:44849645\$1@linux...

>
> It's in the xp effects subsystem thingy if I'm not wrong.
>
>
> "BR" <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:
> >Ok, and where can I get it?
> >Bjorn R
> >
> >"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message
news:44845a41\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Hi,
> >> Wires is for Me too !!
> >> Just run minimum setup exe.
> >> Regards,
> >> Dimitrios
> >>
> >> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >What uses do you have for wires? Below are a couple.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >Input Wire receives audio from other channels or plugs
> >> >
> >> >Output Wire sends audio to other channels or plugs. It passes through
> >audio
> >> >to the channel it is instantiated on AND also sends it to a virtual
wires
> >> >channel. Other plugs such as Key Gate can receive this audio signal
> >and
> >> >use it for processing.
> >> >

>
>>>>Hi,
>>>>Wires is for Me too !!
>>>>Just run minimum setup exe.
>>>>Regards,
>>>>Dimitrios
>>>>
>>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>What uses do you have for wires? Below are a couple.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Input Wire receives audio from other channels or plugs
>>>>>
>>>>>Output Wire sends audio to other channels or plugs. It passes through
>>>
>>>audio
>>>
>>>>>to the channel it is instantiated on AND also sends it to a virtual
>
> wires
>
>>>>>channel. Other plugs such as Key Gate can receive this audio signal
>>
>>and
>>
>>>>>use it for processing.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I've used it to route Aux FX back to strips for added EQ and Panning
>>
>>etc.
>>
>>>>>ie: chorus on an acoustic 12 string guitar panned to the opposite
>
> side
>
>>>>>I've also tried sending all the drums to two Aux (via the Aux send)
>
> then
>
>>>>>returning the two Aux to two strips (a cheezy drum buss) via wires.
>>>>>
>>>>>It's to bad Paris's architecture doesn't allow jumping between
>>>
>>>submixes....now
>>>
>>>>>that could be fun.

>>>>
>>>>using wires can help...set Aux 1 send to post - put a "wires out" on
>>
>>that
>>
>>>>Aux and a "wires in" to a free channel, put that channel into record
>>>
>>>mode
>>>
>>>>and record away
>>>>
>>>>I'm pretty sure that will capture everything
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>
>Wow! And he makes it look easy . . .

S

"Rich Lamanna" <richard.lamanna@verizon.net> wrote in message
news:44840b35@linux...
> This is a most impressive bass solo of Amazing Grace by Victor Wooten.
> It's
> just Jaco and Victor, "ain't no one else, they're holding it down."
>
> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iYINlz4MagA>
>
> Rich
>
>"DC" <dc@spammersonvh1.com> wrote:
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>
>>Nearly a third when interviewed again said
>>they saw Bugs Bunny at Disneyland, which could never have happened.
>
>Ok, taking your analogy, at least 2/3's of us do hear something.
>I can live with that. The idea that all those who hear what you do
>not are deluded, is quite a leap from that study... It only takes one.

This is a complete non sequitor, I have no idea how this relates to anything.
I was saying that non only do we not always perceive things perfectly but
that humans actually modify the memories of perceptions after the fact. In
fact, some
