
Subject: Studio Pics 4

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Sat, 01 Nov 2008 15:11:56 GMT

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

ed

"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>

>i see, The Summing Issue it is :-)

>

>as you might remember, i sailed on that ship quite a few

>years too, and i know exactly what youre talking about.

>having said that though, of course there is no magic

>to the paris sound, its just a combination of things if you ask me:

>

>1. simple, straightforward clipping and truncating

>2. the ensoniq converters and their awesome coloring

>(a longtime ensoniq virtue, i.e. also the ASR and ASRX samplers

>sounded simply amazing whatever you threw at them)

>3. the fact that you run a mix using only nice ensoniq

>algorithms (and boy, did they have a hand for good sounding

>yet simple effect algorithms)

>4. (often underestimated) the "direct" feel of the low

>latency interface and (here comes the only thing i would

>give ID credit for and not ensoniq) the smart mouse behaviour

>when i.e. dragging eq values. oh, and the interface and

>its color does help too.

>

>

>thats pretty much it. and while it is a bunch of stuff, its

>a. nothing that cant be done elsewhere and

>b. no summing rocket science. actually the mere summing

>of paris is quite normal, easily testable with the

>usual phase cancellation tests im sure we all have done.

>so after years of limiting myself to paris because of the

>supposedly magic sound character, it really didnt take me

>very long to get right back to this point with another system.

>i color my stuff with my pres (and i kept some ensoniq AD/DAs

>around for a while), i have a million ways of clipping,

>i only use nice plugins (doh!) and with todays machines,

>latency isnt an issue anymore. my dual quad machine lets me open many times

>more stuff than a fully expanded paris would do while

>running at 1.5ms latency.

>

>

>so, speaking longterm and sound quality only, for a list of things that
can

>really can be had elsewhere

>too if you invest a little time, you give up so many other things
 >that have a true impact on sound, like proper grouping,
 >sample precise latency correction, processing on group and
 >master channels of any kind you wish, group based ducking,
 >100% generation loss free bouncing etc etc.
 >
 >at the end of the day, personally i find this just a bad
 >deal not only featurewise, but *also* soundwise. these days
 >im doing things in nuendo i could not dream of doing in paris.
 >and i had that system very much pushed to the limit. i did
 >drumsubgroup compression over the aux bus (what a pain in the...!). i avoided
 >rendering stuff because it didnt sound
 >right. i made heavy use of the fun ways to clip and distort
 >stuff in paris all the time, id even go as far and claim
 >that i was one of the few people that eventually somewhat figured out
 >the slightly weird paris compressor lookahead behaviour ;-)
 >
 >
 >not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and
 >i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)
 >
 >
 >
 >
 >"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
 >>
 >>Hi Derek -
 >>
 >>Thanks for the comments. All worthwhile from a source who has
 >>earned respect here over the years. I don't think anyone will take offense.
 >>There are 2 reasons why I stick with PARIS:
 >>
 >>1. The sound
 >>2. The cost of a significant change
 >>
 >>I use Logic for the things that it does well and all the reasons
 >>you cited, (convenience/productivity issues) and PARIS for tracking/stem
 >>mixing and final bounce.
 >>
 >>Summing from Logic out through an analog board gives results that
 >>I like. Summing through PARIS without an analog board gives me
 >>results I like even more. AD converters currently available are
 >>more clear, detailed, smooth etc than the PARIS ones, but I would have
 to
 >>sink a bunch more cash into this, and would rather not.
 >>
 >>Engineer/Producer friends of mine, who are a lot more experienced
 >>than me, and have a lot more invested than I do, are consistently pleased/surprised/blown

>>away by the sonic character of what I can do in PARIS. In fact, on a CD
>we
>>just finished, I took the final mixes from Logic, summed out through analog
>>to tape, that my mix guy had done, and dropped them into PARIS with no
gain
>>change, panned L R and re-bounced them. Everyone involved
>>preferred the PARIS bounces 100% of the time.
>>
>>So for me, PARIS right now is still my best choice.
>>
>>Peace,
>>
>>Ted
>>
>>
>>"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>hey guys :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>after seeing how much work is put into the paris project
>>>again lately (hats off to mike) ive been thinking about this
>>>quite a bit and until now dont quite know how to say it without
>>>it coming accross a bit offensive. but since i still am not sure
>>>how to put it, i told myself, i might as well just go ahead
>>>and just put this excuse in advance on top of it ;-) so here goes:
>>>
>>>
>>>with so much manpower going into paris, an essentially dead
>>>platform, one has to wonder, wouldnt it be smarter to
>>>put this manpower into something thats, how shall i put it,
>>>more essential in practical use? exactly how many people are
>>>still using paris? is it even one hundred?
>>>
>>>ive been one of the most enthousiastic supporters of the
>>>platform but for the life of me, i could not imagine ever
>>>going back to it after years in the world of full midi and video
>>>integration, VSTI support, total and complete latency compensation,
>>>sample precise editing, rendering that actually works, compability, etc
>>yada
>>yada. no amount of DP4 algorithm ports
>>is going to change that, and i would assume that many if not
>>most ex-paris users feel that way.
>>
>>>so if you operate on this basic assumption (just follow me here
>>>for the sake of the argument), would it not make much more sense
>>>to focus on something entirely different?
>>>like, i would imagine the biggest hit among ex-paris users

>>>and soon-to-be-ex-paris users would be a conversion application
>>>that reads paris projects, just the most basic stuff
>>>like files in use and position info and would convert
>>>that into...dunno...an OMF maybe? maybe too complicated
>>>(OMFs crossplatform compability seems to be a constantly moving
>>>target and suck big time)..maybe just a bunch of rendered
>>>continous wave files that get their data from the project file
>>>and the associated pafs?
>>>
>>>or maybe a completely different approach, a "hardware driver"
>>>that fools the paris software into believing a fully functioning
>>>EDS card with attached audio interface is present - so that
>>>you can launch paris 3.0 on any computer and use the paris
>>>software to convert projects into OMFs. you know, just a
>>>dead end that on the other end pretends to the software
>>>whatever the software asks for during boot to actually
>>>get to the project window. no actual audio support, just
>>>a fake hardware so that you can get to the software level
>>>where you then could ressurect your files.
>>>
>>>i know suggesting something like this is kind of an insult to the work
>thats
>>>currently being done (and that is exactly
>>>what i would want to avoid), but can you see how that would
>>>make a lot more sense to a lot more people?
>>>
>>>to me, these days, the most important thing about paris
>>>is the question of how i get past projects off that platform
>>>whenever i need to work on them again. i still have a
>>>working paris computer in the second control room but its
>>>collecting dust, the system is slowly fading away as only
>>>outdated pre-XP windows systems were able to do, and
>>>the hardware side doesnt look to promising either.
>>>
>>>and same thing about the effects: porting the awesome and
>>>at times timeless effects from ensoniq effect history is
>>>great - but why on earth do it for this outdated platform?
>>>in the real world i know zero paris users that still use paris
>>>(and i used to know a LOT), but i know lots and lots of
>>>fans of the good old ensoniq stuff that would pay hard cash
>>>for VST ports of some of the ensoniq algorithms.
>>>
>>>not to mention that you would be able to use those effects
>>>in paris then too, on modern computers probably in 50 times
>>>more instances than on the EDS card, if you just take the
>>>paris eq VST plugin as orientation (try to max out any current
>>>machine by opening instances of that plugin - its more or less
>>>impossible).

>>>
>>>
>>>i feel like i have to state that again, i so much admire you
>>>people who do all this, so please dont get these suggestions
>>>wrong.
>>>
>>>
>>>thanks for listening :-)
>>>derek
>>
>> not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and
> i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)

LOL.

If you can find me a zero latency DAW that permits tracking at that zero latency through FX, includes a dedicated and high-quality hardware control surface with automation and a shuttle wheel, has internal mixing capabilities, expandable I/O at about \$150 per eight extra channels and killer fat-sounding sonics overall I admit I might be extremely interested and might consider it as an upgrade.

Of course, it's also got to be under six hundred bucks US, which is about what I paid for all those capabilities - my double Bundle III *and* the computer to run it. Whaddya got that'll get me those features at that price point?

:D

- KI don't think anybody that is still using Paris is not aware of what they can do with other softwares. Most of us have other softwares to do the kind of work that they can do. Investing in a system that we already know, and a system that works for us is not a bad investment. Paris is not done yet! Mike and the paris users here prove that. Not everybody that uses paris is here on this board either, there are many paris users that don't even know about this NG. In the last month or so there have been new paris users asking questions here.

Mike has made it possible to run Paris on new quad core PCs, that alone extends the life of paris. Paris is unique and kind of boutique in a studio. Paris sounds good and to me that's what really matters.

For some music, all the midi stuff is over kill. For some music it's about capturing a great performance with really good sounding equipment, that's Paris. Unfortunately MP3s are becoming the standard, until things really change, I personally don't see a need to spend a bunch of money trying to get better sound when Paris already sounds good.

Paris doesn't cost me any thing now. If and when I switch over to PC I won't have a problem paying Mike for his work, it's much appreciated. I'm not in Europe, or Asia, I'm in north America, right now I'm personally not too keen on sending any more money to Asian companies. I'd rather spend my money in my own backyard. It's tuff in Detroit these days, soon to come to a city near you.

Some of us here are not running commercial studios anymore, and just don't find it necessary to chase their tails on the upgrade trail. Why spend the money when we already own paris, besides what would I get for it now anyways. I guess we'll upgrade when it is really necessary. Many of us are just going to drive paris right in to the ground;)

I know your point is about function, but Paris still functions for many of us, and the price is right.

"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>

>i see, The Summing Issue it is :-)

>

>as you might remember, i sailed on that ship quite a few

>years too, and i know exactly what youre talking about.

>having said that though, of course there is no magic

>to the paris sound, its just a combination of things if you ask me:

>

>1. simple, straightforward clipping and truncating

>2. the ensoniq converters and their awesome coloring

>(a longtime ensoniq virtue, i.e. also the ASR and ASRX samplers

>sounded simply amazing whatever you threw at them)

>3. the fact that you run a mix using only nice ensoniq

>algorithms (and boy, did they have a hand for good sounding

>yet simple effect algorithms)

>4. (often underestimated) the "direct" feel of the low

>latency interface and (here comes the only thing i would

>give ID credit for and not ensoniq) the smart mouse behaviour

>when i.e. dragging eq values. oh, and the interface and

>its color does help too.

>

>

>thats pretty much it. and while it is a bunch of stuff, its

>a. nothing that cant be done elsewhere and

>b. no summing rocket science. actually the mere summing

>of paris is quite normal, easily testable with the

>usual phase cancellation tests im sure we all have done.

>so after years of limiting myself to paris because of the

>supposedly magic sound character, it really didnt take me

>very long to get right back to this point with another system.

>i color my stuff with my pres (and i kept some ensoniq AD/DAs

>around for a while), i have a million ways of clipping,
>i only use nice plugins (doh!) and with todays machines,
>latency isnt an issue anymore. my dual quad machine lets me open many times
>more stuff than a fully expanded paris would do while
>running at 1.5ms latency.
>
>
>so, speaking longterm and sound quality only, for a list of things that
can
>really can be had elsewhere
>too if you invest a little time, you give up so many other things
>that have a true impact on sound, like proper grouping,
>sample precise latency correction, processing on group and
>master channels of any kind you wish, group based ducking,
>100% generation loss free bouncing etc etc.
>
>at the end of the day, personally i find this just a bad
>deal not only featurewise, but *also* soundwise. these days
>im doing things in nuendo i could not dream of doing in paris.
>and i had that system very much pushed to the limit. i did
>drumsubgroup compression over the aux bus (what a pain in the...!). i avoided
>rendering stuff because it didnt sound
>right. i made heavy use of the fun ways to clip and distort
>stuff in paris all the time, id even go as far and claim
>that i was one of the few people that eventually somewhat figured out
>the slightly weird paris compressor lookahead behaviour ;-)
>
>
>not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and
>i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)
>
>
>
>
>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hi Derek -
>>
>>Thanks for the comments. All worthwhile from a source who has
>>earned respect here over the years. I don't think anyone will take offense.
>>There are 2 reasons why I stick with PARIS:
>>
>>1. The sound
>>2. The cost of a significant change
>>
>>I use Logic for the things that it does well and all the reasons
>>you cited, (convenience/productivity issues) and PARIS for tracking/stem
>>mixing and final bounce.

>>
>>Summing from Logic out through an analog board gives results that
>>I like. Summing through PARIS without an analog board gives me
>>results I like even more. AD converters currently available are
>>more clear, detailed, smooth etc than the PARIS ones, but I would have
to
>>sink a bunch more cash into this, and would rather not.
>>
>>Engineer/Producer friends of mine, who are a lot more experienced
>>than me, and have a lot more invested than I do, are consistently pleased/surprised/blown
>>away by the sonic character of what I can do in PARIS. In fact, on a CD
>we
>>just finished, I took the final mixes from Logic, summed out through analog
>>to tape, that my mix guy had done, and dropped them into PARIS with no
gain
>>change, panned L R and re-bounced them. Everyone involved
>>preferred the PARIS bounces 100% of the time.
>>
>>So for me, PARIS right now is still my best choice.
>>
>>Peace,
>>
>>Ted
>>
>>
>>"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>hey guys :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>after seeing how much work is put into the paris project
>>>again lately (hats off to mike) ive been thinking about this
>>>quite a bit and until now dont quite know how to say it without
>>>it coming accross a bit offensive. but since i still am not sure
>>>how to put it, i told myself, i might as well just go ahead
>>>and just put this excuse in advance on top of it ;-) so here goes:
>>>
>>>
>>>with so much manpower going into paris, an essentially dead
>>>platform, one has to wonder, wouldnt it be smarter to
>>>put this manpower into something thats, how shall i put it,
>>>more essential in practical use? exactly how many people are
>>>still using paris? is it even one hundred?
>>>
>>>ive been one of the most enthousiastic supporters of the
>>>platform but for the life of me, i could not imagine ever
>>>going back to it after years in the world of full midi and video
>>>integration, VSTI support, total and complete latency compensation,

>>>sample precise editing, rendering that actually works, compability, etc
>>yada
>>>yada. no amount of DP4 algorithm ports
>>>is going to change that, and i would assume that many if not
>>>most ex-paris users feel that way.
>>>
>>>so if you operate on this basic assumption (just follow me here
>>>for the sake of the argument), would it not make much more sense
>>>to focus on something entirely different?
>>>like, i would imagine the biggest hit among ex-paris users
>>>and soon-to-be-ex-paris users would be a conversion application
>>>that reads paris projects, just the most basic stuff
>>>like files in use and position info and would convert
>>>that into...dunno...an OMF maybe? maybe too complicated
>>>(OMFs crossplatform compability seems to be a constantly moving
>>>target and suck big time)..maybe just a bunch of rendered
>>>continous wave files that get their data from the project file
>>>and the associated pafs?
>>>
>>>or maybe a completely different approach, a "hardware driver"
>>>that fools the paris software into believing a fully functioning
>>>EDS card with attached audio interface is present - so that
>>>you can launch paris 3.0 on any computer and use the paris
>>>software to convert projects into OMFs. you know, just a
>>>dead end that on the other end pretends to the software
>>>whatever the software asks for during boot to actually
>>>get to the project window. no actual audio support, just
>>>a fake hardware so that you can get to the software level
>>>where you then could ressurect your files.
>>>
>>>i know suggesting something like this is kind of an insult to the work
>thats
>>>currently being done (and that is exactly
>>>what i would want to avoid), but can you see how that would
>>>make a lot more sense to a lot more people?
>>>
>>>to me, these days, the most important thing about paris
>>>is the question of how i get past projects off that platform
>>>whenever i need to work on them again. i still have a
>>>working paris computer in the second control room but its
>>>collecting dust, the system is slowly fading away as only
>>>outdated pre-XP windows systems were able to do, and
>>>the hardware side doesnt look to promising either.
>>>
>>>and same thing about the effects: porting the awesome and
>>>at times timeless effects from ensoniq effect history is
>>>great - but why on earth do it for this outdated platform?
>>>in the real world i know zero paris users that still use paris

>>>(and i used to know a LOT), but i know lots and lots of
>>>fans of the good old ensoniq stuff that would pay hard cash
>>>for VST ports of some of the ensoniq algorithms.
>>>
>>>not to mention that you would be able to use those effects
>>>in paris then too, on modern computers probably in 50 times
>>>more instances than on the EDS card, if you just take the
>>>paris eq VST plugin as orientation (try to max out any current
>>>machine by opening instances of that plugin - its more or less
>>>impossible).
>>>
>>>
>>>i feel like i have to state that again, i so much admire you
>>>people who do all this, so please dont get these suggestions
>>>wrong.
>>>
>>>
>>>thanks for listening :-)
>>>derek
>>
>I've read all the other responses and can't really add much except to second
the emotion. Paris still sounds awful good to me and I know it inside and
out. I do still run a small commercial studio and I know I've lost business
for not having Protools but it just doesn't make sense for me to spend the
cash to chase that business, especially in this economic climate. It would
cost me about \$35K to replace my Paris system (3 EDS cards in my main computer
w/ 2 MECs and 32 channels in/16 channels out PLUS a second computer w/ 1
EDS + 1 MEC w/ 16 in/8 out). I just can't justify the expense for a business
that's making about half the money it used to make. I use Digital Performer
for MIDI synced to Paris and I can use the DP machine for outboard FX w/
Waves IR-1 reverbs. I've given serious thought to switching my system to
PC (been a Mac guy for my whole career!) to be able to run new Waves and
UAD-1 plugins. I've contemplated Logic w/ the Apogee Symphony stuff but
again - why spend the money when Paris works? My clients don't care. They
just want their recordings to sound good!

Gantt

"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>
>hey guys :-)
>
>
>after seeing how much work is put into the paris project
>again lately (hats off to mike) ive been thinking about this
>quite a bit and until now dont quite know how to say it without
>it coming accross a bit offensive. but since i still am not sure
>how to put it, i told myself, i might as well just go ahead

>and just put this excuse in advance on top of it ;-) so here goes:
>
>
>with so much manpower going into paris, an essentially dead
>platform, one has to wonder, wouldnt it be smarter to
>put this manpower into something thats, how shall i put it,
>more essential in practical use? exactly how many people are
>still using paris? is it even one hundred?
>
>ive been one of the most enthousiastic supporters of the
>platform but for the life of me, i could not imagine ever
>going back to it after years in the world of full midi and video
>integration, VSTI support, total and complete latency compensation,
>sample precise editing, rendering that actually works, compability, etc
yada
>yada. no amount of DP4 algorithm ports
>is going to change that, and i would assume that many if not
>most ex-paris users feel that way.
>
>so if you operate on this basic assumption (just follow me here
>for the sake of the argument), would it not make much more sense
>to focus on something entirely different?
>like, i would imagine the biggest hit among ex-paris users
>and soon-to-be-ex-paris users would be a conversion application
>that reads paris projects, just the most basic stuff
>like files in use and position info and would convert
>that into...dunno...an OMF maybe? maybe too complicated
>(OMFs crossplatform compability seems to be a constantly moving
>target and suck big time)..maybe just a bunch of rendered
>continous wave files that get their data from the project file
>and the associated pafs?
>
>or maybe a completely different approach, a "hardware driver"
>that fools the paris software into believing a fully functioning
>EDS card with attached audio interface is present - so that
>you can launch paris 3.0 on any computer and use the paris
>software to convert projects into OMFs. you know, just a
>dead end that on the other end pretends to the software
>whatever the software asks for during boot to actually
>get to the project window. no actual audio support, just
>a fake hardware so that you can get to the software level
>where you then could ressurect your files.
>
>i know suggesting something like this is kind of an insult to the work thats
>currently being done (and that is exactly
>what i would want to avoid), but can you see how that would
>make a lot more sense to a lot more people?
>

>to me, these days, the most important thing about paris
>is the question of how i get past projects off that platform
>whenever i need to work on them again. i still have a
>working paris computer in the second control room but its
>collecting dust, the system is slowly fading away as only
>outdated pre-XP windows systems were able to do, and
>the hardware side doesnt look to promising either.
>
>and same thing about the effects: porting the awesome and
>at times timeless effects from ensoniq effect history is
>great - but why on earth do it for this outdated platform?
>in the real world i know zero paris users that still use paris
>(and i used to know a LOT), but i know lots and lots of
>fans of the good old ensoniq stuff that would pay hard cash
>for VST ports of some of the ensoniq algorithms.
>
>not to mention that you would be able to use those effects
>in paris then too, on modern computers probably in 50 times
>more instances than on the EDS card, if you just take the
>paris eq VST plugin as orientation (try to max out any current
>machine by opening instances of that plugin - its more or less
>impossible).
>
>
>i feel like i have to state that again, i so much admire you
>people who do all this, so please dont get these suggestions
>wrong.
>
>
>thanks for listening :-)
>derekHi Derek,

No offense from me. Good points.

Midi is critical to me for sequences I create for other projects so I purchased a laptop and Sonar. Tone is not critical here.

There was a time when I wished for a minimal "Paris to go" so that I could do laptop editing while on the road. Now I'm relatively quick and can live without it.

I don't want to sound like the mass public CD's being produced these days in most genres. They sound soul-less to me. It's not the performances per se. I think it's the digital demon and possibly the track count overload (discussed just two days ago). One of the first digital songs I heard on the radio was from Simply Red and I remember it sounded awesome. Clean, clear and open.

I jump'd on Paris in '97 (six months before the MEC was even available) because I dug the real sounds (close to authentic at the time) from Ensoniq's MR-76 keyboard that I purchased the year before. I was still using an 8-track cassette system (jeez . . . my skeleton is out of the closet now) to record my songs and friend's singer/songwriters. To this day I remember the sales person at Sound Chek in New Orleans telling me to wait about a month because Ensoniq was coming out with this system. I almost went Adat at the time and audio hard drives were just beginning. It was a leap of faith. I waited and I wasn't disappointed. Within that first year I met with an Ensoniq rep (at Sound Chek giving a demo of v1.21) and I was jazz'd. I wish I'd remembered his name. Even got a "t"- shirt.

So, to sum up . . . (yes, pun intended) . . . for me, it's the sound.

Wayne"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>the sonic/summing issue was only half of the 2 reasons I listed.

so i take it you then agree with the points i made there? ;-)

>The second was the cost of making a significant change.

totally true: cant argue with the price point of a dead system.
its why i would never sell my (pretty big) paris rig, it would go for ridiculously low prices so id rather keep it."Mike Audet" <mike@....> wrote:

>Hi Derek,

>

>No offense taken. Would it make more sense to put effort into writing software
>to convert PARIS projects to something else? Not for me. I use PARIS.

>I couldn't care less about porting projects out.

that sure makes a lot of sense :-)
bad luck for me, but good for you :-)

>I like PARIS the way it is. Also, I refuse to use anything that is host
>based,

im tempted to say youre doing yourself a disservice here.
i can see how one could come to the conclusion that native systems were bullshit in the past, but IMO this has changed recently. to me - and im a heavy plugin user - the magic moment was somewhere when pcs went past 4 cores running at

above 2 GHZ, to use a simplified picture. i currently use a dual quadcore (8 cores at 2.33ghz) and its the first machine where i can NOT

max out the CPU, no matter what i throw at it.

as absurd as it is, my new bottleneck now is memory. i run out of memory just by opening effect plugins before i run out of CPU power.

so, while i too considered native systems to be shaky bitches with high latency for years, these days i say - not anymore. not by a long shot. these things rule big time now.

oh, and they run in circles even around fully expanded protocols HD rig too now. i remember that time where they benchmarked some new waves plugin and it ran on around 180 instances on a huge PTHD setup, which sounded impressive until you heard that a dual quadcore xeon ran the same algorithm in VST some 650 times (!!)

and that leaves Pro Tools and PARIS. I refuse to give even one more >dime to Digidesign, so that leaves PARIS.

im fully with you on that digidesign sentiment ;-)

>I synch Cakewalk Pro Audio 9 to PARIS via MTC. I use a EMU ESI2000 sampler.

thats the kind of stuff that really sounds like a headache to me. triple project maintenance, longer sound path, realtime bouncing of tracks, EMU samplers (i had an e4k for a while in the studio and compared to the ensoniq sound it...did not sound as good ;-)

>Why should anyone spend thousands of dollars on a new system that may make >things easier, but won't make one's recordings sound any better?

see my previous post. i want to stress that im not saying this in hopes to "convert" you, i really am not. i know the feeling of being in love with ye olde ensoniq puppy :-)
but just on the basis of a what-sounds-good-and-what-doesnt discussion between people that dig good sound, i still have

to disagree. its simply NOT only about ease of use.
it also is very much about sound. (copying from my
other post) proper grouping,
sample precise latency correction, processing on group and
master channels of any kind you wish, group based ducking,
100% generation loss free bouncing etc etc. all make a difference
in sound, and a huge one at times.

i would go even further and argue that even "ease of use"
can make a difference in sound. in paris, how many times had i
thought to myself "do i give myself the headache of
a drum submix compression through the aux bus? or do i need
it to be compressed by some other compressor, so do i do a submix
now? am i ready for that to be submixed at all?" and then sometimes going
through with it
(taking a lot of time), sometimes not because of the amount
of work involved. in a modern system, its a no brainer.
you just do it when your engineer instinct demands it,
and you choose the compressor with the characteristics you
need on the spot, and if you then think that the compression
stresses the basedrum a bit too much, you simply move
that fader. all that results in good sound.

or using UAD. come on, how often have you thought "am i really
willing to go through this whole manual latency compensation
business for just that one more UAD effect"? on a modern
system, a no brainer. you just open the plugin you want to
open.

of stuff that simply is completely impossible to do...i.e.
where i live, vocals need to be louder than a typical US mix
by an average of around 1.5db (due to our language
being less easy to understand in a thick mix than english).
that of course has an impact of
how "fat" the playback comes accross of course.
but you can get almost an entire db of that back by doing
subtle ducking on anything that is in the vocals frequency
range, i.e. all guitars, keyboards, but not drums or base
being ducked by the lead vocal.

of course such a thing is virtually impossible to plan
in advance (believe me ive tried ;-). its really only possible
if you have completely free routing and can route anything
anywhere at anytime.

this is not ease of use stuff. its about sound.

Also, consider

>that when in a few years, that system will be worth a few hundred dollars,
>if that. The depreciation on DAW hardware is worse than on a car.

thats true for any digital system of any kind of course.

>Here's an example: I bought three UAD1 cards (for around \$100 each) planning
>to "upgrade" my EQ to the Cambridge. The PARIS EQ sounds better.

well uh...why did you use the cambridge eq of all things???
thats more or less a modern version of the waves q10, an
analytic digital eq, not a "character" eq like the paris one
is. UAD has a couple of very nice eqs, the pultecs and neves
are awesome, and the precision mastering eq is simply the
best digital eq ive ever heard with to my ears an almost
perfect mix of character and smoothness on the one hand,
yet still dead accurate precision and "bite" when needed
on the other hand. i fall in love again and again every time
i open this one. "best-eq-ever" ;-)

i love the paris eq, but its really in another league here.
its very easy to dial in nice and cool settings, but its not
without its flaws, being a little wishy washy in the highs,
being a little phasey in the low range. still a super
cool channel eq though, thats for sure.

>As it is, I LOVE the Dp/Pro Hall. My Lexicon MPX1 isn't even plugged in
>right now. I love the PARIS Eq.

second all of that :-)

> I love having no latency when I'm recording.

modern native rigs dont have any noticable latency when recording
while still offering multiple times the plugin beef.
even a mortal single quadcore from the intel consumer line
would give you dozens of decent plugins at 1.5ms.

>I will eventually be porting at least some of the effects to VST, but I've
>got PARIS to run the effects right now, so VST isn't a priority. ASIO is
>a priority. With ASIO, I'll be able to use the PARIS hardware with newer
>software when it makes sense to do so. I love the spectral editing in Audition.
> Getting that working makes sense to me.

i hope it comes accross that i discuss all of this in good
spirit and just on a from-geek-to-geek basis ;-)
having said that, may i still slip in a super theoretical question: if you
really are able to do something
that high tech as an asio driver for the MEC hardware, would
that "fake driver to start the paris app without actual hardware
to save projects from extinction even where no hardware is
present" be within your technological reach?

you know, strictly theoretically speaking,
maybe for that time in ten years when you finally
decide to move on and stuff ;-)

>I'm glad you're happy with whatever you are using now. But, so are many
>of us.

i dont doubt it for a second. ive been a paris user from
late 97 till...2005 i believe. loved the system, adored the
company. what a loss that was when they were eaten by
%%&/%(%)\$/ creative and merged into nonexistence by emu :-(

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

>Hey if you like to send me all your old Paris stuff, I'd be glad to pay
for
>the shipping...;)
>
>James

haha youd like that wouldnt you :-)
only over my dead corpse!(if thats a saying in english at all)

i could maybe rethink this the day when some kind of "paris project resurrection software" or driver like i talked about exists, but until then, in addition to my emotional attachment to that dusty old rig, its also my only way to export and convert past projects. Kerry Galloway <kg@kerrygalloway.com> wrote:
>> not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and
>> i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)
>
>LOL.

aw come one man, no reason to "lol" into anyones faces here :-)
all in good spirit. i used to be a paris zombie too (i even go as far back to know that the term paris zombie is a positive one :-)

>If you can find me a zero latency DAW that permits tracking at that zero
>latency through FX

there is no such thing as zero latency. of course paris has a latency, i dont remember the measurements exactly but they circled around this NG too. i think it was something like 2.something milliseconds for one signal trip through mixing engine and converters (=what you hear when you track a signal).

making a "no latency at all in paris versus some latency elsewhere" argument that seems like a comparison of absolutes is being dishonest to yourself. the reality is more a gradual one like 2 milliseconds versus 3 milliseconds (my converters are nicely fast and partly make up for the 1.5 milliseconds the VST engine loses in comparison to the paris engine).

>, includes a dedicated and high-quality hardware control
>surface with automation and a shuttle wheel,

....with no motorfaders and potentiometers that start to skip randomly after a while like unfortunately most late ensoniq gear did (that was a really bad shipment of potis they got there in their late days, the ASR and ASRX suffered from that problem too) :-)

but yeah, the c16 was cool. the shuttlewheel ruled.
of course it was slightly pointless because its only application that made sense was to move the now line around

(editing was faster and more precise with the mouse, scrubbing was too unreliable) and you might as well use two keys to move the now line around, but it sure was FUN to use it. i think i have FOUR c16s in the closet, and most of them have that cool spot where the black color completely wore off between the transport and the wheel. they say "ive been USED a LOT, so i must have been useful" :-)

has internal mixing
>capabilities,

which daw doesnt have that? :-)
here id argue that as far as the featureset of internal mixing goes, paris loses the battle against almost anything else these days, in terms of flexibility and routing not to mention in terms of anything more advanced like object volume or, god forbid, the awesome object based mixing capabilities of hosts like samplitude and sequoia. my personal "heureka" moment was when at some point i realized that 1. i didnt want to live with the bugs of paris 3 anymore and 2. i wanted to route stuff to groups and do sum processing on groups damnit! i mean, thats like one of the most essential mixing techniques there is!

expandable I/O at about \$150 per eight extra channels and
>killer fat-sounding sonics overall

again, cant argue with the price of a dead system. and the I/O that shipped with wonderful doses of ensoniq-ness in sound for so little money per 8 channels was already a steal when they were still sold full price brandnew. you wont get any argument there from me, ever :-)
as i said, i used to keep some ensoniq ADDA around just for the fun and coolness of it. eventually i switched to do all my coloring via pres, but it doesnt mean i lost my love for the ensoniq magic there :-)

>Of course, it's also got to be under six hundred bucks US, which is about
>what I paid for all those capabilities - my double Bundle III *and* the
>computer to run it. Whaddya got that'll get me those features at that price
>point?

>
>:D

nothing, but then, it also wouldnt come with all the limitations
and with IDs paris 3.0 software bugfest. in that sense, the
old "you get what you pay for" rule applies as always.

best,
derek

p.s.: i really did not want to turn this into a "paris pro and con" discussion.
for now i keep going as long as its all good
clean fun, but if anyone is annoyed, one word and i will stop
this immediately. its not what i came here for :-)"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:
>~ Hi Derek,
>I think what you're finding is a bunch of fairly content users.

yes, i just realized that :-) quite amazing actually.

>I still blame you for interesting me in softsynths. Now I'm
>loaded with really cool stuff. Thanks!!!

i apologize ;-) but its amazing how far this has come in so
little time, huh? just recently i tried out the new BFD 2
and i couldnt help but think back to the beginnings of this
technology where id freak out about some fxpansion
drummachine thingy simply because of its timing.
and its really not long ago at all! amazing how
much has happened...

best,
derekHi to you all,

Allways good to hear from you, Derek. I understand really well your
behavings have gone another route than Paris but....

.....some behavings are yet to record the real stuff with use of old tape
recording machines.
Have been away from the district here in Norway for over 20 years, but the
leading studio here
are living well with their 24 channel taperecorder and the TL Audio VTC

tube-mixing desk.

Had a long phonetalk with him right before Christmas and shall visit him one of the coming days.

Have talked with some old clients here, from the early years of '80, that have used his studio for years now.

There are plenty of producers and clients yet, that's hating much of what's coming out from the industry today. So I believe Paris is the only computer recording system that will satisfy some of these "old" ears.

I have both Cubase 4.5 and the new Pro Tools 8 here. Using Cubase a lot and ProTools is just if someone ask what I have, just to get some extra clients - and then convert them for the "dead Paris-route";-)

Summasumarum, for what I need to record, it's still Paris. It's the only computer-system that have "the old sound" and have behaviors in the "old style", with a modern computer-way of working....

.....so, I believe Paris isn't dead before most of us here have got our graveyard-stone..... ;-)

Thanks for listening

Erling

"derek" <a@b.com> skrev i melding news:49614e91\$1@linux...

>

> i see, The Summing Issue it is :-)

>

> as you might remember, i sailed on that ship quite a few

> years too, and i know exactly what youre talking about.

> having said that though, of course there is no magic

> to the paris sound, its just a combination of things if you ask me:

>

> 1. simple, straightforward clipping and truncating

> 2. the ensoniq converters and their awesome coloring

> (a longtime ensoniq virtue, i.e. also the ASR and ASRX samplers

> sounded simply amazing whatever you threw at them)

> 3. the fact that you run a mix using only nice ensoniq

> algorithms (and boy, did they have a hand for good sounding

> yet simple effect algorithms)

> 4. (often underestimated) the "direct" feel of the low

> latency interface and (here comes the only thing i would

> give ID credit for and not ensoniq) the smart mouse behaviour

> when i.e. dragging eq values. oh, and the interface and

> its color does help too.

>

>

> thats pretty much it. and while it is a bunch of stuff, its

> a. nothing that cant be done elsewhere and

> b. no summing rocket science. actually the mere summing
> of paris is quite normal, easily testable with the
> usual phase cancellation tests im sure we all have done.
> so after years of limiting myself to paris because of the
> supposedly magic sound character, it really didnt take me
> very long to get right back to this point with another system.
> i color my stuff with my pres (and i kept some ensoniq AD/DAs
> around for a while), i have a million ways of clipping,
> i only use nice plugins (doh!) and with todays machines,
> latency isnt an issue anymore. my dual quad machine lets me open many
> times
> more stuff than a fully expanded paris would do while
> running at 1.5ms latency.
>
>
> so, speaking longterm and sound quality only, for a list of things that
> can
> really can be had elsewhere
> too if you invest a little time, you give up so many other things
> that have a true impact on sound, like proper grouping,
> sample precise latency correction, processing on group and
> master channels of any kind you wish, group based ducking,
> 100% generation loss free bouncing etc etc.
>
> at the end of the day, personally i find this just a bad
> deal not only featurewise, but *also* soundwise. these days
> im doing things in nuendo i could not dream of doing in paris.
> and i had that system very much pushed to the limit. i did
> drums subgroup compression over the aux bus (what a pain in the...!). i
> avoided
> rendering stuff because it didnt sound
> right. i made heavy use of the fun ways to clip and distort
> stuff in paris all the time, id even go as far and claim
> that i was one of the few people that eventually somewhat figured out
> the slightly weird paris compressor lookahead behaviour ;-)
>
>
> not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and
> i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)
>
>
>
>
> "Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hi Derek -
>>
>>Thanks for the comments. All worthwhile from a source who has

>>earned respect here over the years. I don't think anyone will take
>>offense.
>>There are 2 reasons why I stick with PARIS:
>>
>>1. The sound
>>2. The cost of a significant change
>>
>>I use Logic for the things that it does well and all the reasons
>>you cited, (convenience/productivity issues) and PARIS for tracking/stem
>>mixing and final bounce.
>>
>>Summing from Logic out through an analog board gives results that
>>I like. Summing through PARIS without an analog board gives me
>>results I like even more. AD converters currently available are
>>more clear, detailed, smooth etc than the PARIS ones, but I would have to
>>sink a bunch more cash into this, and would rather not.
>>
>>Engineer/Producer friends of mine, who are a lot more experienced
>>than me, and have a lot more invested than I do, are consistently
>>pleased/surprised/blown
>>away by the sonic character of what I can do in PARIS. In fact, on a CD
> we
>>just finished, I took the final mixes from Logic, summed out through
>>analog
>>to tape, that my mix guy had done, and dropped them into PARIS with no
>>gain
>>change, panned L R and re-bounced them. Everyone involved
>>preferred the PARIS bounces 100% of the time.
>>
>>So for me, PARIS right now is still my best choice.
>>
>>Peace,
>>
>>Ted
>>
>>
>>"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>hey guys :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>after seeing how much work is put into the paris project
>>>again lately (hats off to mike) ive been thinking about this
>>>quite a bit and until now dont quite know how to say it without
>>>it coming accross a bit offensive. but since i still am not sure
>>>how to put it, i told myself, i might as well just go ahead
>>>and just put this excuse in advance on top of it ;-) so here goes:
>>>

>>>
>>>with so much manpower going into paris, an essentially dead
>>>platform, one has to wonder, wouldn't it be smarter to
>>>put this manpower into something that's, how shall I put it,
>>>more essential in practical use? exactly how many people are
>>>still using paris? is it even one hundred?
>>>
>>>I've been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the
>>>platform but for the life of me, I could not imagine ever
>>>going back to it after years in the world of full MIDI and video
>>>integration, VSTi support, total and complete latency compensation,
>>>sample precise editing, rendering that actually works, compatibility, etc
>>yada
>>>yada. no amount of DP4 algorithm ports
>>>is going to change that, and I would assume that many if not
>>>most ex-paris users feel that way.
>>>
>>>so if you operate on this basic assumption (just follow me here
>>>for the sake of the argument), would it not make much more sense
>>>to focus on something entirely different?
>>>like, I would imagine the biggest hit among ex-paris users
>>>and soon-to-be-ex-paris users would be a conversion application
>>>that reads paris projects, just the most basic stuff
>>>like files in use and position info and would convert
>>>that into...dunno...an OMF maybe? maybe too complicated
>>>(OMFs crossplatform compatibility seems to be a constantly moving
>>>target and suck big time)..maybe just a bunch of rendered
>>>continuous wave files that get their data from the project file
>>>and the associated pafs?
>>>
>>>or maybe a completely different approach, a "hardware driver"
>>>that fools the paris software into believing a fully functioning
>>>EDS card with attached audio interface is present - so that
>>>you can launch paris 3.0 on any computer and use the paris
>>>software to convert projects into OMFs. you know, just a
>>>dead end that on the other end pretends to the software
>>>whatever the software asks for during boot to actually
>>>get to the project window. no actual audio support, just
>>>a fake hardware so that you can get to the software level
>>>where you then could resurrect your files.
>>>
>>>I know suggesting something like this is kind of an insult to the work
> that's
>>>currently being done (and that is exactly
>>>what I would want to avoid), but can you see how that would
>>>make a lot more sense to a lot more people?
>>>
>>>to me, these days, the most important thing about paris

>>>is the question of how i get past projects off that platform
>>>whenever i need to work on them again. i still have a
>>>working paris computer in the second control room but its
>>>collecting dust, the system is slowly fading away as only
>>>outdated pre-XP windows systems were able to do, and
>>>the hardware side doesnt look to promising either.
>>>
>>>and same thing about the effects: porting the awesome and
>>>at times timeless effects from ensoniq effect history is
>>>great - but why on earth do it for this outdated platform?
>>>in the real world i know zero paris users that still use paris
>>>(and i used to know a LOT), but i know lots and lots of
>>>fans of the good old ensoniq stuff that would pay hard cash
>>>for VST ports of some of the ensoniq algorithms.
>>>
>>>not to mention that you would be able to use those effects
>>>in paris then too, on modern computers probably in 50 times
>>>more instances than on the EDS card, if you just take the
>>>paris eq VST plugin as orientation (try to max out any current
>>>machine by opening instances of that plugin - its more or less
>>>impossible).
>>>
>>>
>>>i feel like i have to state that again, i so much admire you
>>>people who do all this, so please dont get these suggestions
>>>wrong.
>>>
>>>
>>>thanks for listening :-)
>>>derek
>>
>"derek" <a@b.com> wrote in message news:4961e7eb\$1@linux...

>
> there is no such thing as zero latency. of course paris
> has a latency, i dont remember the measurements exactly but they
> circled around this NG too. i think it was something like
> 2.something milliseconds for one signal trip through mixing engine and
> converters
> (=what you hear when you track a signal).
>

1.5mSec round trip is what BT came up to.Don't rule out Creamware for card DSP. :)

AA

"derek" <a@b.com> wrote in message news:4961e19b\$1@linux...
>

> "Mike Audet" <mike@....> wrote:
>>Hi Derek,
>>
>>No offense taken. Would it make more sense to put effort into writing
>>software
>>to convert PARIS projects to something else? Not for me. I use PARIS.
>
>>I couldn't care less about porting projects out.
>
>
> that sure makes a lot of sense :-)
> bad luck for me, but good for you :-)
>
>
>>I like PARIS the way it is. Also, I refuse to use anything that is host
>>based,
>
>
> im tempted to say youre doing yourself a disservice here.
> i can see how one could come to the conclusion that native
> systems were bullshit in the past, but IMO this has
> changed recently. to me - and im a heavy plugin user - the
> magic moment was somewhere when pcs went past 4 cores running at
> above 2 GHZ, to use a simplified picture. i currently use a
> dual quadcore (8 cores at 2.33ghz) and its the first machine where i can
> NOT
> max out the CPU, no matter what i throw at it.
> as absurd as it is, my new bottleneck now is memory. i run
> out of memory just by opening effect plugins before i run
> out of CPU power.
>
> so, while i too considered native systems to be shaky bitches
> with high latency for years, these days i say - not anymore. not by
> a long shot. these things rule big time now.
> oh, and they run in circles even around fully expanded
> protocols HD rig too now. i remember that time where they
> benchmarked some new waves plugin and it
> ran on around 180 instances on a huge PTHD setup, which
> sounded impressive until you heard that a dual quadcore
> xeon ran the same algorithm in VST some 650 times (!!)
>
>
>
>
> and that leaves Pro Tools and PARIS. I refuse to give even one more
>>dime to Digidesign, so that leaves PARIS.
>
>

> im fully with you on that digidesign sentiment ;-)
>
>
>
>
>>I synch Cakewalk Pro Audio 9 to PARIS via MTC. I use a EMU ESI2000
>>sampler.
>
>
> thats the kind of stuff that really sounds like a headache
> to me. triple project maintenance, longer sound path, realtime
> bouncing of tracks, EMU samplers (i had an e4k for a while
> in the studio and compared to the ensoniq sound it...did not
> sound as good ;-)
>
>
>>Why should anyone spend thousands of dollars on a new system that may make
>>things easier, but won't make one's recordings sound any better?
>
>
> see my previous post. i want to stress that im not saying
> this in hopes to "convert" you, i really am not. i know
> the feeling of being in love with ye olde ensoniq puppy :-)
> but just on the basis of a what-sounds-good-and-what-doesnt
> discussion between people that dig good sound, i still have
> to disagree. its simply NOT only about ease of use.
> it also is very much about sound. (copying from my
> other post) proper grouping,
> sample precise latency correction, processing on group and
> master channels of any kind you wish, group based ducking,
> 100% generation loss free bouncing etc etc. all make a difference
> in sound, and a huge one at times.
>
> i would go even further and argue that even "ease of use"
> can make a difference in sound. in paris, how many times had i
> thought to myself "do i give myself the headache of
> a drum submix compression through the aux bus? or do i need
> it to be compressed by some other compressor, so do i do a submix
> now? am i ready for that to be submixed at all?" and then sometimes going
> through with it
> (taking a lot of time), sometimes not because of the amount
> of work involved. in a modern system, its a no brainer.
> you just do it when your engineer instinct demands it,
> and you choose the compressor with the characteristics you
> need on the spot, and if you then think that the compression
> stresses the basedrum a bit too much, you simply move
> that fader. all that results in good sound.
>
> or using UAD. come on, how often have you thought "am i really

> willing to go through this whole manual latency compensation
 > business for just that one more UAD effect"? on a modern
 > system, a no brainer. you just open the plugin you want to
 > open.
 >
 > of stuff that simply is completely impossible to do...i.e.
 > where i live, vocals need to be louder than a typical US mix
 > by an average of around 1.5db (due to our language
 > being less easy to understand in a thick mix than english).
 > that of course has an impact of
 > how "fat" the playback comes accross of course.
 > but you can get almost an entire db of that back by doing
 > subtle ducking on anything that is in the vocals frequency
 > range, i.e. all guitars, keyboards, but not drums or base
 > being ducked by the lead vocal.
 >
 > of course such a thing is virtually impossible to plan
 > in advance (believe me ive tried ;-). its really only possible
 > if you have completely free routing and can route anything
 > anywhere at anytime.
 >
 > this is not ease of use stuff. its about sound.
 >
 >
 > Also, consider
 >>that when in a few years, that system will be worth a few hundred dollars,
 >>if that. The depreciation on DAW hardware is worse than on a car.
 >
 >
 > thats true for any digital system of any kind of course.
 >
 >
 >
 >>Here's an example: I bought three UAD1 cards (for around \$100 each)
 >>planning
 >>to "upgrade" my EQ to the Cambridge. The PARIS EQ sounds better.
 >
 >
 > well uh...why did you use the cambridge eq of all things???
 > thats more or less a modern version of the waves q10, an
 > analytic digital eq, not a "character" eq like the paris one
 > is. UAD has a couple of very nice eqs, the pulsecs and neves
 > are awesome, and the precision mastering eq is simply the
 > best digital eq ive ever heard with to my ears an almost
 > perfect mix of character and smoothness on the one hand,
 > yet still dead accurate precision and "bite" when needed
 > on the other hand. i fall in love again and again every time
 > i open this one. "best-eq-ever" ;-)

>
> i love the paris eq, but its really in another league here.
> its very easy to dial in nice and cool settings, but its not
> without its flaws, being a little wishy washy in the highs,
> being a little phasey in the low range. still a super
> cool channel eq though, thats for sure.
>
>
>
>>As it is, I LOVE the Dp/Pro Hall. My Lexicon MPX1 isn't even plugged in
>>right now. I love the PARIS Eq.
>
>
> second all of that :-)
>
>
>
>> I love having no latency when I'm recording.
>
>
> modern native rigs dont have any noticable latency when recording
> while still offering multiple times the plugin beef.
> even a mortal single quadcore from the intel consumer line
> would give you dozens of decent plugins at 1.5ms.
>
>
>
>>I will eventually be porting at least some of the effects to VST, but I've
>>got PARIS to run the effects right now, so VST isn't a priority. ASIO is
>>a priority. With ASIO, I'll be able to use the PARIS hardware with newer
>>software when it makes sense to do so. I love the spectral editing in
>>Audition.
>> Getting that working makes sense to me.
>
>
> i hope it comes accross that i discuss all of this in good
> spirit and just on a from-geek-to-geek basis ;-)
> having said that, may i still slip in a super theoretical question: if you
> really are able to do something
> that high tech as an asio driver for the MEC hardware, would
> that "fake driver to start the paris app without actual hardware
> to save projects from extinction even where no hardware is
> present" be within your technological reach?
>
> you know, strictly theoretically speaking,
> maybe for that time in ten years when you finally
> decide to move on and stuff ;-)
>

>
 >>I'm glad you're happy with whatever you are using now. But, so are many
 >>of us.
 >
 >
 > i dont doubt it for a second. ive been a paris user from
 > late 97 till...2005 i believe. loved the system, adored the
 > company. what a loss that was when they were eaten by
 > %%&/%(%\$/ creative and merged into nonexistence by emu :-(
 >
 >
 >
 >
 > best,
 > derek"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:
 >so if you operate on this basic assumption (just follow me here
 >for the sake of the argument), would it not make much more sense
 >to focus on something entirely different?
 >like, i would imagine the biggest hit among ex-paris users
 >and soon-to-be-ex-paris users would be a conversion application
 >that reads paris projects, just the most basic stuff
 >like files in use and position info and would convert
 >that into...dunno...an OMF maybe? maybe too complicated
 >(OMFs crossplatform compability seems to be a constantly moving
 >target and suck big time)..maybe just a bunch of rendered
 >continous wave files that get their data from the project file
 >and the associated pafs?

Hey Derek... if your main need with regard to Paris is being able to port stuff out of it into other apps, would it not make sense to simply acquire a few ADAT cards & lightpipe the songs out in real-time? For mega-channel projects where even several ADAT cards might not be enough to do it in one pass, all you'd have to do is to make sure that each machine was started at the very beginning point of each project & then nudge or slide the incoming DAW tracks to the starting point... IOW, you would even have to worry about syncing the two DAW's - as long as they were either word-clocked together or you had the incoming DAW set to lightpipe sync, you'd be fine. I can't imagine that even on large multi-song projects, this would add more than a couple or three hours of transfer time to the client's bill... probably not much more than a software-based exporting application would take, considering the rendering, copying to whatever transfer media you chose, then importing into the new DAW app, etc.

Just a suggestion for you... heck, maybe this is what you're doing already, for all I know. :)

Neillately I've been re-visiting a couple of my favorite recordings - "Me and My Guitar" and "Manzanita" by Tony Rice. Apart from the great playing (and singing!) the sound of those albums is amazing. Clear, deep, wide and natural.

Bill Wolf, the guy who recorded and mixed that stuff is now a mastering engineer in Arlington, VA and I've asked him lots of questions about recording that stuff. He says that he almost always used two mics on each instrument but when I listen to the CD's I hear a great localization of each individual instrument. One of the things that he's always said about the sound of the instruments (Rice's guitar in particular) is that the guys all just made them sound great. To me that kind of sums up the "density" issue. Great players make their instruments sound good and create great arrangements that allow the whole recording to open up and breath. Makes mixing a lot easier!

One of my favorite recent projects was a tune that was 2 guitars (elec + acoustic), bass, drums, lead vocal and 3 or 4 female harmonies. Came out sounding great!

Gantt

"Shane M" <shanem@nospam.com> wrote:

>
>Question: I was listening to a very long video on "why audio quality matters"
> (this is about 2 1/2 hrs in total) where characteristics of favorite recordings
>are discussed.
>
> http://philoctetes.org/Past_Programs/Deep_Listening_Why_Audio_Quality_Matters
>
>and 3 themes of some favorite listenable recordings kept popping out at
me.
>1) space in the mix (density)
>2) simplicity of signal chain
>3) quiet (overall levels had a lot of true quiet - not just overcompressed
>quiet - loudness wars)
>
>obviously capturing a great performance is key, but it stood out to me that
>tracks identified as great recordings seemed to have lower audio density.
> (granted alot of the recordings seemed to be single takes in a the same
>room too - maybe that's more of it).
>
>I realize many of the older tracks were this way because of physical track
>and time limitations that prohibited filling up of every sonic niche, but
>it got me to wondering whether the current practice of stereo recording
sources
>may be contributing also once certain track thresholds are reached.
>
>... and along with that thought - have any of you purposefully attempted
>to track more sources in mono to reduce the sonic footprint? Do you intentionally
>force yourself to work with fewer tracks?

>
>I guess at base I'm wondering if tracking multiple sources in stereo vs.
>mono can contribute to mixes that in aggregate are harder to listen to.

>
>
>Gantt,

You are so right. The quality of the talent has everything to do with the quality of the finished product. No production tools or techniques can hide inability on the talent side. I find myself dealing with that more often than I'd like.

I'll have to check out the recordings you suggested here!

Tom

"Gantt Kushner" <ganttmann@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:496238af\$1@linux...

>
> Lately I've been re-visiting a couple of my favorite recordings - "Me and
> My Guitar" and "Manzanita" by Tony Rice. Apart from the great playing
> (and
> singing!) the sound of those albums is amazing. Clear, deep, wide and
> natural.
> Bill Wolf, the guy who recorded and mixed that stuff is now a mastering
> engineer in Arlington, VA and I've asked him lots of questions about
> recording
> that stuff. He says that he almost always used two mics on each
> instrument
> but when I listen to the CD's I hear a great localization of each
> individual
> instrument. One of the things that he's always said about the sound of
> the
> instruments (Rice's guitar in particular) is that the guys all just made
> them sound great. To me that kind of sums up the "density" issue. Great
> players make their instruments sound good and create great arrangements
> that
> allow the whole recording to open up and breath. Makes mixing a lot
> easier!
> One of my favorite recent projects was a tune that was 2 guitars (elec +
> acoustic), bass, drums, lead vocal and 3 or 4 female harmonies. Came out
> sounding great!
>
> Gantt
>
> "Shane M" <shanem@nospam.com> wrote:
>>

>>Question: I was listening to a very long video on "why audio quality matters"

>> (this is about 2 1/2 hrs in total) where characteristics of favorite recordings are discussed.

>>

>> http://philoctetes.org/Past_Programs/Deep_Listening_Why_Audio_Quality_Matters

>>

>>and 3 themes of some favorite listenable recordings kept popping out at me.

>>1) space in the mix (density)

>>2) simplicity of signal chain

>>3) quiet (overall levels had a lot of true quiet - not just overcompressed quiet - loudness wars)

>>

>>obviously capturing a great performance is key, but it stood out to me that tracks identified as great recordings seemed to have lower audio density.

>> (granted alot of the recordings seemed to be single takes in a the same room too - maybe that's more of it).

>>

>>I realize many of the older tracks were this way because of physical track and time limitations that prohibited filling up of every sonic niche, but it got me to wondering whether the current practice of stereo recording sources may be contributing also once certain track thresholds are reached.

>>

>>... and along with that thought - have any of you purposefully attempted to track more sources in mono to reduce the sonic footprint? Do you intentionally force yourself to work with fewer tracks?

>>

>>I guess at base I'm wondering if tracking multiple sources in stereo vs. mono can contribute to mixes that in aggregate are harder to listen to.

>>

>>

>>

>Derek since you mentioned the C-16, FYI, Paris maybe getting a new control surface with moving faders, thanks to Doug W. Paris still lives!

"derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>

>Kerry Galloway <kg@kerrygalloway.com> wrote:

>>> not trying to "convince" anyone here, i know i wont and

>>> i dont intend to. just consider it FYI, if you will :-)

>>

>>LOL.

>

>
>aw come one man, no reason to "lol" into anyones faces here :-)
>all in good spirit. i used to be a paris zombie too (i even go
>as far back to know that the term paris zombie is a positive one :-)
>
>
>>If you can find me a zero latency DAW that permits tracking at that zero
>>latency through FX
>
>
>there is no such thing as zero latency. of course paris
>has a latency, i dont remember the measurements exactly but they
>circled around this NG too. i think it was something like
>2.something milliseconds for one signal trip through mixing engine and converters
>(=what you hear when you track a signal).
>
>making a "no latency at all in paris versus some latency elsewhere" argument
>that seems like a comparison of
>absolutes is being dishonest to yourself. the reality is more a gradual
one
>like 2 milliseconds versus 3 milliseconds (my converters are nicely
>fast and partly make up for the 1.5 milliseconds the VST
>engine loses in comparison to the paris engine).
>
>
>>, includes a dedicated and high-quality hardware control
>>surface with automation and a shuttle wheel,
>
>
>...with no motorfaders and potentiometers that start to skip
>randomly after a while like unfortunately most late ensoniq
>gear did (that was a really bad shipment of potis they got
>there in their late days, the ASR and ASRX suffered from
>that problem too) :-)
>
>but yeah, the c16 was cool. the shuttlewheel ruled.
>of course it was slightly pointless because its only
>application that made sense was to move the now line around
>(editing was faster and more precise with the mouse,
>scrubbing was too unreliable) and you might as well use
>two keys to move the now line around, but it sure was FUN
>to use it. i think i have FOUR c16s in the closet, and
>most of them have that cool spot where the black color completely
>wore of between the transport and the wheel.
>they say "ive been USED a LOT, so i must have been useful" :-)
>
>
> has internal mixing

>>capabilities,
>
>
>which daw doesnt have that? :-)
>here id argue that as far as the featureset of internal mixing
>goes, paris loses the battle against almost anything else
>these days, in terms of flexibility and routing not to mention
>in terms of anything more advanced like object volume or,
>god forbid, the awesome object based mixing capabilities of
>hosts like samplitude and sequoia.
>my personal "heureka" moment was when at some point i realized
>that 1. i didnt want to live with the bugs of paris 3 anymore and
>2. i wanted to route stuff to groups and do sum processing
>on groups damnit! i mean, thats like one of the most essential
>mixing techniques there is!
>
>
>
> expandable I/O at about \$150 per eight extra channels and
>>killer fat-sounding sonics overall
>
>
>again, cant argue with the price of a dead system. and
>the I/O that shipped with wonderful doses of ensoniq-ness
>in sound for so little money per 8 channels was already a steal
>when they were still sold full price brandnew.
>you wont get any argument there from me, ever :-)
>as i said, i used to keep some ensoniq ADDA around just
>for the fun and coolness of it. eventually i switched to
>do all my coloring via pres, but it doesnt mean i lost
>my love for the ensoniq magic there :-)
>
>
>
>>Of course, it's also got to be under six hundred bucks US, which is about
>>what I paid for all those capabilities - my double Bundle III *and* the
>>computer to run it. Whaddya got that'll get me those features at that price
>>point?
>>
>>:D
>
>
>nothing, but then, it also wouldnt come with all the limitations
>and with IDs paris 3.0 software bugfest. in that sense, the
>old "you get what you pay for" rule applies as always.
>
>
>best,

>derek

>

>

>p.s.: i really did not want to turn this into a "paris pro and con" discussion.

>for now i keep going as long as its all good

>clean fun, but if anyone is annoyed, one word and i will stop

>this immediately. its not what i came here for :-)"Neil" <OIUIOU@OUI.com> wrote:
heck, maybe this is what you're

>doing already, for all I know. :)

i tried that route for a while, until i realized
that within the time i take for all the routing,
troubleshooting and restarts because of hiccups of
one kind or the other, i might as well just export
selections of tracks within paris at a time.

my interest is not so much in saving a few man hours.
its more for the times when the hardware will eventually
bite the dust. and that day is coming. not to mention
the slowly fading software compability etc. already today,
my only chance of opening a project as is with all
settings and plugs in place it to actually maintain
my win 98 machine from back then. and that just feels like
a ticking bomb to me."derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>

>"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>>~ Hi Derek,

>>I think what you're finding is a bunch of fairly content users.

>

>

>yes, i just realized that :-) quite amazing actually.

>

>

>>I still blame you for interesting me in softsynths. Now I'm

>>loaded with really cool stuff. Thanks!!!

>

>

>i apologize ;-) but its amazing how far this has come in so

>little time, huh? just recently i tried out the new BFD 2

>and i couldnt help but think back to the beginnings of this

>technology where id freak out about some fxpansion

>drummachine thingy simply because of its timing.

>and its really not long ago at all! amazing how

>much has happened...

>

>

>best,
>derek

I'm using Toontrack Drumtracker with BFD2 for replacement/enhancement of some less-than-great tracks in a project I'm mixing. Everything is so tight and phase coherent that it's downright amazing. Hey DeeJ

I read your previous post on drumtracker...is it as easy to use as the demo video shows

Have you tried it on overheads?

"deeJ" <noway@jose.net> wrote in message news:496293f7\$1@linux...

>

> "derek" <a@b.com> wrote:

>>

>>"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>>>~ Hi Derek,

>>>I think what you're finding is a bunch of fairly content users.

>>

>>

>>yes, i just realized that :-) quite amazing actually.

>>

>>

>>>I still blame you for interesting me in softsynths. Now I'm

>>>loaded with really cool stuff. Thanks!!!

>>

>>

>>i apologize ;-) but its amazing how far this has come in so

>>little time, huh? just recently i tried out the new BFD 2

>>and i couldnt help but think back to the beginnings of this

>>technology where id freak out about some fxpansion

>>drummachine thingy simply because of its timing.

>>and its really not long ago at all! amazing how

>>much has happened...

>>

>>

>>best,

>>derek

>

> I'm using Toontrack Drumtracker with BFD2 for replacement/enhancement of

> some less-than-great tracks in a project I'm mixing. Everything is so

> tight

> and phase coherent that it's downright amazing.

>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@rogers.com> wrote:

>Hey DeeJ

>

>I read your previous post on drumtracker...is it as easy to use as the demo

>video shows

>

>Have you tried it on overheads?

>

It's easy to use on mono tracks. Haven't tried it on overheads."Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@rogers.com> wrote:

>>Hey DeeJ

>>

>>I read your previous post on drumtracker...is it as easy to use as the demo

>

>>video shows

>>

>>Have you tried it on overheads?

>>

>It's easy to use on mono tracks. Haven't tried it on overheads.

These are roughs from the seemingly never ending punkabilly project. All of them have BFD2 working with the kick, snare and toms. they are being brought up under the overheads and other individual tracks to enhance what was recorded. There is a lot of the sampled room ambience in these. It's really helping me get them dialed in a bit better. These mixes were bounced to around -2dB and are waiting on comment from the producer before we move on.

http://www.mediafire.com/file/myuwym2jiqd/BILLY_SLIDE_12-20-FOR_HIDDEN_TRACK.mp3

http://www.mediafire.com/file/niwwmajiakw/BOYS_AND_TOYS_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3

http://www.mediafire.com/file/mnlcmmnuld3/COPS_ON_BIKES_12-28-08.mp3

http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get_a_Job_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3

http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get_a_Job_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3 Really good sounds overall. I have BFD 1.8 but there are problems with it and Logic 8, or so it seems. I have NFI how to get TFTW...

In the meantime, I use DGog.

Ted

"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:

>

>"Deej" <noway@jose.net> wrote:
 >>
 >>"Don Nafe" <dnafe@rogers.com> wrote:
 >>>Hey Deej
 >>>
 >>>I read your previous post on drumtracker...is it as easy to use as the
 >demo
 >>
 >>>video shows
 >>>
 >>>Have you tried it on overheads?
 >>>
 >>It's easy to use on mono tracks. Haven't tried it on overheads.
 >
 >These are roughs from the seemingly never ending punkabilly project. All
 >of them have BFD2 working with the kick, snare and toms. they are being
 brought
 >up under the overheads and other individual tracks to enhance what was recorded.
 >There is a lo of the sampled room ambience in these. It's really helping
 >me get them dialed in a bit better. These mixes were bounced to around -2dB
 >and are waiting on comment from the pr4oducer before we move on.
 >
 >[http://www.mediafire.com/file/myuwym2jiqd/BILLY SLIDE 12-20-FOR HIDDEN TRACK.mp3](http://www.mediafire.com/file/myuwym2jiqd/BILLY_SLIDE_12-20-FOR_HIDDEN_TRACK.mp3)
 >
 >[http://www.mediafire.com/file/niwwmajiakw/BOYS AND TOYS NEW YEARS EVE.mp3](http://www.mediafire.com/file/niwwmajiakw/BOYS_AND_TOYS_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3)
 >
 >[http://www.mediafire.com/file/mnlcmnmnuld3/COPS ON BIKES 12-28-08.mp3](http://www.mediafire.com/file/mnlcmnmnuld3/COPS_ON_BIKES_12-28-08.mp3)
 >
 >[http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get a Job NEW YEARS EVE.mp3](http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get_a_Job_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3)
 >
 >[http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get a Job NEW YEARS EVE.mp3](http://www.mediafire.com/file/zjwhtymhdi1/Get_a_Job_NEW_YEARS_EVE.mp3)Just curious if
 anybody knows of a soft synth out there that emulates this
 particular keyboard. Threrere's a patch that I would like to use, but the
 volume slider is dirty, and no mater how much I've attempt to clean it, it
 adds a "scratchy" background sound, which I obviously do not want.

Thanks a bunch!

Stephen"Gantt Kushner" <ganttmann@comcast.net> wrote:
 > He says that he almost always used two mics on each instrument
 >but when I listen to the CD's I hear a great localization of each individual
 >instrument. One of the things that he's always said about the sound of
 the
 >instruments (Rice's guitar in particular) is that the guys all just made
 >them sound great. To me that kind of sums up the "density" issue. Great
 >players make their instruments sound good and create great arrangements
 that
 >allow the whole recording to open up and breath.

thanks Gantt, I appreciate the comments and observations - esp re stereo micing."Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:

>Gantt,

>

>You are so right. The quality of the talent has everything
>to do with the quality of the finished product. No production
>tools or techniques can hide inability on the talent side. I find
>myself dealing with that more often than I'd like.

>

>I'll have to check out the recordings you suggested here!

>

>Tom

>

>

>"Gantt Kushner" <ganttmann@comcast.net> wrote in message
>news:496238af\$1@linux...

>>

>> Lately I've been re-visiting a couple of my favorite recordings - "Me
and
>> My Guitar" and "Manzanita" by Tony Rice. Apart from the great playing

>> (and

>> singing!) the sound of those albums is amazing. Clear, deep, wide and

>> natural.

>> Bill Wolf, the guy who recorded and mixed that stuff is now a mastering
>> engineer in Arlington, VA and I've asked him lots of questions about
>> recording

>> that stuff. He says that he almost always used two mics on each
>> instrument

>> but when I listen to the CD's I hear a great localization of each

>> individual

>> instrument. One of the things that he's always said about the sound of

>> the

>> instruments (Rice's guitar in particular) is that the guys all just made
>> them sound great. To me that kind of sums up the "density" issue. Great
>> players make their instruments sound good and create great arrangements

>> that

>> allow the whole recording to open up and breath. Makes mixing a lot
>> easier!

>> One of my favorite recent projects was a tune that was 2 guitars (elec
+

>> acoustic), bass, drums, lead vocal and 3 or 4 female harmonies. Came
out

>> sounding great!

>>
>> Gantt
>>
&g
