
Subject: XP updates

Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Sat, 10 Nov 2007 01:04:31 GMT

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

gt;>>>

>>>>>> Let's hope the RIAA loses this one.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> DC

>>>>>>

>>Hi Erlilo,

Thanks so much for your help. I acquired the 8-in manual from the parisfaqs.com website. I knew about the adjustment screw but I never messed with them.

I suppose I will have to look at these adjustments and try that. What worries me is that I have absolutely great levels when I send preamps or what-not directly into the 8-in card. I don't understand why I am losing so much beef going through the mixer... and the levels

Subject: Re: XP updates

Posted by [Ed](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 13:13:23 GMT

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

#64;OIU.com> wrote in message news:477cf7a9\$1@linux...

>

> Could the ZLM function in TotalMix have anything to do with it?

>

> Neil

>

>

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

>>Haven't had time yet but I'll get around to it. I've got a feeling there

> is

>>some sort of glitch in the way the MF driver talks to Cubase. I'd lay odds

>

>>that the rea latency is around 1 ms as all my other stuff here pings

>>through

>

>>at around 0.91.

>>

>>

>>"Aaron Allen" <know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote in message

>>news:477c7869\$1@linux...

>>> is that a true latency number?????

>>> Have you tried playing out one track while recording it to another to

> see

>>> what the real world DA->AD number is?

>>>

```
>>>
>>> AA
>>>
>>>
>>> "Deej" <noway@jose.org> wrote in message news:477c5668$1@linux...
>>>> That's the one
```

Subject: Re: XP updates
Posted by [uptown jimmy](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 22:18:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

```
;>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Deej
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>
>
```

--
Chris Ludwig

ADK Pro Audio
(859) 635-5762
www.adkproaudio.com

chrisl@adkproaudio.comThe question we were discussing was not whether bandwidth is good or bad for

a certain kind of artist, or good or bad for a particular industry, or good or bad for 'content and services' which means I'm not sure what. What I said, and what you're basically agreeing to, is that as bandwidth increases data gets cheaper.

Now then, obviously if one is making horrible music the 'content' is less likely to draw customers to use some of their bandwidth to get/purchase it. However, even if you have the super bitchingist content ever you will still be subject to the price dynamic--i.e. the easier it is to get the lower the price you will get for it. You can try to create some artificial scarcity but so far the only two ways tried (DRM and suing your customers) have been dismal failures.

To use the book example again. Illuminated manuscripts are, in my opinion, some of the most beautiful objects ever created by the mind of man. If I ever get rich I will certainly own a few. I'm sure your Medieval Scribes Local 310 saw the first printed books and scoffed saying, 'Our content and

services are SO much better than this trash we don't even need to worry. Who would want one of these hideous things, even if they are cheap?' And 50 years later there were probably more printed books in circulation than had been produced by hand in the history of Europe, and the scribe business was in serious trouble. Track the history of the internet from Compuserve and AOL through MSN and the telcos down to google and bittorrent and MySpace and you'll see it getting stupider, easier, cheaper, and m

Subject: Re: XP updates

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 22:41:48 GMT

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

ore filled with
porn. I'm not saying whether this is right or wrong, for that you'll have to consult someone confident about such things like an ethicist or DC, I'm just pointing out the way things have worked so far, not just with the internet but other technologies as well. I don't see whey something as simple as music distribution will be able to make the rain fall up when it comes to the dynamics of price and scarcity.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>TCB wrote:

>> Except that the world has never worked that way. I didn't say with enough
>> bandwidth everything is free, I said that as bandwidth (and storage) increase
>> the price of data will inevitably decrease. It might not be a linear relationship
>> and it might not happen right away, but it's the way the world works.

>

>We agree that costs are going down.

>

>I think where I part ways with you on this one is the vague translation

>from "content" to "data." It's as if a field of vegetables and a field
>of nuclear waste were combined into the single description of "dirt."
>It's not all just "dirt." What's actually in the field matters.

>

>Likewise all content and services can't be merely hand waved away as
>"data." What's actually encoded into the bitstream matters.

>

>I see higher data bandwidth as being beneficial to producing and
>distributing content and services, not detrimental. Potentially better
>for price, for increased consumer and artist choices, and certainly
>better for value. And as costs go down for moving bits around, woohoo,
>that's lower overhead.

>

>There are companies being built on the increasing bandwidth and making
>money. Bigger bandwidth means better content and services can be
>offered. The internet is growing as the content and services improve and

>the demand continues to increase.

>

>This month, rumor has it, iTunes will start renting movies. Making more

>money on the increasing bandwidth available.

>

>

>> And it doesn't matter whether an artist wants to be a T-Shirt shop or
a bucket

&g
