
Subject: 2 card question

Posted by [RK](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 00:28:27 GMT

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

r />

>matter what.

>

>Neil

>

>

>

>rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>just a question...are you listening to both mixes each through the
>>same converters? i only ask due to my belief that the only difference
>>lies in the da conversion as all the ad's do is write the 1's and 0's
>>describing the event. i've done comparisons here with the rme, paris
>>and lynx converters; the differences disappear when the material
>>recorded on each is played back through any of the 3 mentioned. to
>>me, it's kind of like playing an lp on different turntables and
>>attributing the difference in the sound to the lp itself.

>>

>>

>>

>>On 18 Jan 2006 16:04:55 +1000, "Neil&quo

Subject: Re: 2 card question

Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 00:48:48 GMT

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

nux..." target="_blank">43cdb3ff@linux...

> > > Thanks.

> > >

> > > ...so you finally bought 3.0 software?

> > >

> > > How much?

> > >

> > > Suad

> > >

> > > "Edna" <edna@texomaonline.com> wrote in message news:43cdaee2@linux...

> > > > I'm using 9.0 with xp and 3.0 without problems, but no guarantee of
> > > course.

> > > > Edna

> > > >

> > > > "Suad" <suad@sail.hr> wrote in message news:43cc701c@linux...

> > > > > Of course... Ghost is my No.1 application.

> > > > > I can't imagine life without it..

> > > > >

>>>> The problem is that I'm booked and don't have a time for
>> experiments...
>>>> ...there is nothing worse than computer related problems in
presence
>>>> of clients...
>>>>
>>>> Thanks and cheers.
>>>>
>>>> Suad
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
>>>> news:43cc69ea\$1@linux...
>>>>> Set a ghost point/system restore point before you do ANYTHING
>>>>>
>>>>> Then, you'll have a safe place to get back to if the install
goes
>> sour
>>> for
>>>>> DX9c.
>>>>> AA
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> "Suad" <suad@sail.hr> wrote in message news:43cc53ba@linux...
>>>>>> I'm using Win XP.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Must install DirectX 9c because Sony Vegas requires it.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Till now I used DirectX 8.1
>>>>>>> Are there any issues with PARIS and DirectX 9c.
>>>>>>> Which is the best DirectX version for PARIS????
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Need help as soon as possible.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Thanks.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Suad
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

Subject: Re: 2 card question
Posted by [RK](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 00:58:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>

termination do not need
T-adaptor and terminator plug. " - RME Audio

So, people are doing mistake when connecting wordclock out to in, and then another out to in of second device, then another out to in of third, fourth... xyz device. That way of connecting wordclock is raising jitter in the wordclock signal especially if device wordclock in and out aren't 100% in phase. (steady clock WC in/out of RME fireface is another story...)

Drawback of that method is weakening of wordclock signal in large networks, so termination makes things worse in that case... Termination is case sensitive and it helps in some cases, but not in other cases.

When using large wordclock networks like mine, termination is bad idea... I have 6 devices in my wordclock network WITHOUT termination. With setup connected like that, I never have a single synchronization problem or click or dropout. (2xMEC + 1xFireface + 1xTC M3000 + 2xRME 9652 - all connected in a network with

T-adapters + digital ins/outs and ADAT sync) . To make things worse, my WC master MEC is not even at the end of the chain, but - it works flawlessly!

Lately I purchased another 2 MEC's and I'm planning to expand my system to 4 EDS cards and 4 MECs. That will be 8 devices in a wordclock network across about 10 meters of cable.... and I think it should work. If not, I'll use my RME fireface like WC signal refresher somewhere in the middle of the chain, and take benefit of RME's "steady clock" technology.

Also, as I'm a technician, I have made all my cables by myself using HQ connectors, cable and silver soldering wire....

I know that's very complicated, but that's the way it is... ;-)

Here are some pics, so you better understand...

I hope this will help to many PARIS users.

Cheers.

SUAD

Hi Bill,
You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD

"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>I used Logic a bit last year and fou

Subject: Re: 2 card question
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 01:15:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nd fast"? Do you mean the interface design?

It

>> seems reasonably CPU efficient already.

>>

>> Do you have any complaints about the sound?

>>

>> I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking

>> instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window needs

>> attention, and Logic could require it less.

>>

>> But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it works
now,

>> many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where you

>> need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability to drag

>> or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)

>>

>> I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving regions

>> around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very fast.

And

>> Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.

>>

>> Cheers,

>> -Jamie

>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

>>

>>

>> LaMont wrote:

>>> Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been excited

>>> about

>>> Logic's audio recording performance.

>>>
>>> The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997. Yes, the

>>> instruments
>>> are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in league
of
>>> it's
>>> own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine in
>>> Cubase
>>> SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine is not
as
>>> sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
>>> sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
>>>
>>> It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction. I

>>> only
>>> hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer.. Then,

>>> Appple
>>> will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
>>> Take care.LAD
>>>
>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>LaMont, what are your complaints with Logic's audio engine? And are you
>>>
>>>
>>>>talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>
>>>>Cheers,
>>>> -Jamie
>>>> <http://www.JamieKruz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>jef knight wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>lol
>>>>>
>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>><http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php>
>>>>>>Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI) range
or
>>>
>>>

>>>>>non-existence
>>>>>of this market segment, they announce this.
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the best midi

>>>>>sequencers,
>>>>>it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>That said, Apple has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already have a

>>>>>kill
>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>
>>>>>If so, this could send shock waves thru out the industry. And, I must
>>>
>>>
>>>>>admit
>>>>>that Dedic's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about the "State
>>>
>>> of
>>>
>>>>>New Native DAWs!!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>
>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this NAMM show goes.. So far,so
>>>
>>>
>>>>>good
>>>>>:)
>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>
>>>
>i took out the ADAT card from meca A so far so good

Thanks Aaron

"Aaron Allen" <

Subject: Re: 2 card question
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 08:46:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tion of my caring side...

>
>...but I'll have you know I'm very caring at the AA meetings. I'm always
>buying people a beer when they need it most! :o)
>
>PS. Moment of morbid seriousness. Sorry Deej if I was a little uncaring.

>I do know how infuriating lack of internet service can be...
>
>Now, where'd I put that beer...
>
>>
>>On 19 Jan 2006 19:25:20 +1000, "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>
>>>Well...
>>>
>>>...better your ISP than mine. ;o)
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>>Kim.
>>>
>>>"Deej" <animixnosrapamus@animas.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I've been carrying on a few offline conversations with folks here and
>I'm
>>>>not sure if I've received any PM's or if you (and you know who *you* are
>>>>;o) got the last ones I sent. My ISP has been torpedoed somehow and they
>>>>have been scrambling to get backup servers working for the entire day.
>They
>>>>say that all incoming e-mail should show up once things are back on track,
>>>>but for now, the whole of animas.net is toast.....if anyone has been
>trying
>>>>to ping me, I've been unpingable and have been incapable of establishing
>>>>contact with the rest of the known universe.
>>>>
>>>>Deej
>>Check out this month's issue of "Electronic Musician" for the article on "
Analog Summing".....Hi James..
You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".

I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the velocity engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to do"..

So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate" speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple

was was Isoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..

OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer. The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Beucase that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most graphics cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and the others that will be announce at this years Namm..

My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
LaMont

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest news.

> Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.

> You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the new

>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer

>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual processor

>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the tests

>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,

>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors! In

>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products

in

>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.

>

>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance

>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac

is

>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi media

>work. The other thing is the towers have the AltiVec technology for multi

>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation

>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. AltiVec is a definite factor

>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core

>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss. My guess is one processor

>is handling what AltiVec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time

will

>tell on all this.

>

>I'm just saying look in to all of it more closely. I think if you do, and

>your honest with yourself, you'll see what I'm talking about.

>

>James

>
>
>"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>
>>Jamie,
>>
>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.
>But,
>>I'm not c
