
Subject: Re: Why not Protools?

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 17 Feb 2007 22:50:35 GMT

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

e.com/macosx/bootcamp/" target="_blank">http://www.apple.com/macosx/bootcamp/

>>

>>

>

>Deej, here is an article you might want to read that came out today.

I understand the price thing being an issue.

http://www.computerworld.com/action/article.do?command=viewArticleBasic&articleId=9014686&intsrc=hm_ts_head

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

>I was just spec'ing out one of these.Macs on Apple's website with dual

>2.66GHz Xeon coreduo CPU's, two 500G backup HD's and 4G RAM. (how they can

>justify charging over \$1k for 4 x 1G 667MHZ ECC RAM stick

Subject: Why not Protools?

Posted by [Dave Geoghegan](#) on Sat, 17 Feb 2007 23:32:34 GMT

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

64@hotmail.com" target="_blank">excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>> news:460b3fd0\$1@linux...

>>>

>>>

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?

Posted by [TC](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 00:27:48 GMT

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

p their sleeve.

Thanks for all the Mac info BTW. I can see how the cost could be lowered a bit by going with some 3rd party hardware. If I was logic user, I'd be turning flips thinking about all the new goodies that are in the works.

;o)

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:460b6c63\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>I was just spec'ing out one of these.Macs on Apple's website with dual
>>2.66GHz Xeon coreduo CPU's, two 500G backup HD's and 4G RAM. (how they can
>
>>justify charging over \$1k for 4

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 01:14:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

s boggles the mind)
>
>Total price from Apple was \$4545.00 (without adding Applecare which I would

>definitely want to do given some of the experiences I and others here have

>had with Macs so we're looking at another \$249.00 for a total of \$4794.00).
>
>I just spec'ed the same basic computer componentry for building a DIY PC

>from Newegg for \$2659.90 and this would include Vista Ultimate. That's a

>difference of \$2135.00. For less than this \$2k difference added to the PC

>you could upgrade to d

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 12:49:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> wrote:
>>
>>>I'm afraid they =
>do... it=20

>
>>>Sorry Steve, =

> =
>=3D
>>one.
>>>
>>>David.<BR&g=

>=20
> wrote:
>>>> Roland does not make a mouse.. They =
>use a=20

> mouse..
>>
>>>>=20

> =
>
>>
>

</BLOC=
>KQUOTE>
><DIV><FONT=20
> size=3D3D2>

I choose Polesoft Lockspam to =
>fight spam,=20
> =
>=3D
>and=3D20
>you

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 14:22:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

using the MacOS just isn't worth \$2k
+
>>>> to me so the Mac pricing still doesn't come close to anything I would

>>>> want to get involved with.....even if it can run Windows
>>>>
>>>> ;o)
>>>>
>>>> Deej
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:460b4556@linux...
>>>>> James,
>>>>>
>>>>> Has Apple implemented the *right click* feature in OSX so that a two

>>>>> button (or more) mouse can

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 17:48:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>>>> the DA7 right in the sweet spot... the middle.
>>>>
>>>> "Neil" <IOUOIU@OIU.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> "Steve Cox" <stevec1@charter.net> wrote:
>>>>>>

>>>>>I found one on another forum I belong to. Thanks'
>>>>>
>>>>>What? You belong to another forum? And here we thought we had
>>>>>you exclusively???
>>>>>
>>>>>Oh the betrayal!
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>Today was a bonus day. Got the loaner 8in from Brother Rick, got the
bundle of stuff I won from ebay. So, I'm completely covered for the
Peterik concert on the 15th.

However, when I unboxed the bundle of stuff, I noticed that while the
MEC looks good, and the 8in card was still installed, so it's safe,
the Bandwidth knob on the 16 is flopping around. I assume the pot
broke loose off the pcb.

How much of a bitch is it to open one of these things, possibly solder
in a new pot, and then get all the fiddly bits to go back in place?

I suppose I could just relegate that controller to the mobile
recording rig, since I'm only using it for tracking anyway and
wouldn't need to twiddle that particular knob. But aesthetically, it
just bugs me.

pabGot the package. Stuff I got from ebay came today as well, but just
in case there's and issue with any of it, I feel all warm and fuzzy
that I have at least one good 8-in card to use.

Thanks, gorgeous.

On Thu, 29 Mar 2007 05:23:19 -0400, rick <parnell68@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>make me proud honey.
>
>
>
>On Wed, 28 Mar 2007 17:50:09 -0500, Paul Braun
><

Subject: Re: Why not Protools?
Posted by [TC](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 18:08:12 GMT

target="_blank">cygnus_nospam@ctgonline.org> wrote:

>

>>On Wed, 28 Mar 2007 05:46:57 -0400, rick <parnell68@hotmail.com>

>>wrote:

>>

>>>i'd be happier if you were a girl but at my age (and 34 years of

>>>marriage)...ewwww...never mind.

Subject: Re: Why not Protocols?

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 18:13:32 GMT

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

BLKw6hGPO5QLL6EOqh

nhOZEbNbCGJkildQERexQAsMtgnTHl4QgFE4hzRIA3MQAwZ4lx/oJffiNgmo
BSilAgGkhE1BDEiJoSDEPKYhiiOcB7Q4E6lwmqq4gyE7PSNDMiSDgMmyhhXw
R8iSPS7Mih8glNszmtwbCi9jikmhlUqJuliTOlqrJ8zglOS7p//K2AzP8Dg8
jJU5Y5yDmhyFsj5A5EMrQkRC0yJCFBbjlA4EKL/pmi7zSxHpaZYpmAKe64A3
ciNMhJ3xmg/zmo/7W5f02r9aPErFk4ObiAlj0jhKsLpW651a5LZRNMUdAAWu
kwMRsDVepJgPMT8B6lVDYxETFJHqmZ4SmRFfTMZhcxhmTDaM+KphnKqMSQhe
4lVzqAS9rlQQEAMo8a8dqIU98AKGGwZyNMdNKaa/yoMfTAqnmMcijlEjRJqn
elo/uQrao70c4AlpalF81Ed+HAFrGE1+6wcNAos6kYLRExsdelck3II5eKEX
UkedgBSHFazDiEgdQowe8qFSeQM4LBX/N6OMN/u43qKV3/LD4SJXRHJXGEu
8UNEK7KcmKuoQISNQHSBmAMPDLIJbNBj+ZAP2LnE2BIPdpmpOdC6pVNABUTA
pbsJIWCMwGnFHpCDLJAPOgKqlyLKmTJFEfgvrcyEKSgRtiOZvksRCwyRtTvL
uSyRC8M7tDsRBPuQZryeEISkqsoYNcDLv

Subject: Re: Why not Protocols?

Posted by [gene lennon](#) on Sun, 18 Feb 2007 19:14:38 GMT

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

MzLSkgDAIOJR0DAWsiPTigMc0wM

3uyhyxOTpnGKojGaqSi41oyGp/mGP5maOeEKP7A3M8iFcVA9M+jHfTMybSqB
HJCC0wS4tzgGz3O3GNgDtvEyUEDDyntlMpPIH6KEvaGni8y4OSTOOYSzglq+
jzQo55Qc4flc/y/KvuOKOYiCzi3yovg xv5e8lbULxODoorSagkBwnTf6hHBB
L/RaF0M9z9zRHf8ooFlzApnKAhdjhD7aElbkgwCMAquLHRX4BCzonaAaTwvA
Agvoz1rAKQN5kJvMDgQjGeY4u7FDu+qRGGETRrYrH+1ZiKZyERyRO7ibqmo0
h0ogBL1chGucgoAZoC2QgDI4IGHoAXJ8AwqA1nMkjCptmleYx80ruCsTrAkq
gAr4AgzSCinwA024t32jLHQdzXONvazpCg1K0m6yCsSahwrosiAMQsZMR4dU
Q0vRTUzhAwo4R1ZQRcYwszQTTszwDH96AOPMQ+QcueW8s+sDli6iHP/xsxzp
LMTkKA7yml0fU

Subject: Re: Why not Protocols?

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

Cxy1BDJc4PRXQ11IG6IYAlah1VrbIf+uBCtYeQ2yDXiBLW3BBmyBKRSgAQYF
zGDJ/2DJ2akd28HVMPXMAi3QD+DC3GGgV1T/W19NULb1HQDcwDXICRxoQzmA
0EDdDmK4Ah44xCxIn2AQFRWd30k9Dx6hHCGc0eq0jZPhxEhw7Ho0OfxWybM
U6rEh4J8S2rUh6QYUjhEks9Rx+IoDoRcVnwBDOF0HqvoQTsU3p+0SsnJnGMZ
BjfNQmOAW/DIBxwJyHf1DailC4PMR4qY0eaEBsi9nKPIDnl8H5pZwr3g3M0d
0ntBTs+FXxMNYEBUkqlh0sEgomBow3M8DPHu1SQemPdkREdkDCPoX9Z1FZK0
T1hxXVgB24URG5WYAltZACqiXQ34gFIUkDANKAE5m7Mpk1bcVd1RmxTgAl9J
0F8xzTVtGwDQBSdY/8KNfcvLwZkINAIpNdmpVCbHVLIVANmGAholl6S9Q2n
7I19sAd17cdt6l3dsMp24AY5Yo36BUD3UUilBBcTMdyH8Fx1OOEZVMFpZEs7
tlOnEMJi8dh

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

<http://alesis.com/product.php?id=106>

James

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

>

>Has anyone tried one of these? I'm about to drop a lot more money on a moving
>fader control box. A lot more.

>

>TCB

>

>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>;) Next they will have fruit flavors!

>>

>><http://www.behringer.com/BCF2000-WH/index.cfm?lang=eng>

>Hi Thad,

Do you need one that is programmable?

If not then the Mackie is the one everyone copies and it still has the
best integration with the DAW stuff.

The only other one I've seen that is well made and programmable is the
Mixed Logic unit but it is a huge monster.

The controllers that are built into the audio interfaces and digital
mixers do not go deep enough for me to think they are worth while.
And the vast majority of the other control surface units all use the
Mackie Control format so why not just get the real thing? Also having no
drivers to install being able to run longer cable runs with MIDI is also
good.

Unless I can address every part a channel I might as well use a mouse.
The mackie control com

Subject: Re: Why not Protocols?

Posted by [Chris Latham](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 02:30:54 GMT

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

cCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>;) Next they will have fruit flavors!

>>
