

t and if one CPU will run at 2.8GHZ and the other at 2.6 GHz.

Just curious....

DeeJl agree wholeheartedly with Chuck. VMWare is probably the best option in terms of features and quality, it works with damn near anything. If they made a .deb for it that worked I'd probably buy it for my linux box. Virtual box is also very good, though it's only truly open source if you build it from source, the binaries are under a different license. In practice this means absolutely nothing. Of course I haven't tried the MSoft option as I'm avoiding their software whenever possible.

Ubuntu Feisty installs easily into both Virtual Box and VMWare, as does Debian Etch. I haven't tried a Debian testing or unstable netinstall but my guess is they'd work fine. SuSE as well, but at this point for me running SuSE is practically as offensive as running XP.

Good luck, and if you have any questions related to Debian (if you go that route) or (to a lesser extent) Ubuntu feel free to post here or email me off list.

TCB

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>

>It's the only way I work now. As I posted in the past, my physical machine  
>has absolutely nothing installed on it. I install and run everything in  
>a series of VMs. There are a couple of options for XP.

>

>1. Microsoft Virtual PC 2007. Free download. Highly optimized for windows.  
> Tight integration with physical PC (file copy, drag and drop, cut and paste,  
>display resolutions).

>

>2. Virtual Box. Open Source. Free download. Cool.

>

>3. VMWare. Cost\$. Probably the best there is, if only because of the expansive  
>feature set.

>

>There's nothing inherently dangerous about a VM, and I run a bunch of linux  
>distros just fine. In fact, the physical machine is 100% isolated from  
anything  
>the VM may do.

>

>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>  
>>What's the go hear?  
>>  
>>I want to get an isolated copy of Linux running under Windows XP on my  
work  
>>laptop here. What's the go? Is it dangerous at all?  
>>  
>>What's the popular option software wise?  
>>  
>>Cheers,  
>>Kim.  
>What's the advantage of running a virtual machine? I don't get  
that sort of thing at all - how does it differ from a regular  
PC setup?

Neil

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:  
>  
>I agree wholeheartedly with Chuck. VMWare is probably the best option

---

---

Subject: Re: Paris-Using external converters with different latencies-Important  
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Tue, 24 Apr 2007 07:42:43 GMT

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

---

in  
terms  
>of features and quality, it works with damn near anything. If they made  
a  
>deb for it that worked I'd probably buy it for my linux box. Virtual box  
>is also very good, though it's only truly open source if you build it from  
>source, the binaries are under a different license. In practice this means  
>absolutely nothing. Of course I haven't tried the MSoft option as I'm avoiding  
>their software whenever possible.  
>  
>Ubuntu Feisty installs easily into both Virtual Box and VMWare, as does  
Debian  
>Etch. I haven't tried a Debian testing or unstable netinstall but my guess  
>is they'd work fine. SuSE as well, but at this point for me running SuSE  
>is practically as offensive as running XP.  
>  
>Good luck, and if you have any questions related to Debian (if you go that  
>route) or (to a lesser extent) Ubuntu feel free to post here or email me  
>off list.

>  
>TCB  
>  
>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>It's the only way I work now. As I posted in the past, my physical machine  
>>has absolutely nothing installed on it. I install and run everything in  
>>a series of VMs. There are a couple of options for XP.  
>>  
>>1. Microsoft Virtual PC 2007. Free download. Highly optimized for windows.  
>> Tight integration with physical PC (file copy, drag and drop, cut and  
paste,  
>>display resolutions).  
>>  
>>2. Virtual Box. Open Source. Free download. Cool.  
>>  
>>3. VMWare. Cost\$. Probably the best there is, if only because of the expansive  
>>feature set.  
>>  
>>There's nothing inherently dangerous about a VM, and I run a bunch of linux  
>>distros just fine. In fact, the physical machine is 100% isolated from  
>anything  
>>the VM may do.  
>>  
>>"Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>What's the go hear?  
>>>  
>>>I want to get an isolated copy of Linux running under Windows XP on my  
>work  
>>>laptop here. What's the go? Is it dangerous at all?  
>>>  
>>>What's the popular option software wise?  
>>>  
>>>Cheers,  
>>>Kim.  
>>  
>Nevermind.....ain't gonna fly.....although I do think someone  
should try this .....just because

(it won't be me, however)

;o)

..

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:464b28e9@linux...  
> Can two CPU's that are rated differently work in the same dual socket

> mobo?  
>  
> I've got a possibility of buying an Opteron 2220 Socket F which is rated  
> at 2.8GHz for an extremely good price, but there is only one. Myt mobo  
> uses dual CPU's and I was wondering if I can use an Opteron 2218rated at  
> 2.6 GHz in the other socket and if one CPU will run at 2.8GHZ and the  
> other at 2.6 GHz.  
>  
> Just curious....  
>  
> Deej  
>A dual socket server mobo running dualcore CPU's will not allow square pegs  
to be hammered into round holes.....picky, picky, picky as far as what  
can/can't be used. I just got off the phone with Tyan tech support. I glad I  
called them. I would suggest that anyone who is contemplating going down  
this road do their homework and be especially careful of matching things  
like CPU revisions.....this is absolutely necessary.....two AMD Opteron  
Socket "F" CPU

---

---

Subject: Re: Paris-Using external converters with different latencies-Important  
Posted by [Dimitrios](#) on Tue, 24 Apr 2007 12:28:54 GMT

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

---

f time due to family and day job add to that!

And thanks for all the info your always providing....Hi Neil,

Here are some practical examples of why I use a VM exclusively for all desktop  
apps.

The entire file system of the virtual machine is contained in a virtual hard  
disk, which is a single physical disk file. All of my corporate applications,  
including Office, Email, etc are installed on this VM. This file can be  
moved freely from physical machine to machine. Software is installed only  
once. Software is authorized only once. This brings several advantages:

1. I can back up my entire machine by simply copying this file to an external  
hard drive, an operation that takes 7 minutes on my machine. I copy the  
VM from my primary work laptop to my home desktop machine every night. If  
anything were to happen to my laptop, I could be back up and running on a  
new laptop by simply copying the file.

2. I can move this file to any of my other machines. For example... I have  
an ultralight laptop that I use for travel. It weighs 4 lbs and is very  
small. I move the virtual hard disk file to this machine, and my complete  
desktop environment including all applications and files is ready for action.  
I have a kick ass multi-monitor desktop at home at my desk. When I want

to use that machine - same thing, copy over a file.

3. Testing software... I backup the virtual machine, then am free to install and test anything I want, including virus infected malware without any risk. If the wheels come off I simply shut down the virtual machine and restart from the backup.

etc. etc. :-)

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:

>

>What's the advantage of running a virtual machine? I don't get

>that sort of thing at all - how does it differ from a regular

>PC setup?

>

>Neil

>

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>I agree wholeheartedly with Chuck. VMWare is probably the best option in

>terms

>>of features and quality, it works with damn near anything. If they made  
>a

>>deb for it that worked I'd probably buy it for my linux box. Virtual box

>>is also very good, though it's only truly open source if you build it from

>>source, the binaries are under a different license. In practice this means

>>absolutely nothing. Of course I haven't tried the MSoft option as I'm avoiding

>>their software whenever possible.

>>

>>Ubuntu Feisty installs easily into both Virtual Box and VMWare, as does

>Debian

>>Etch. I haven't tried a Debian testing or unstable netinstall but my guess

>>is they'd work fine. SuSE as well, but at this point for me running SuSE

>>is practically as offensive as running XP.

>>

>>Good luck, and if you have any questions related to Debian (if you go that

>>route) or (to a lesser extent) Ubuntu feel free to post here or email me

>>off list.

>>

>>TCB

>>

>>"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>It's the only way I work now. As I posted in the past, my physical machine

>>>has absolutely nothing installed on it. I install and run everything





the same low latencies as Paris you would need:

3 x RME HDSP 9652's and 1 RME Multiface (2 of the HDSP's in the master computer, the other in a slave box for streaming VSTi's to the master box)-Appx \$1800.00 street  
1 x 13 slot Magma for the HDSP's in the Master box-appx \$500.00 street  
1 computer running an Opteron 185 CPU-could be built for around \$1200.00 from scratch  
1 computer running 2 x Opteron 2218 CPU's on a server system-could be built for around \$2500.00 from scratch  
2 x RME ADI8-DS's-Street on two of these these is around \$2400.00 (\$1.2k a piece average)  
1 RME ADI4-DD-street is around \$600.00  
1 x Mytek Stereo 96 A/D-Street at \$800.00  
1 x Mytek Stereo 96 D/A-Street at \$800.00  
Lucid GenX6-Street at appx \$400.00-to distribute WC from Mytek AD which is used as a master clock  
Neve 5042-\$1650.00 (to get Parislike sound)  
Furman HDS-16 cue system to cross RME HDSP submixes when tracking - \$1500.00 (or an HDSP MADI system plus an HDSP AES 16 plus BOB-instead of using the Multiface and 2 x HDSP 9652's-add another \$2400.00 for this - there is also a Friend-chip audio digitap patchbay that will accommodate some of this crosscard routing for around \$2k as another option. None of these options are cheap.  
Now add another Magma and 4 x UAD-1 cards-\$2000.00

That's roughly \$15 ,000.00 to around \$18,000.00 + depending on how you go.

At this point, Pro Tools HD starts looking sorta viable if you need a big system.

Compare the price of this to a 4 x EDS card/4 x MEC system with 4 x ADAT cards per MEC and an A8it and A8ot and an IF2 in 3 of the 4 x MECs.

Appx prices last I looked-

4 x MEC @ \$100.00- \$400.00  
3 A8iT @ \$275.00 - \$1650.00  
3 x A8oT @ 275.00 -\$1650.00  
4 EDS @ \$250.00= \$1000.00  
8 x ADAT cards @ 250.00= \$2000.00 (not really necessary unless you want to fully interface with another DAW like I was doing)-\$2000.00  
GenX6-\$400.00  
Nice D/A converter for monitoring -\$800.00  
computer to run Paris: Appx \$1,000.00  
computer to run VSTi's-Appx \$1500.00  
RME HDSP 9652 for VSTi box-\$450.00

That's around \$10,500-----or around \$9000.00 with just a couple of ADAT

modules instead of eight of them.

First you should ask.....do I need all of this I/O???, because if you don't, your costs will go wayyyyy down with either system.

Is the difference in capabilities between the two systems worth the extra money to you?. If you are happy with lots of workarounds to integrate hardware and software with Paris, 44.1/48k sample rates and great sound once you get it set up, I'd stay with Paris. You could buy a lot of nice hardware processors to integrate with Paris with the extra money you would save by staying away from native.

To go native, you're going to spend a lot more, especially when it comes to a computer to run the system, but from an integration/workflow standpoint, you're going to have fewer workarounds, but not eliminate them completely unless you go with the horsepower that is available to a dual quad Mac running Logic or Digital Performer. If you go with a Mac and the hardware

---