

Subject: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...
Posted by [Kim W](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 06:34:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

```
t; to
>> >> > the
>> >> >>> >right ( 50ms=2240 - 192 = 2048)
>> >> >>> >Regards,
>> >> >>> >Dimitrios
>> >> >>> >
>> >> >>> >
>> >> >>>
>> >> >>
>> >> >>
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>
>In order for this to be really effective, you need to record nothing, copy
this to an adjacent track, invert the phase and then do a bounce.
```

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 06:43:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

; $\mathcal{O}P$

"Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote in message news:4349668d@linux...
> Yes well, I think because that is too easy !
> :)
> Regards,
> Dimitrios
> "Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote in message
> news:43496148\$1@linux...
> >
> > why not just record nothing in Paris. That's what I do. I have a :30
file
> > like that.
> > "Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
> > >Just in wavelab record nothing for 1 sec and then copy this for
hundreds
> > of

> > >times until you get say a 5 minute file.
> > >then save as paf.
> > >I will take next question :)
> > >Regards,
> > >Dimitrios
> > >"Aaron Allen" <nospam@not

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 06:46:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

_here.dude> wrote in message
> news:43487b76@linux...
> > > I made mine by putting Paris in record at the desired sample rate,
> looping
> > > a
> > > digital input to a mixer in the patchbay for Paris and feeding it no
> > > audio.
> > > AA
> > >
> > >
> > > "Cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
> > > news:43485317\$1@linux...
> > > >
> > > > Hey D,
> > > > Thanks for the Email.
> > > > I am going to bombard you with questions soon.
> > > > I need to make a ghost of my system first.
> > > > How do you make a silent PAF file?
> > > > Sorry if this is a dumb question.
> > > >
> > > > "Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
> > > > > He,
> > > > > Yeah well,
> > > > > I didn't mean to make any harm to your system....
> > > > >
> > > > > EDSTransfer 8,16 is better and more relaxed than 8,8.
> > > > > I use this for 4-5 months now ,no problem at all.
> > > > > The 8,8 causes slow disk transfers with many tracks.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes your old UAD1 wraps are 16384 samples long....
> > > > > Chainer is a way to go.
> > > > > But download this Spinaudio lite for free to wrap around chainer to
> > > > lower
> > > > > the latency to 4096 samples.
> > > > > That is 1/4 of your "working" latency.
> > > > > If you are adventurous insert the FREE multifixvst inside chainer

> and
>

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 07:19:44 GMT

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

> > >>then
> > >>>load UAD to go down to 2048 samples ! latent around 40ms...
> > >>>Not bad right ?
> > >>>Yes you were right about the compensation but at that special time
it
> > >did
> > >>>not work for me !!
> > >>>I guess I did something wrong then.
> > >>>Now this is a great method of compensating.
> > >>>Senderella is a great adventure to be taken for Paris.
> > >>>I hope and someone else will try it too and test it ...
> > >>>
> > >>>I will post all that I know about senderella and wrapping and
> > >compensating
> > >>>in one long updated post....
> > >>>Cheers,
> > >>>Dimitrios
> > >>>"cujo" <chris@applemanstudio.com> wrote in message
> > >news:4347d7f0@linux...
> > >>>
> > >>>> Yeah this is they way I was thinking you could do it a while ago.
> > >>>> But I thought Senderella was not wokring unless you did the 8.8
ine
> > in
> > >>>tghe
> > >>>> config.
> > >>>> wasn't that supposed to cause overheating?
> > >>>> Also I guess we'd want Chainer for more inserts for this.
> > >>>>
> > >>>> I need to get my hea

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...

Posted by [Kim W](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 07:23:28 GMT

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

d around these new numbers as I use that old
DX
> > >>>wrapper

> > >>> where al do 4x100 to the left then sample slide 1058 or whatever
to
> > >the
> > >>right
> > >>> again.
> > >>>
> > >>> You are an intrepid man D, the idea of messing with my working
> system
> > >>gives
> > >>> me nightmares
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>> "Dimitrios" <musurgio@otenet.gr> wrote:
> > >>> >Now the most obvious trick I missed (well didn't think that
would
> > >work
> > >>but
> > >>> >it does !) was to just to nudge the audio tracks you wanna use
> with
> > >>> >senderella for 100ms to the left and just put in a slot after
> > >>> >senderella
> > >>> >voxengo (free) sample delay 384 samples to the right.
> > >>> >Remember 100ms=4480 samples - 384 = 4096
> > >>> >That is if you use Spinaudio wrapper that lowers buffer with a
> 4096
> > >UAD
> > >>> >plugin latency.
> > >>> >If you will use multifxvst then use 50ms nudge to the left and
182
> > to
> > > the
> > >>> >right (50ms=2240 - 192 = 2048)
> > >>> >Regards,
> > >>> >Dimitrios
> > >>> >
> > >>> >
> > >>>
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> >
>
> >You know, I have read some reports that people actually percieve a difference
between audio sampled

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...
Posted by [Kim W](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 07:28:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

at 44k, and audio sampled at 96k. I don't have any 96k converters, or I'd give it a shot myself. In all things audio, I'd trust this group's ears over m(any) others.

If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:

-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured. (I'd tend to doubt this one...)

-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our ears. Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is deaf "listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.

Or...

-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.

Any thoughts???

MRSeemed like the slutz were having some fun with that thread.

What's your worst gear purchase?

I'll go first.

1969 My first electric guitar. Went to a thrift shop and there was a Jazzmaster that looked cool. Only 55.00! So, I sold a bunch of stuff and bought it. It needed a knob so I took it to the local Fender dealer and his service guy about fell off his chair. It was a cheap knockoff (Fender decal and all) from the Phillipines! (evidently some of the servicemen buy them and bring them back)

No truss rod, green wood in the neck, wavy plastic on the pickguard.

Total POS. Worth nothing.

ArrgGGGGGHHHHH...

I'm 16 right, and know nothing about guitars, but I do know I am in a world of caca, and now I have no money.

So, I go back to the thrift store, having cooked up a story about having sold something that wasn't mine and now I am in trouble, and the guy gave me my 55.00 back...

Whew...

Went and bought a real Fender (Jaguar this time) and finally got my heartbeat down to 195 or so....

DCDoes it taste like chicken?

"Mike Claytor" <claytor@nospam.com> wrote in message
news:43488518\$1@linux...

>

> Man, my plate is mucho full. I've got projects a year old that i need to finish!

>

> Really, all i've done is take the Royer mod and apply it to different mics.

> It's REAL easy if ya know which end of the soldering iron is the hot end.

>

> If yer clueless on this stuff (and if memory serves, you're not!) it's still

> an easy project.

>

> Keep the capsule and body and just wire in the Royer circuit, etc.

>

> I've got geetars, pre-amps, mics, landscaping, truck repair, etc. stacked

> up on me and just can't take on any outside stuff at this time.

>

> deadline stress is bad for Mikey!

>

> ...and hey! Texas b

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...

Posted by [erlilo](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 09:16:55 GMT

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

m(any) others.

> If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:

>-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured. (I'd
>tend to doubt this one...)

>-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our ears.

> Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is deaf

>"listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.

>or...

>-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.

>Any thoughts???

>MR [http://perso.wanadoo.fr/vb-audio/us/products/dxrack/dxrack.h tm](http://perso.wanadoo.fr/vb-audio/us/products/dxrack/dxrack.htm)

Scroll down to bottom of page....

el miguel

like having it done this way. As far as the final audio product that is heard in the film is concerned, 5.1 and higher sample rates aren't taking the world by storm.....not even a little.

Deej

"DC" <dc@spamyermama.com> wrote in message news:4349c570\$1@linux...

>
> Here's my .02
>
> 1. Everything has to be equal. *Almost always* when someone
> complains about digital it is because of cheap convertors or bad
> engineering. Compare the same convertor at different resolutions
> and you can hear some difference. I've done this with a Lavry and
> it is real, but of smaller magnitude of improvement than most people
> expect.
>
> The existence of so many recordings transferred back in the 80's
> on the wretched convertors in the Sony 1630/40 mastering decks
> is still causing complaints about "digital harshness".
>
> I have done orchestras straight to 44.1 / 16 bits that have been
> as smooth and sweet and detailed as anyone could expect and way
> better sounding than any vinyl record could ever be.
>
> 2. It is not a matter of hearing the higher frequencies. We don't.
> What we may hear is the transient response being better. One of the
> things I learned from my power amp design friends is that you need
> frequency response out

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...

Posted by [erlilo](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 11:23:43 GMT

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

c-pre quality,
> component quality, basic circuit design and interface issues.
>
>
> Recording engineers we have to be able to do 4 things well:
>
> Never yell with headphones on
>
> Coil cables properly
>
> Hear where to EQ
>
> Have minimal placebo effect. Yes, this can be learned.

>
>
> In the end, I would rather engineer well, with good gear (and never in
> the Pro Tools mix buss!) at red-book spec than use hi-rez stuff
> that has less attention paid to the quality of each piece.
>
> All things being equal, hi-res is better. But less than they say.
>
> BTW, with the amazing popularity of iPods and the like, it seems as
> if hi-res is no longer an issue since we can't even get beyond MP3
> let alone red-book. I disagree. Right now, there are iPods with 60
> gigabytes!
>
> Now, a CD can only 700meg, so we could easily have iPods holding
> 86+ CD's of uncompressed audio! No MP3 crap! It's mainly an
> access speed issue at this point, but I think it will happen, and then
> hi-res will follow.
>
> DC
>
>
> "Mike R." <emare@not.com> wrote:
> >
> >You know, I have read some reports that people actually percieve a
> difference
> >between audio sampled at 44k, and audio sampled at 96k. I don't have any
> >96k converters, or I'd give it a shot myself. In all things audio, I'd
> trust
> >this group's ears over
> >m(any) others.
> > If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:
> >-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured.
(I'd
> >tend to doubt this one...)
> >-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our
ears.
> > Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is
deaf
> >"listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.
> >or...
> >-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.
> >Any thoughts???

> >MR

>Sort of on this topic, anyone notice how bad radio is sounding lately?
Even the Beatle hour is bad "you can't do that" sounded like a real audio
file or something.
I load my Ipod on the highest rate before Apple lossless.

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Yesterday I was doing some location work recording a panel discussion of
>some heavyweight film songwriters/scorers/producers and publishers who
>specialize in placing music with film editors and producers.

>

>The issue of higher sample rates and 5.1 mixing came up. The only place
>higher sample rates were preferred were for ftp'ing MP3's to the publisher
>for listening sessions prior to sending on the finished *stereo/44.1* final
>mixes subsequent to approval of the song. Seems that there is some voodoo
>that these folks think they are hearing when MP3's are upsampled to 192kHz.
>I've never done this so maybe there is some validity to it, but anyway,
they

>like having it done this way. As far as the final audio product that is
>heard in the film is concerned, 5.1 and higher sample rates aren't taking
>the world by storm.....not even a little.

>

>Deej

>

>"DC" <dc@spamyermama.com> wrote in message news:4349c570\$1@linux...

>>

>> Here's my .02

>>

>> 1. Everything has to be equal. *Almost always* when someone
>> complains about digital it is because of cheap convertors or bad
>> engineering. Compare the same convertor at different resolutions
>> and you can hear some difference. I've done this with a Lavry and
>> it is real, but of smaller magnitude of improvement than most people
>> expect.

>>

>> The existence of so many recordings transferred back in the 80's
>> on the wretched convertors in the Sony 1630/40 mastering decks
>> is still causing complaints about "digital harshness".

>>

>> I have done orchestras straight to 44.1 / 16 bits that have been
>> as smooth and sweet and detailed as anyone could expect and way
>> better soundin

Subject: Re: Whilst on the subject of disk formatting...

Posted by [Kim](#) on Wed, 07 Sep 2005 11:41:28 GMT

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

>> well reproduced. This may be an issue in digital also.

>>

>> 3. What many people are claiming to hear is not more highs, but
>> more detail. I hear more detail at very low levels on classical, where
>> you start running out of bits at 16. This is a real issue, but less

so
>>
>> for pop music since with most pop, the waveform is so compressed
>> it looks like a solid bar instead of a waveform.
>>
>> 4. There's always some placebo effect, and there have been a LOT
>> of bad sounding boxes sold on their high sample rates while the
>> bozo designers simply forgot about things like mic-pre quality,
>> component quality, basic circuit design and interface issues.
>>
>>
>> Recording engineers we have to be able to do 4 things well:
>>
>> Never yell with headphones on
>>
>> Coil cables properly
>>
>> Hear where to EQ
>>
>> Have minimal placebo effect. Yes, this can be learned.
>>
>>
>> In the end, I would rather engineer well, with good gear (and never in
>> the Pro Tools mix buss!) at red-book spec than use hi-rez stuff
>> that has less attention paid to the quality of each piece.
>>
>> All things being equal, hi-res is better. But less than they say.
>>
>> BTW, with the amazing popularity of iPods and the like, it seems as
>> if hi-res is no longer an issue since we can't even get beyond MP3
>> let alone red-book. I disagree. Right now, there are iPods with 60
>> gigabytes!
>>
>> Now, a CD can only 700meg, so we could easily have iPods holding
>> 86+ CD's of uncompressed audio! No MP3 crap! It's mainly an
>> access speed issue at this point, but I think it will happen, and then
>> hi-res will follow.
>>
>> DC
>>
>>
>> "Mike R." <emare@not.com> wrote:
>> >
>> >You know, I have read some reports that people actually percieve a
>> >difference
>> >between audio sampled at 44k, and audio sampled at 96k. I don't have
>> any
>> >96k converters, or I'd give it a shot myself. In all things audio, I'd

>> trust
>> >this group's ears over
>> >m(any) others.
>> > If it is audible I'd propose three possibilities:
>> >-Our ears are much more sensitive than perviously thought or measured.
>(I'd
>> >tend to doubt this one...)
>> >-We do "hear" the higher frequencies, but with senses other than our
>ears.
>> > Perhaps our skin, or fine hair on the skin. Much like someone who is
>deaf
>> >"listens" to music, we are able to percieve the higher frequencies.
>> >or...
>> >-Its a sort of placebo effect. We think it's there, so it's there.
>> >Any thoughts???
>> >MR
>>
>
>DJ,

Are you sure they didn't mean 192kbps mp3 encoding vs 128kbps encoding?
That would make sense in the context.

And for DC: I think the lossless codecs (Apple's and FLAC for example) are
a good way to go for portables. I guess the problem is that a lot of consumers
can't hear the difference between 192kbps mp3 or AAC in their environments...

And about those amp designers, what analog recording format (or more importantly,
what consumer playback medium) in the past had response out to 250k?

Regardless, I think it's always going to be a battle where convenience wins
out over fidelity in consumer audio. And as long as it sounds "good enough"
to the consumer, that's a good thing for music when people want to listen
and can do it where they like. It remains a part of their lives and thus
lets us live ours.

;))

Regards,

Graham

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>Yesterday I was doing some location work recording a panel discussion of
>some heavyweight film songwriters/scorers/producers and publishers who
>specialize in placing music with film editors and producers.

>

>The issue of higher sample rates and 5.1 mixing came up. The only place

>higher sample rates were preferred were for ftp'ing MP3's to the publisher
>for listening sessions prior to sending on the finished *stereo/44.1* final
>mixes subsequent to approval of the song. Seems that there is some voodoo
>that these folks think they are hearing when MP3's are upsampled to 192kHz.
>I've never done this so maybe there is some validity to it, but anyway,
they
>like having it done this way. As far as the final audio product that is
>heard in the film is concerned, 5.1 and higher sample rates aren't taking
>the world by storm.....not even a little.
>
>DeejOn Sun, 9 Oct 2005 17:26:28 -0600, "DJ"
<animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:

>In order for this to be really effective, you need to record nothing, copy
>this to an adjacent track, invert the phase and then do a bounce.
>
