
Subject: Studio Pics 3

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Sat, 01 Nov 2008 15:08:40 GMT

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

the transport was running.

>>>>> Autotune made the transport stop but not SIR.

>>>>>

>>>>> Next I will install Cubase and lock with Paris. Those soft synths

>>>>> should give it a work out.

>>>>>

>>>>> Ha ha ha hahahahahaaaaaa,

>>>>> T.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message

>>>>> news:4959a14a@linux...

>>>>>> Hi Kerry,

>>>>>>

>>>>>> Ya Mike is a major league player regarding Paris that's for sure.

>>>>>> I have been installing many plugins and

>>>>>> so far with great success. I am about to wrap them and see

>>>>>> how they function. Many are DX and work right out of the

>>>>>> box. Some of the VSTs do too. The Waves SSL is sweet

>>>>>> and didn't show it's quirky display problem that shut the

>>>>>> transport down in my old comp. There is a driver update

>>>>>> for some video cards because of it.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I am going back at it and will try to make it quit from

>>>>>> abuse again only this time with as many SIRs as I can get

>>>>>> going as inserts. This should be fun!

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I'll post back.

>>>>>> Tom

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>> "Kerry Galloway" <kg@kerrygalloway.com> wrote in message

>>>>>> news:C57ECC48.C1AF%kg@kerrygalloway.com...

>>>>>>> Huge news, Tom - congratulations, and thanks for trailblazing for

>>>>>>> everyone!

>>>>>>> I'll be watching the process with extreme interest - my production

>>>>>>> buddy is

>>>>>>> all PC and he wants to have a pretty brawny computer in the studio,

>>>>>>> so this

>>>>>>> couldn't have come at a better time for me.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Mike, looks like you hit it out of the park.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> - K
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On 12/29/08 2:06 PM, in article 49594d55@linux, "Tom Bruhl"
>>>>>>> <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Well everyone, Mike has saved the day by updating the
>>>>>>> PSCL for me in particular. I was receiving a new error
>>>>>>> never seen before. After more than a few tries Mike seems
>>>>>>> to have nailed it. Again no funny workarounds with XP Pro,
>>>>>>> 2 mecs, 5 eds, Magma, UAD-2, Quadcore, etc..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I will continue loading plugins then finally add the Creamware
>>>>>>> card.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 1 EDS card is sharing with video, USB controllers and a few other
>>>>>>> less important things. Not a glitch in operation and the beast is
>>>>>>> smooth
>>>>>>> and stable. Config in Paris is 64, 160, 210,000. I know, weird
>>>>>>> but
>>>>>>> not an error in sight and that's dragging 10 tracks in time all
>>>>>>> over the
>>>>>>> editor and dropping them whereva... while it's playing 24 tracks
>>>>>>> with edits.
>>>>>>> The gui is displaying at the sample level on 4 submixes too.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I think you will all like this very very much.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Happy as a lark,
>>>>>>> Tom
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message
>>>>>>> news:494fd4d4\$1@linux...
>>>>>>> Two ADATs show up in Mec 2 in a 5 eds card -
>>>>>>> two mec setup using a quad core. One ADAT
>>>>>>> also was installed in Mec 1 at the time. I can't
>>>>>>> confirm ADAT sync at this time but the gui operated
>>>>>>> as expected in the patchbay.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I'll need to pick up a creamware sync plate for that test.
>>>>>>> I may try the adat machine after all is well here.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Tom
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message

>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

>My god, I thought I was the only one who realized this until today. That record is a benchmark for me despite the fact that it went "plywood" rather than gold. And the songs/writing are just primo. Glad to find someone out there who, 20 years later, gets it. Bravo Aaron... you got it right bro.

MWW (formerly known as WMW)..... thanks Thadius B!

"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message
news:495edbed\$1@linux...

Mr Mister were masters of understanding the process and how to best use it, though hardly anyone knew it on their last official release *Go On*. This is making me rethink all about every keyboard being stereo, stereo guitar pedal boards, acoustics being mic'd and piezo'd, drums being mix'd in the entire stereo field and direct bass and cabinet mic'ng. And the overdub's are stereo too. Then there is the doubling of all vox's. Granted, it makes each instrument sound huge, and individually are a marvel to listen to. Today's tones have built in depth, but I guess after multiple tracks things can get awfully crowded. Not to forget that it also doubles the mix's workload.

No wonder after listening to a single CD in headphones I have ear fatigue.

Wayne like them in stereo but you can control the pan controls and have a keyboard span L 10 o'clock position to R at 11 o'clock for a narrow positioned stereo image. One cunning trick that allows density of arrangement without over-cluttering the mix is EQing so that each instrument sits in it's own frequency as much as possible. Of course this should first be managed by the arranger or musicians in the parts they play and the sounds of their instruments.

One problem I have with EQing like this is that it tends to force the guitar (my instrument), which is naturally rather midrangey into a high frequency range which I hate as a player. Oh well.

The key is to EQ "in situ", rather than soloing each track to EQ it. Soloing tends to make one want to fill out every instrument which completely defeats a clean, uncluttered mix.

Shane M 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 a lot of the recordings seemed to be single takes in 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.
 >
 >
 > Wayne, that was exactly my thought listening to some of the samples. Individually
 it sounds cool but does it hurt the aggregate?

I'm a hobbyist (definitely non-pro), but my tendency - largely unquestioned
 - has always been to thicken it up, record more mics/sources if it sounded
 better that way - without consideration of what it did for the total mix.

Because of my lack of skill I've noticed minimalism on drums works in my
 favor, but hadn't questioned elsewhere.

My personal favorite recording/performance is Stevie Ray Vaughan's "Little
 Wing" - I don't know how it was recorded but it's notably different in that
 most of SRV's recordings don't approach that level of intimacy

"Wayne Carson" <waynecarson@cox.net> wrote:

> This is making me rethink all about every keyboard being stereo, stereo

> guitar pedal boards, acoustics being mic'd and piezo'd, drums being mix'd

in

>the entire stereo field and direct bass and cabinet mic'ng. And the
>overdub's are stereo too. Then there is the doubling of all vox's.
>Granted, it makes each instrument sound huge, and individually are a marvel

>to listen to. Today's tones have built in depth, but I guess after multiple

>tracks things can get awfully crowded. Not to forget that it also
>doubles the mix's workload.

>

>No wonder after listening to a single CD in headphones I have ear fatigue.

>

>Wayne

>

>We call it wide mono around here...

Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>One cunning trick that allows density of arrangement without
>over-cluttering the mix is EQing so that each instrument sits in it's
>own frequency as much as possible. Of course this should first be
>managed by the arranger or musicians in the parts they play and the
>sounds of their instruments.

>

>One problem I have with EQing like this is that it tends to force the
>guitar (my instrument), which is naturally rather midrangey into a high

>frequency range which I hate as a player. Oh well.

>

>The key is to EQ "in situ", rather than soloing each track to EQ it.
>Soloing tends to make one want to fill out every instrument which
>completely defeats a clean, uncluttered mix.

>

>Shane M 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.
>>
>>
>>I just found this interview that I did 7 years ago. It's pretty funny - I
don't remember saying ANY of this stuff! Some of it's actually pretty good.
I should take my own advice from time to time!

<http://www.prorec.com/Articles/tabid/109/EntryId/102/ProRec-Interviews-Gantt-Kushner.aspx>

Now, if I just had some good advice for how to keep the business going!become a doctor...i'm
sure you can get the diploma on-line.
hint...the pay for ones are better than the free ones...higher quality
paper...plus most words are spelled correctly.

On 4 Jan 2009 15:55:19 +1000, "Gantt Kushner" <ganttmann@comcast.net>
wrote:

>
>I just found this interview that I did 7 years ago. It's pretty funny - I
>don't remember saying ANY of this stuff! Some of it's actually pretty good.
> I should take my own advice from time to time!
>
> <http://www.prorec.com/Articles/tabid/109/EntryId/102/ProRec-Interviews-Gantt-Kushner.aspx>
>
>Now, if I just had some good advice for how to keep the business going!)

I took a look at the insert code. The next big PARIS step is the ASIO driver.
But, adding a submix knob to nolimit or the variable knee compressor sounds

like an interesting idea to me.

All the best,

Mike

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

>We're going to have to rename Paris "Oh, Canada" !

>

>John

>

>

>"Rob_A" <mani1147athotmaildotcom> wrote in message news:495e8d47@linux...

>> If a couple "Wow's will trigger Mike's creativity, here ya go.....!!!!

>>

>>

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow WowWow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> WowWow Wow

>> Wow

Wow Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow WowWow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow
Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> WowWow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow Wow
Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

Wow Wow

>> Wow

Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> WowWow Wow

Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow

>> Wow Wow Wow Wow

>>

>> Have more if required.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> "Erling" <erling.lovik@lyse.net> wrote in message news:495e4d46\$1@linux...

>>> ...it seems you're setting new ideas in Mike's head here....;-)

>>>

>>> Erling

>>>

>>> "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> skrev i melding news:495e45bc\$1@linux...

>>>>

>>>> Which brings me to something I used to think about alot when I was

>>>> working

>>>> on paris.

>>>>

>>>> Apparently the patch bay and effects subsystem only exposes a small

>>>> portion
>>>> of the possible patch points, and only allows you to connect them in
the
>>>> ways exposed, even though there are potentially hundreds of other ways

>>>> to
>>>> patch them.
>>>>
>>>> I always wanted to figure out the patching code and make an 'effect'

>>>> that
>>>> would allow you to communicate with the PSCL and repatch things in
>>>> different
>>>> ways.
>>>>
>>>> I know its possible because way, way back when there was a guy from

>>>> ensoniq
>>>> who made a hack that allowed you to patch an effect over a single submix
>>>> just like goran is describing.
>>>>
>>>> Chuck
>>>>
>>>> "Mike Audet" <mike@...> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Hi Goran,
>>>>>
>>>>>It's tricky, but it can be done. You have to set an effect send to
pre
>>>> fader
>>>>>and mix your drums through the effect send. The pan and send volume

>>>>>work,
>>>>>and you mix through these. Turn the track faders all the way down.
Set
>>>>>an external effect on your effect bus, and patch you compressor in
>>>>>there.
>>>>>
>>>>>You really have to mix with your ears and not with your eyes, but it

>>>>>works.
>>>>>
>>>>>All the best,
>>>>>
>>>>>Mike
>>>>
>>>>

>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

>AKA The Van Gelder treatment :-)

Chuck

"John Macy" <john@nospamjohnmacy.com> wrote:

>
>We call it wide mono around here...

>
>
>

>Bill L <bill@billlorentzen.com> wrote:

>>One cunning trick that allows density of arrangement without
>>over-cluttering the mix is EQing so that each instrument sits in it's
>>own frequency as much as possible. Of course this should first be
>>managed by the arranger or musicians in the parts they play and the
>>sounds of their instruments.

>>
>>One problem I have with EQing like this is that it tends to force the
>>guitar (my instrument), which is naturally rather midrangey into a high

>
>>frequency range which I hate as a player. Oh well.

>>
>>The key is to EQ "in situ", rather than soloing each track to EQ it.
>>Soloing tends to make one want to fill out every instrument which
>>completely defeats a clean, uncluttered mix.

>>
>>Shane M 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.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>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 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."

I don't take any offense to your questions, although I really don't do anything paris related anymore.

Chuck

"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 -

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 resurrect 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 too have Logic and PT and Reaper and so on. I record rock and roll, I'd
like midi and all that, but I really don't need midi, I actually record musicians
playing instruments. What I seek is the best sound.

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

James

"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 agree with everything Ted said.

I'm using Paris at the moment for summing because of the sound, period.

To put it in perspective, I have a PTHD2 accel system and a native Logic system that I use for recording/midi composition etc.

I also have a Shadow Hills Equinox, and also prior to that had 2 Rolls folcroms with 2 API 512c's that were used as a summing mixer.

I love the Equinox for summing, but Paris is now filling that role. I can automate my mix in paris and use some eds inserts on channels, so I'm still using Paris' biggest strengths. Now that Mike's drivers are out, it makes this route even more appealing.

My Equinox cost around 4k, I've spent a few grand on Paris stuff over

the last couple months (Ok, I went a bit overboard, but I'm planning to use this for another 10 years). The Paris stuff that I'm actually using now that everything is set up was maybe \$1600.00, and it's a big ass paris rig.

I don't think native paris would sound the same. The mojo with Paris is a sum of all parts, hardware and software.

The sound is the only reason why Paris still lives. If it sounded like a PT mix system, it would be long dead and buried. You just have to know it's strengths as well as it's limitations.

Cheers,

TC

Ted Gerber 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 resurrect 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

>Yup. My mom wanted me to be a doctor. Or a lawyer. Or an engineer (NOT recording!). I just wouldn't stop playing that doggone guitar long enough to get thru school.

Gantt

rick <parnell68athotmaildotcom> wrote:

>become a doctor...i'm sure you can get the diploma on-line.

>hint...the pay for ones are better than the free ones...higher quality

>paper...plus most words are spelled correctly.

>

>On 4 Jan 2009 15:55:19 +1000, "Gantt Kushner" <ganttmann@comcast.net>

>wrote:

>

>>

>>I just found this interview that I did 7 years ago. It's pretty funny

- I

>>don't remember saying ANY of this stuff! Some of it's actually pretty good.

>> I should take my own advice from time to time!

>>

>> <http://www.prorec.com/Articles/tabid/109/EntryId/102/ProRec-Interviews-Gantt-Kushner.aspx>

>>

>>Now, if I just had some good advice for how to keep the business going!

>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.

I like PARIS the way it is. Also, I refuse to use anything that is host based, and that leaves Pro Tools and PARIS. I refuse to give even one more dime to Digidesign, so that leaves PARIS.

I synch Cakewalk Pro Audio 9 to PARIS via MTC. I use a EMU ESI2000 sampler. If I'm going to spend money on a major upgrade, it will be for a U87 or better mic preamps.

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? 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. For me, it makes way more sense to use PARIS to its best potential and use the "upgrade" money for things that hold their value and actually deliver a better final product.

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. Imagine

if I had spent \$3000 on that same digital hardware just a few years ago chasing the latest/greatest? What a waste of money.

As it is, I LOVE the Dp/Pro Hall. My Lexicon MPX1 isn't even plugged in right now. I love the PARIS Eq. I love having no latency when I'm recording. I love my new Grace m101 that I wouldn't have been able to afford if I had bought a ProTools HD rig.

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

All the best,

Mike

"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 :-)

>dereki 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, 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
>~ Hi Derek,

I think what you're finding is a bunch of fairly content users.
That doesn't mean we wouldn't want more if it became
available. Being a new quadcore Paris user allows the
plugin counts you're talking about within Paris. Latency
is compensated for with one click using Faderworks.
Mike's ports of the DP Pro have been awesome but certainly
not state of the art. The newest UAD software works fine
in Paris. Most pros that mix in the box probably have one
of those too.

I agree that Paris is gone as far as new users are concerned.
The few that remain are a dedicated bunch as you well know.
Mike has taken the exact path that was needed to make Paris
still contend on most levels with the current crop of DAWs
albeit using a MIDI DAW in tandem.

On my wish list for Paris are patch points (DX/VST - hardware)
at the group outs and the Master. This would make all kinds of
pro routing schemes possible as you suggested.

Being a Cubase user has shown me the many options that new DAWs
have. I remain with Paris for cost but more for sonic reasons.

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

~ Tom

"Mike Audet" <mike@....> wrote in message news:49613783\$1@linux...
>

> 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.
>
> I like PARIS the way it is. Also, I refuse to use anything that is host
> based, and that leaves Pro Tools and PARIS. I refuse to give even one
> more
> dime to Digidesign, so that leaves PARIS.
>
> I synch Cakewalk Pro Audio 9 to PARIS via MTC. I use a EMU ESI2000
> sampler.
> If I'm going to spend money on a major upgrade, it will be for a U87 or
> better mic preamps.
>
> 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? 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. For
> me,
> it makes way more sense to use PARIS to its best potential and use the
> "upgrade"
> money for things that hold their value and actually deliver a better final
> product.
>
> 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. Imagine
> if I had spent \$3000 on that same digital hardware just a few years ago
> chasing
> the latest/greatest? What a waste of money.
>
> As it is, I LOVE the Dp/Pro Hall. My Lexicon MPX1 isn't even plugged in
> right now. I love the PARIS Eq. I love having no latency when I'm
> recording.
> I love my new Grace m101 that I wouldn't have been able to afford if I had
> bought a ProTools HD rig.
>
> 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'm glad you're happy with whatever you are using now. But, so are many
> of us.
>
> All the best,
>
> Mike
>
>
> "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 resurrect 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

>No -

the sonic/summing issue was only half of the 2 reasons I listed.

The second was the cost of making a significant change.

Nuendo 4, (which I believe I like better than Logic) costs \$1900

CDN right now. CuBase 4 costs \$700 CDN. I would also need to spend \$2000 for 8 channels of decent converters, plus a soundcard to accept the new signal.

My current PARIS rig cost me \$450 CDN total, and I'm happy with it.

I have no doubt that fantastic results are achieved with other systems, (in fact I know this to be true) but since I'm happy with what I can do in PARIS, I don't want to spend the money needed to make any change at this time.

Peace,

T
