

Posted by [jim](#) on Mon, 02 Jan 2006 23:48:45 GMT

```
;>>>>>>>> I know we have the Cubases ($499) Nuendo's ($1,500), Logic(1k),  
>>>> DP(699)  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>> &  
>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>> Sonar($400). There are all very good native systems that will  
>>yield  
>>>>>>> pro  
>>>>>>>>>> results. However, I can't believe thatthere is not one manufacture  
>>>> other  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>> than  
>>>>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>>>>>>> Digidesig
```

Posted by [Martin Harrington](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 00:25:03 GMT

[illegible]

Page 1 of 12 ---- Generated from The PARIS Forums

starting point, creating attitude on a track by track basis as needed.
I know that's a departure from the audio industry's engineering approach to using consoles for their character almost as a mantra rather than understanding the real reason: we developed those expectations and "standards" if yo

Subject: Re: noise problems
Posted by [Kim](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 01:21:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Now, we have this Apple fiasco..New machines, with new CPUS,
>little
>>>>>> software
>>>>>>>>>> support. do they really think that thisi was good move now??
>I'm
>>>>> not
>>>>>>> even
>>>>>>>>>> a current Mac owner and I agonise for MAc lovers and users.
If
>>I
>>>>> were
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> them,
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> I would not upgrade for at least 3-4 years. I digress again ...)
>>>> Sorry.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Again, calling on all new and current manufactures..You a vast
>>market
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Pro users and studios that needs more juice and pro features
>than
>>>>> your
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> current
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>> offereing, but we don;t want to spend 20k for it.. Soemthing
>along
>>>>> say
>>>>>&

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [Rob Arsenault](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 02:08:10 GMT

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

S
>>>> using
>>>>>> Nuendo and had the budget.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> <http://www.arbitermt.co.uk/nuendo/products/idcontroller.htm>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A bit pricey, but definitely specific to the application and with
> a
>>moose
>>>>>> of a DAW running the software and DSP, a nice rack of Myteks or
>>>>>> Lavry's
>>>>> for
>>>>>> tracking and patching external processors, and a decent summing box,
>>>> I
>>>>> might
>>>>>> be convinced to jump ship.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ;o)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> "LaMont " <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> "Productivity is a matter of finding a system that does what you
> need
>>>>> what
>>>>>>> I need may not be what you need and that could be the root of this
>>>>>>> discussion)."
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Agreed.. :)
>>>>>>> But, the rest of your post illustrates my points. Some Producer
>

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [Mike Audet](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 02:10:55 GMT

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

x" target="_blank">1@linux, "Deej"
>>><yiruyfh@hgdgr.not>
>>>wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> La Mont,
>>>>

>>>> I started noticing something sort of mushy in SX in the low end at
>>>> around
>>>> 24 tracks. It could very well be that I just don't know how to mix on
>>a native
>>>> system though. Fire it over lightpipe into the Paris mixer and it gets
>>big
>>>> again. I'm still summing in Paris and actually setting levels and
>>>> fader/FX
>>>> automation on both DAWs. I'm getting basic fader moves done in SX and
>>then
>>>> tweaking them in Paris. It's pretty wild to watch a mix happen here.
> I'm
>>>> using a fair amount of analog gear in my mixes. I've got 10 analog I/O
>>in
>>>> my Cubase DAW and I'm using them all for inserts of analog comps and
> EQ's.
>>>> In Paris, I'm patching in analog qand digital reverbs and delays. For
>>a while
>>>> I was paranoid about signal degradation with this many AD/DA's. Now I
>>don't
>>>> even think twice.
>>>>
>>>> Last night Tony posted up a song that I mixed on his site.
>>>>
>>>

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [excelav](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 02:28:55 GMT

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

ns, limited for summming with high track
>>>>> counts.
>>>>> LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>>> ID would be cool, even if it looks like a psychedelic video switching
>>mixer
>>>>>> from the 70's, but the reviews on functionality and increased
>>>>>> productivity
>>>>>> are rather convincing. Price is a bit steep though.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One of these wouldn't be bad either:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/system_5-mc/system_5-m c.htm
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Or maybe,
>>>>>>

>>>>> http://www.euphonix.com/post/products/mc/mc.htm
>>>>>
>>>>> That's Nuendo on screen in both links.
>>>>>
>>>>> This one still gets my vote for geek heaven and client wow factor:
>>>>>
>>>>> http://www.smartav.net/images/E72Splash1-1024x768.jpg
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BTW - I'm guessing that if Steinberg gets the 64 bit update right
>>>>> with
>>>> a
>>>> 64
>>>>> bit full audio path, summing boxes could be just another color in the
>>tool
>>>>> palette, but far from necessary, and likely less spacious and clear,
>>but
>>>>> that's more optimism than guarantee.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would like to hear Sonar 5 in full 64-bit glory to see if 64-bit
> (assuming
>>>>> Cakewalk isn't blowing smoke) lives up the paper specs on the
>>>>> concept,
>>>> but
>>>>> I'm hesitant to buy into the hype un

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [audioguy_editout_](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 02:31:22 GMT

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

n I'm after will come from China?

>>>>>>> LaMont

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Lamont wrote:

>>>>>>>> Hey Jaimie,

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Although native cpus are fast, don't think that you are getting

> off

>>>>> cheap.

>>>>>>>> Playing the speed keep up game every 2 years is 1) not

>>>>>>>> productive..2)

>>>>>>>> very

>>>>>>> expensive.. think about it..??
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Both native and DSP-based can be expensive. Native can be much
>>>>>>> less

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [Mike Audet](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 03:11:44 GMT

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

;>>>>>> buddies
>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> mine in town, were having this same discusion about amonth or so
> ago.
>>>>> They
>>>>>>> are all Mac user, with a few giga machines. The consesus for us all
>>>> is
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> we have grown tired of the "upgrade" syndrome that, for one forces
>>the
>>>>>>> non-computer
>>>>>>> music guy to become so entrenched with personal computer
>>>>>>> technology,
>>>>> that
>>>>>>> they can't focus on music..At the end of the conversation, we all
>>agreed
>>>>>>> that having a system like Pro-Tools HD would "serve" us best with
>>out
>>>>> having
>>>>>>> to "think" or stay on the CPU upgrade "teadmill" if you will. I've
>>been
>>>>>>> on
>>>>>>> that treadmill since 97,and as I look back on how many great
>>>>>>> working
>>>>> system
>>>>>>> setups I've detroyed due becuase I was trying to play the CPU sped
>>>> game.
>>>>>>> I've lost decnet paying mixng and production jobs becuase my
>>>>>>> systems
>>>>> were
>>>>>>> not as stable as I had them before I "upgraded" to a faster cpu and
>>>> OS..
>>>>>>> I one of our suites we still have PT Mix cube running on a G4(450)
>>OS9
>>>>> that's
>>>>>>> rock solid stable.. One of my Paris setup still has Win
>>>>>>> 98se..Stable
>>>>> stable

>>>>>>> stable:)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 2 staff producers went chasing the Apple speed dream , from Dual
> 867s
>>>>> to
>>>>>>> Dual G5(2.5s) on OSX..Man, the agony and frustrations on their
>>>>>>> faces
>>>>> due
>>>>>>> to the fact that they had serious deadlines. That's what spurred
> our
>>>>>>> conversations
>>>>>>> about it's either PTHD or a slotion with DM2000/02r96 with
>>>>>>> Nuendo/PT
>>>>> Radar
>>>>>>> with the yammy difital mixer.. Each set up cost. But, we demand a
>>solid
>>>>>>> working
>>>>>>> system,

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Tue, 03 Jan 2006 03:43:35 GMT

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

y is low enough that it hasn't been a problem.

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The i/o integration is fine, I have 18 analog inputs and 16 analog
>>>>>>>> outputs plus stereo digital i/o directly patchable through my DAW
>>>>>>>> software and also routable from the i/o box's monitoring software.
>>>> If
>>>>> I
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> need more i/o I can plug in another Firewire i/o box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I run my system with a mouse and a jog/shuttle wheel add-on. I can
>>>> get
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> moving fader controllers from at least four different
>>>>>>>> manufacturers
>>>>>>>> which is tempting, but since I only really used the jog/shuttle
> part
>>>>> of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> the PARIS controller I haven't needed that. Plus I've grown used
>>to
>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> precision and (believe it or not) speed of mixing with the mouse.

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The sad truth with moast if not all native solutios is that
>>>>>>>> it has forced a big\$\$\$ third party solutions market, inwhic
>>>>>>>> native
>>>>> users
>>>>>>>> are going back to purchase , talk back units, better than average
>>>>>>>> converters..All
>>>>>>>> to chase the dsp systems way of working..in the end, the native
>>person
>>>>>>>> does
>>>>>>>> not realize that they have spent just as much, if not more than
>>they
>>>>>>>> could've
>>>>>>>> gotten with a dsp based DAW.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> A native system will be more flexible, you'll have more developers
>>>> to
>>>>>>>> choose from to enhance your system, and if one of the developers
>>goes
>>>>>>>> under, your system will not hit a dead end.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Over the last decade I've spent way less than, for example, a
>>>>>>>> ProTools
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> system would have cost and am getting, I think, comparable
>>>>>>>> results.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Having used nuendo sice it's inception (2000,),logic audio, Ican
>>>>> with
>>>>>>>>> hesitation,
>>>>>>>>> that it takes a lot of \$\$\$ to bring those apps up to pro specs,
>>and
>>>>> truth
>>>>>>>>> be known, steinbergs way of integrating hardware leaves a lot to
>>be
>>>>>>>>> desired..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>&

Subject: Re: noise problems
Posted by [jim](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 13:50:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;>
> >>>

> >>>
> >>>Well...
> >>>
> >>>...better your ISP than mine. ;o)
> >>>
> >>>Cheers,
> >>>Kim.
> >>>
> >>>"Deej" <animixnosrapamus@animas.net> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>I've been carrying on a few offline conversations with folks here and
> >I'm
> >>>>not sure if I've received any PM's or if you (and you know who *you*
are
> >>>>;o) got the last ones I sent. My ISP has been torpedoed somehow and
they
> >>>>have been scrambling to get backup servers working for the entire day.
> >They
> >>>>say that all incoming e-mail should show up once things are back on
track,
> >>>>but for now, the whole of animas.net is toast.....if anyone has been
> >trying
> >>>>to ping me, I've been unpingable and have been incapable of
establishing
> >>>>contact with the rest of the known universe.
> >>>>
> >>>>Deej
> >>
>The Altivec processors are disturbingly, amazingly powerful. And they sit
there doing nothing because coding for them is extremely difficult and the
development tools to take advantage of them never got anywhere close to good
enough. Which is a damn shame, think of all of those sad little floating
point calculations that were never vectorized. I weep for them, those sad
little calculations so ill treated by the generic floating point units on
the PPC chips. The never had a chance! sob sob . . .

TCB

"LaMont" <jjdpro@ameritech.net> wrote:

>
>Hi James..
>You wrote: "Altivec is a definite factor
>in how a G4 and G5 perform. I think that is why they went with dual core
>Intel chips, to make up some of the performance loss".
>
>I have to disagree here. There were only a hand full of vendors that were
>actually taking advantage of the Altivec engine(Audio ease-Altiverb), and
>Adobe PhotoShop. A lot of third party developers did not jump onthe Altivec

>wagon. Even our Edmund Parelli, stated that "recoding an App to use the velocity
>engine was a major task that many , including himself was not willing to
>do"..
>
>So, where di that leave Appple?? Well, if left them with having to "fabricate"
>speed test and other outlandish performance statments. All while, trying
>to convince IMB to make a better faster PPC CPU. Well, as you know, a year
>pasted on the Dual G5, which was still using 7 year cpu technology, Apple
>was was Isoing badly in the performance race. Even worse, they were counting
>on IBM to boost performace of the ongoing OSX developments. When OSX came
>out we had a Siler/ G4 Dual 1gig machine. And that Mac could barely hang
>with a P4 1.8 or AMD Athlon 1.5 PC..
>
>OSX was and is a Hog.. My point is: Apple needs AMD/Intel badly. They (Mr
>Jobs) can no longer spew the performance lies with a stright face any longer.
>The trurth is the truth. With a dual core Intel, Mc user's will see their
>machines perform like they never have. No one will miss the Velocity engine..Becuase
>that same high-end floating point technology cane be bought on most gra

Subject: Re: noise problems

Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Thu, 05 Jan 2006 03:42:37 GMT

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

andling what Altivec was handling, but I don't know for sure. Time

>>>>

>>>>will

>>>>

>>>>>tell on all this.

>>>>>

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

>>>

>>>and

>>>

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

>>>>>

>>>>>James

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>"LaMont" <jjdpro@amerietch.net> wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>>>Jamie,

>>>>>>

>>>>>>Logic use to be my main sequencer, it still is,if I'm using a computer.

>>>>>>

>>>>>>But,

>>>>>>

>>>>>I'm not comparis Logic with Paris, rather Cubase SX/Nuendo, Pro Tools
>>>
>>>LE
>>>
>>>>>AKA The Natives.
>>>>>
>>>>>Logic does not handle audio, in both recording, editing and mixng the
>>>
>>>way
>>>
>>>>>these apps do. Logic is a fine music creation DAW and yes you can mix
>>>
>>>fairly
>>>
>>>>>well on it.. But, I would not say that it's audio engine is as sleek,
>>>
>>>fast
>>>
>>>>>as Cubase SX/Nuendo or PT LE. It's still that same old mixer/arrange
>>
>> setup
>>
>>>>>that been there since version 4. We have Logic 7.1 on a dual G5 (2.5)
>>>
>>>and
>>>
>>>>>with all the new add-ons, it just seems to get clunkier and clunkier.
>>>
>>>>>Apple is moving to the Intel processor to put some much needed juice
>>
>> behind
>>
>>>>>their DAW. That's cool, except they apple have really let down a lot
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>users
>>>>>
>>>>>who were conviced that their (our) G5 were the king of the hill.. You
>>>
>>>would
>>>
>>>>>not believe how many friends of mine who jumped on the Dual G5 and
upgraded
>>>>>Logic as well, figuring that "finally" we can really see this app(Logic)
>>>>>
>>>>>burn
>>>>>

>>>>>rubber..Well, we were all fooled.. Even more, it seem that certain
version
>>>>>of OSX slowed not only Logic down, but other apps as well. sadly, today
>>>>>
>>>>>most
>>>>>
>>>>>of htose users now run PT on their G5's.
>>>>>
>>>>>If you check most online forums, you'd noyice thatthe most requested
>>
>> upgrade
>>
>>>>>users want from emagic is: Rewrite, re0code the audio engine and thus
>>>
>>>make
>>>
>>>>>Logic Audio an 'first rate audio app with same midi engine. Instead
of
>>>>
>>>>it
>>>>
>>>>>being a Midi app with add on audio capabilities.
>>>>>
>>>>>The folks over at Emagic have balked to make the much needed comsmetic
>>>>
>>>>>changes,
>>>>
>>>>>as well as, have the slick, cool editing found on the top DAWs.
>>>>>I'm not putting down the product,rather just stating as a long-time
user
>>>>>some of it's shortcomings and changes I and a lotof others like to
see.
>>>>>
>>>>>At this pont, I don't know if Emagic can make it happen. It seems that
>>>>
>>>>Apple
>>>>
>>>>>is goin full bore with SOundTrack Pro/Final Cut Pro.. Soundtrack Pro's
>>>>
>>>>layout
>>>>
>>>>>and audio engine is
