
Subject: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 00:45:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

target="_blank">edna@texomaonline.com> wrote in message news:43cdc8c8@linux...
> > Yup, I promised not to tell though : ?)
> >
> > "Suad" <suad@sail.hr> wrote in message news:

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [Miguel Vigil \[1\]](#) on Wed, 04 Jan 2006 18:37:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes.. So
>>>
>>>far,so
>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>James, you realize you're quoting me, right?

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

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [Lance Reichert](#) on Thu, 05 Jan 2006 05:43:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the NeXT computer.

As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies

that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.

Links:

<http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/>

<http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html>

http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Conceptual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_section_1.html

[http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?](http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm)

[topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm](http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm)

<http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562&f=8300945231&m=8790959504>

<http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585>

<http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html>

<http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#category1>

I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming, we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many to dismiss out of hand.

Cheers,

-Jamie

<http://www.JamieKrutz.com>

TCB wrote:

> Hey Jamie,

>

> Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration

> and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people do

> and I have spent lots of time studying and learning from other programmers.

> Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature

> to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.

> For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl is

> inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,

> but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical

> reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming

> is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot C programmer

> so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler in

> a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that way.

> I oohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than

> Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."

>

> So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm using

> a standard C compiler and programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really think
> much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching. The
> compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation on
> a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
> this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU, let's
> send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
> to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
> happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl if someone
> is doing important stuff like designing nuclear reactors or modeling the
> historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any case,
> all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work for
> me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there. So,
> me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
> the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like me
> writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
> there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people in
> the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
> of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
> and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
> gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earth
> it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>
>
> Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how to
> program the Altivec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code for
> the Altivec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I can't
> even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
> but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in C
> or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have to
> know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the Altivec code again
> in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my mortgage,
> hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows
> users and I get to a spot where I can use Altivec or not. What do you think
> I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>
> Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000 times
> the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have some
> of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will really
> matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the Altivec unit is greatly
> exploited is because it is so incredibly powerful. If it *were* used a lot
> Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
> The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
> code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather research
> and wave mechanics and so on.
>
> Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
> than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
> to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful benchmark

> when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for AltiVec,
> but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start working
> with audio on a computer.
>
> TCB
>
> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>
>>For anyone interested here's the wikipedia link:
>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec>
>>
>>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
>>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>>
>>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
>>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
>>everything you need to produce media content...
>>
>>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.
>>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>>
>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>
>
>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>
>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>
>
>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>
>>Anyhoo,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>
>>>Pretty much the only apps that use AltiVec are written by Apple (and run
>
> only
>
>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and
>
> such

>
>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>
> would
>
>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
>>>only on one platform.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of AltiVec, and
>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. AltiVec was not necessary for Paris
>
> because
>
>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple, or
>
> a
>
>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>
> anybody
>
>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>>>
>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in the
>>>>way of their opinions!!!!
>>>>
>>>>Some use of AltiVec.
>>>>
>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having AltiVec.
>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html>
>>>>
>>>>Steinberg 2002
>>>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR/Cubase-VST-51.html>
>>>>
>>>><http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec>
>>>>
>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of AltiVec, although with the move to
>>>
>>>dual
>>>
>>>
>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture, it

>>>
>>>may
>>>
>>>
>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>
>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html>
>>>>
>>>>James
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>"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 lsoing 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 graphics
>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>
> the
>
>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>
>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the CPU..??
>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>
>>>news.
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>
>>>new
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer

>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>
> processor
>
>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>
> tests
>
>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>
>>>
>>>>In
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>
>>>>>in
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>
>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>>>
>>>>>is
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>
>>>media
>>>
>>>
>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>
> multi
>
>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. 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. My guess is one

>>>>
>>>>processor
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>is handling 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 convinced 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 "finaly" 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 where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>
> the
>
>>>>>future
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>
> not
>
>>>>>spening
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>
>>>with
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of a
>
> handle
>
>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>>>
>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>
> could

>
 >>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
 >>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
 >
 > they
 >
 >>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
 >>>
 >>>but
 >>>
 >>>
 >>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to
 >
 >
 >>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included and
 >>>
 >>>3rd
 >>>
 >>>
 >>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
 >>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
 >>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
 >
 > set
 >
 >>>>>of
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could indeed
 >>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
 >
 >
 >>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
 >>>>
 >>>>Get
 >>>>
 >>>>

>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or
>
> a
>
>>>
>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>
>>>areas
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot
>
> of
>
>>>>>time
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message [news:43ceeea7\\$1@linux...](mailto:news:43ceeea7$1@linux...)

```

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there in
>
> Logic's
>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the
>
> individual
>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface
>
> design?
>
>>>>>>>>>It
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>>
>>>>needs
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As it
>
> works
>
>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info where
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>>>

```

>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>
>>>to
>>>
>>>
>>>>>drag
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I can edit audio with Logic in comparable ways to PARIS, moving
>
> regions
>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>around and adding crossfades within the same track. Again, very
>
> fast.
>
>>>>>>>>And
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
>>>
>>>excited
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997.
>
> Yes,
>
>>>>>>the

>>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>instruments
 >>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in
 >
 > league
 >
 >>>>>>>>>of
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>it's
 >>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
 >>>>
 >>>>in
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>Cubase
 >>>>>>>>>>>SX, Logic and DP is esentially the same app. The audio engine
 >
 > is
 >
 >>>>not
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>as
 >>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>sleek and fast as is SX/Nuendo PT,or even Paris..No
 >>>>>>>>>>>>sample accurate editing. The Logic look is dated.
 >>>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>It seems that Apple's Sountrack Pro is going inthe right direction.
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>|
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>only
 >>>>>>>>>>>>hope that tey manage to integrate that killer Logic sequencer..
 >>>
 >>>Then,
 >>>
 >>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>Apple
 >>>>>>>>>>>>will have a killer DAW. Note: Logic's Audio Instruments are steller..
 >>>>>>>>>>>>Take care.LAD
 >>>>>>>>>>>>
 >>>>>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

[illegible]

>>>
>>> I have listened to the Mackies - Dyna 5's, truths (8") and event
>>20/20's...
>>> The Dyna's were the best (my take) but were like \$900 vs 300 for the
>>Truths.
>>> I have not heard the Yorkvilles mentioned in a post as I could not find
>>> a local dealer here but was hoping that someone used the Truths and
>>> could
>>> let me know what they thought. This is for a project studio (3 card
>>> Paris
>>> mostly pop/rock) so money is as always a major factor...
>>> Thanks in advance this place is awwwsome
>>
>>
>Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this the
flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates
look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't
even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google
uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half the
programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do, and
this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions
otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling
reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it?
I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is Ruby.
It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO, and
forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or less)
than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in the
direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python any
time soon.

Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the link
to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section was
"Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes, some
of them work for audio companies. But badass assebmly programmers are not
everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot of
apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.

TCB

Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:

>
>Hi Thad,
>
>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>
>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:

>http://www.runrev.com/ - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"

>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>

>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It
>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>

>Links:
>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/
>http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html
> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Conceptual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_section_1.html
> http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm
> http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562 &f=8300945231&m=8790959504
>http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585
>http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html
> http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#category1
>

>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,
>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many

>to dismiss out of hand.
>

>Cheers,
> -Jamie
> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
>

>TCB wrote:
>> Hey Jamie,
>>
>> Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>> and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
do
>> and I have spent lots of time studying and learning from other programmers.

>> Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>> to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.
>> For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
is
>> inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>> but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>> reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>> is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
C programmer
>> so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
in
>> a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that
way.
>> I oohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than
>> Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."
>>
>> So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm using
>> a standard C compiler an programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really
think
>> much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching.
The
>> compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation
on
>> a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
>> this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU, let's
>> send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
>> to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
>> happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl if
someone
>> is doing important stuff like designing nukulor reactors or modeling the
>> historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any
case,
>> all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work
for
>> me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there. So,
>> me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
>> the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like
me
>> writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
>> there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people
in
>> the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
>> of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
>> and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
>> gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earht
>> it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>>
>>

>> Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how to
>> program the AltiVec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code for
>> the AltiVec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I can't
>> even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
>> but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in C
>> or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have to
>> know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the AltiVec code again
>> in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my mortgage,
>> hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows
>> users and I get to a spot where I can use AltiVec or not. What do you think
>> I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>
>> Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
times
>> the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have some
>> of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will really
>> matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the AltiVec unit is greatly
>> exploited is because it is so incredibly powerful. If it *were* used a lot
>> Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
>> The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
>> code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather research
>> and wave mechanics and so on.
>>
>> Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
>> than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
>> to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful benchmark
>> when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for AltiVec,
>> but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start working
>> with audio on a computer.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>
>>>For anyone interested here's the wikipedia link:
>>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec>
>>>

>>>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
>>>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>>>
>>>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive

>>>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>>>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
>>>everything you need to produce media content...
>>>
>>>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.

>>>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>>>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>>>
>>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>>
>>
>>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the

>>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>>
>>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>>
>>
>>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>>
>>>Anyhoo,
>>> -Jamie
>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>
>>>
>>>TCB wrote:
>>>
>>>>Pretty much the only apps that use AltiVec are written by Apple (and
run
>>
>> only
>>
>>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and
>>
>> such
>>
>>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>>
>> would
>>
>>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
>>>>only on one platform.

>>>>
 >>>>TCB
 >>>>
 >>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of AltiVec,
 and
 >>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. AltiVec was not necessary for Paris
 >>
 >> because
 >>
 >>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
 >>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple,
 or
 >>
 >> a
 >>
 >>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
 >>
 >> anybody
 >>
 >>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in
 the
 >>>>>way of their opinions!!!!
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Some use of AltiVec.
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having AltiVec.
 >>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Steinberg 2002
 >>>>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR/Cubase-VST-51.html>
 >>>>>
 >>>>><http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of AltiVec, although with the move
 to
 >>>>>
 >>>>>dual
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
 it
 >>>>>
 >>>>>may

>>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>all be a moot point.
 >>>>>
 >>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>James
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>"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 lsoing 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
graphics
>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>
>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
CPU..??
>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>
>>>>news.
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs said.
>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>>
>>>>new
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>
>> processor
>>
>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>>
>> tests
>>
>>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and integer,
>>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>In
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>>
>>>>>>in
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the iMac
>>>>>>
>>>>>>is
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>
>>>>media
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>>
>> multi
>>

>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. 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. My guess is
one
>>>>>
>>>>>processor
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>is handling 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 mixing
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 convinced 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 "finaly" we can really see this app(Logics)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>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 where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>>>future
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>
>> not
>>
>>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's

>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>
>>>>with
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you suggest
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of
a
>>
>> handle
>>
>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably well
>>>>>
>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>
>> could
>>
>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design

>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>
>> they
>>
>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment window
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to do.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>
>>>>but
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability to

>>
>>
>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
and
>>>>
>>>>3rd
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio

>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>
>> set
>>
>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
indeed
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>
>>
>>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>>>>
>>>>>Get
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or
>>
>> a
>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:

```

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>>
>>>>areas
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot
>>
>> of
>>
>>>>>>time
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there
in
>>
>> Logic's
>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the
>>
>> individual
>>
>>>>>>>>>

```

>>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface
>>
>> design?
>>
>>>>>>>>>It
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>>
>>>>needs
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As
it
>>
>> works
>>
>>>>>>>>>now,
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>many parts of the interface are very fast and put useful info
where
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>need to see and interact with it. They finally added the ability
>>>>
>>>>to
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>drag
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>or copy plugins from track to track - very PARIS like. :^)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>

[illegible]

>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>>> lol
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>>>
>>>>> range
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>> non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>>> of this market segment, they anouce this.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Logic Audio is nice, but a little dated. Still one of the
best
>>>>>>
>>>>>> midi
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> sequencers,
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> it audio engine leaves a lot to be desired.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> That said, Aplle has new Macs, maybe just maybe they already
>>>>>
>>>>> have

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>kill
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>new version of Logic or Sountrack Pro.??? :)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>If so, thsi could send shock waves thru out the industry.
And,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>must
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>admit
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>that Dedric's & Thad's theories were right on "Point" about
>>
>> the
>>
>>>>>>>"State
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>New Native DAWS"!! This product proves it big time..
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I guess we'll have to wait and see how this namm show goes..
>>>>
>>>>So
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>far,so
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>good
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>:)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>Thanks Doug, great site!
Edna

"Doug Wellington" <doug@parisfaq.com> wrote in message
news:43cd2a15\$1@linux...

> After seeing requests for XP install instructions and ASIO drivers, I'd
just
> like to point out that they've been posted at <http://www.parisfaq.com> for
> some time. If you're looking for something about Paris and it's not on
the
> site, send me an email and I'll see what I can do...
>
> As a matter of fact, I created the site two years ago on January 17th!
>
> --
> -Doug
>
> <http://www.parisfaq.com>
>
> Great explanation, thanks. The lightbulbs are slowly coming on. I've got
everything hooked up in the patchbay, but now I'm trying to figure out how
to monitor. Could you email me your number (off the newsgroup if you want)
so I can drop you a quick line? Much appreciated.

Kent

Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
news:BFF5C5AF.45DA%tony@standinghampton.com...

> Ok, I'm assuming you still have the 442 attached to card B on your
computer.
> Right? Go into the patchbay, grab mixer B and drag it to the patch area.
Now
> you can route the 442's inputs to whatever channels on Mixer-B you want.
> Don't worry about the Mixer-B left and right outputs as they are
> automatically routed to the card A masters.
>
> Now, If I were you, I'd switch my MEC and 442 SCSI cables. That would put
> the 442 on card A. Now Mixer-A in the patchbay will connect to the 442.
> Route the Mixer-A outputs to whatever outputs you want on the 442. Route
> the inputs from your MEC to Mixer-B. Now you can record using the MEC
inputs
> to whatever submix you have assigned to card B and also record from the
442
> to the submix assigned to card A. So for example, in my case I have a MEC
> with an eight input card and a 442. So from the Mec I can record 12
inputs,
> plus from the 442 I can record 4 inputs (this isn't counting the spdif
> in's). So now I have 16 tracks recorded, 12 on one submix, and 4 on
another
> for a total of 16. Now I go into the submix 1 editor window and remove the
> four tracks from the playing field. Then go into submix 2 and drag those

> same four tracks out of the Audio Bin to the playing field. So I've used all

> the analog inputs to record 16 tracks simultaneously, then moved 4 so they'd all be in one submix. Submix 2 which is assigned to card B. Now card

> A which is assigned to submix 1 is open for global inserts. You can also use

> submix 1 for any tracks you won't need EDS FX on and you won't take up any DSP from card A.

>

> I'm not great at explaining stuff, so I hope this helps at least a bit.

The

> best thing would be for you to read the patchbay section of the PARIS manual. The concept is a little hard to understand until you mess around a bit in there. If you're like me, a light bulb will pop on after a while and

> everything will be clear. Let me know if you need more help and I'll give you my phone number. If we were both sitting in front of PARIS, I could have

> you running in two minutes.

>

> Tony

>

>

>

> On 1/19/06 6:38 PM, in article 43d03167@linux, "Kent"

> <kent510745@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

> > I can drag the 442 to the patchbay, but I can't hook it up to anything.

> >

> > Kent

> >

> > "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message

> > news:43cff0d0@linux...

> >> Kent,

> >>

> >> You should be able to drag the 442 to the patch window in the patchbay.

> > I'm

> >> not in front of my PARIS rig, so I can't walk you through this right now.

> >> Mostly cause my brain is too small to remember the steps! If no one else

> >> helps you out, I'll try to get back to you tonight.

> >>

> >> Tony

> >>

> >> "Kent" <kent510745@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:43cfee84@linux...

> >>> Little confused how to monitor from the 442. In the patchbay, if I

set

> >>> the

> >>> 442 as A, I have no connections to either the 442 or the MEC (default

> >>> saved

> >>> with MEC as A.) Can I make the monitor connections for the 442 and

the

> >>> input connections for the MEC in the patch bay? If not, how do I make

> > the

> >>> connections? Thanks.

> >>>

> >>> Kent

> >>>

> >>>

> >>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message

> >>> news:43cfeb8c@linux...

> >>>> Yes, the physical connection to cards A & B can't be changed in the

> >>>> software. What I would do is connect your 442 to card A and monitor

> > from

> >>>> that either analog or spdif out. Connect your MEC to card B and

record

> > to

> >>>> that. That way card A and the 442 is always open for the global EDS

> >>> inserts.

> >>>> I have a three card system and change the card assignments around all

> > the

> >>>> time. I just wait until I'm ready to mix before adding the global

> > inserts

> >>> to

> >>>> the submix with the most open resources.

> >>>>

> >>>> Tony

> >>>>

> >>>>

> >>>> "Kent" <kent510745@hotmail.com> wrote in message

news:43cfe3aa@linux...

> >>>>> That's what I was doing, but everytime I switch submixes, I lose my

> >>> global

> >>>>> inserts. Not that big of deal, I guess, pretty easy to throw them

> > back

> >>>>> in.

> >>>>> I was just hoping I could add my 442, then record on either the MEC

> > or

> >>>>> 442.

> >>>>> Guess not. Welcome to ParisWorld.

> >>>>>

> >>>>> Thanks Tony,

> >>>>>

> >>>>> Kent

> >>>> "Tony Benson" <tony@standinghampton.com> wrote in message
> >>>> news:43cfe284@linux...
> >>>>> Kent,
> >>>>>
> >>>>> You can always switch the card assignment in the master output
> > window
> >>>> during
> >>>>> mixing. Just make Card A's submix a virtual mix temporarily. Switch
> >>> Card
> >>>>> B
> >>>>> to Card A. Then Switch Card A's virtual mix to Card B. Basically,
> > just
> >>>>> assign your open submix to card A when you're ready to mix.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Tony
> >>>>>
> >>>>> "Kent" <kent510745@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>> news:43cfd8fc@linux...
> >>>>>> Yeah. EDS cards are connected. With the two cards, I can swap
> > back
> >>>>>> and
> >>>>>> forth and use the MEC on both submixes. But I want to be able to
> >>>>>> record
> >>>>>> to
> >>>>>> card B, keeping card A open for heavy global inserts (since I run
> >>>>>> out
> >>>>>> of
> >>>>>> resources using a couple compressors and no limit on the global
> >>>>>> insert.)
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Kent
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >>>>>> news:43cfd51b\$1@linux...
> >>>>>>> You cannot patch across EDS cards without physically routing
> > analog
> >>>>>>> connections between them. Do you have the ribbon cables connected
> >>>>> between
> >>>>>>> the two EDS cards?
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> "Kent" <kent510745@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>>>> news:43cfd2bf@linux...
> >>>>>>>> 1 card with MEC works great (98SE). Decided to complicate my
> >>>>>>>> life
> >>>>> and
> >>>>>>> add
> >>>>>>>> another card and introduce my ol' 442 in the mix. What I want

> >>

> >>

> >

> >

>Hey guy's, I just wanted to share my feelings regarding the Portico 5012 as I have had an opportunity to use it more extensively.

The last several recordings I have done have been used primarily with the 5012 on the front end. I also own an Avalon 737sp as well as a custom made pre (Bill Baty) which I like allot.

Admittedly, while tracking I was not sure as to the extent that I would appreciate the 5012. It was noticeably warmer than both my Avalon and Bill Baty pre, but I think I was still looking for the "big bang" as I finally owned something in the Neve family.

I used the pre almost exclusively in the "silk" position, as my understanding was this position provided another degree of harmonic distortion for "warmth". After tracking the last several songs it has become quite evident as to the degree of quality it has added to my modest group of pre's. All of the tracks have a much warmer sound that I am not accustomed to, but have associated with different projects I have heard over the years. I am reluctant to say this, but it does seem to provide that "record sound". As I am starting to mix the tracks, they seem to fall together with little effort and sound fantastic.

I probably should incorporate my other pre's a little more for diversity,

myself away from it. I am very pleased with this pre!

TyroneHey guy's, I just wanted to share my feelings regarding the Portico 5012 as I have had an opportunity to use it more extensively.

The last several recordings I have done have been used primarily with the 5012 on the front end. I also own an Avalon 737sp as well as a custom made pre (Bill Baty) which I like allot.

Admittedly, while tracking I was not sure as to the extent that I would appreciate the 5012. It was noticeably warmer than both my Avalon and Bill Baty pre, but I think I was still looking for the "big bang" as I finally owned something in the Neve family.

I used the pre almost exclusively in the "silk" position, as my understanding was this position provided another degree of harmonic distortion for "warmth". After tracking the last several songs it has become quite evident as to the degree of quality it has added to my modest group of pre's. All of the tracks

have a much warmer sound that I am not accustomed to, but have associated with different projects I have heard over the years. I am reluctant to say this, but it does seem to provide that "record sound". As I am starting to mix the tracks, they seem to fall together with little effort and sound fantastic.

I probably should incorporate my other pre's a little more for diversity, myself away from it. I am very pleased with this pre!

Tyronegotta love that app

Chris Ludwig wrote:

> http://www.steinberg.de/ProductPage_sb_wl6_eu.html

>

> Sweet!

>that kind of excitement deserves two posts. ya know, when it's good...it's good.

On 21 Jan 2006 03:35:33 +1000, "Tyrone Corbett"
<tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:

>

>Hey guy's, I just wanted to share my feelings regarding the Portico 5012 as
>I have had an opportunity to use it more extensively.

>

>The last several recordings I have done have been used primarily with the
>5012 on the front end. I also own an Avalon 737sp as well as a custom made
>pre (Bill Baty) which I like allot.

>

>Admittedly, while tracking I was not sure as to the extent that I would appreciate
>the 5012. It was noticeably warmer than both my Avalon and Bill Baty pre,
>but I think I was still looking for the "big bang" as I finally owned something
>in the Neve family.

>

>

>I used the pre almost exclusively in the "silk" position, as my understanding
>was this position provided another degree of harmonic distortion for "warmth".
>After tracking the last several songs it has become quite evident as to the
>degree of quality it has added to my modest group of pre's. All of the tracks
>have a much warmer sound that I am not accustomed to, but have associated
>with different projects I have heard over the years. I am reluctant to say
>this, but it does seem to provide that "record sound". As I am starting to
>mix the tracks, they seem to fall together with little effort and sound fantastic.

>

>

>I probably should incorporate my other pre's a little more for diversity,

>myself away from it. I am very pleased with this pre!
>
>Tyronethe old greats are starting to go...can't say i'm thrilled with what
has taken their places...a sad day.

On 20 Jan 2006 09:42:32 +1000, "Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:

>
>I know we've all had to play "Mustang Sally" WAAAY too many
>times, but man, I loved this guy's voice. He just had "it".
>
>I don't know where he's been since 1970, but just thought I would
>acknowledge his passing today...
>
>ChrisRuby eats perl and python for breakfast. hehe couldn't resist.

TCB wrote:

> Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this the
> flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates
> look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't
> even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google
> uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half the
> programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do, and
> this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions
> otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling
> reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it?
> I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is Ruby.
> It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO, and
> forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or less)
> than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in the
> direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python any
> time soon.
>
> Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the link
> to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section was
> "Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
> someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
> code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes, some
> of them work for audio companies. But badass assebmly programmers are not
> everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot of
> apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.

>
> TCB

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

>
>>Hi Thad,

>>
>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>>
>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
>><http://www.runrev.com/> - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
>
>
>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>>
>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>
>
>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It
>
>
>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>>
>>Links:
>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/>
>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html>
>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Conceptual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_section_1.html
>> <http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm>
>> <http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562&f=8300945231&m=8790959504>
>><http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585>
>><http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html>
>> <http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#category1>
>>
>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,
>>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many
>
>
>>to dismiss out of hand.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>

>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>
>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>>Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>>>and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
>
> do
>
>>>and I have spent lots of time studying and learning from other programmers.
>>>Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>>>to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.
>>>For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
>
> is
>
>>>inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>>>but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>>>reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>>>is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
>
> C programmer
>
>>>so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
>
> in
>
>>>a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that
>
> way.
>
>>>I oohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than
>>>Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."
>>>
>>>So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm using
>>>a standard C compiler and programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really
>
> think
>
>>>much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching.
>
> The
>
>>>compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation
>
> on
>

>>>a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
>>>this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU, let's
>>>send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
>>>to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
>>>happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl if
>
> someone
>
>>>is doing important stuff like designing nukular reactors or modeling the
>>>historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any
>
> case,
>
>>>all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work
>
> for
>
>>>me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there. So,
>>>me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
>>>the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like
>
> me
>
>>>writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
>>>there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people
>
> in
>
>>>the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
>>>of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
>>>and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
>>>gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earth
>>>it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>>>
>>>
>>>Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how
>
> to
>
>>>program the Altivec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code
>
> for
>
>>>the Altivec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I
>
> can't
>
>>>even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,

>>>but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in
>
> C
>
>>>or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have
>
> to
>
>>>know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the AltiVec code again
>>>in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my
>
> mortgage,
>
>>>hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows
>>>users and I get to a spot where I can use AltiVec or not. What do you
>
> think
>
>>>I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>>
>>>Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
>
> times
>
>>>the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have
>
> some
>
>>>of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will
>
> really
>
>>>matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the AltiVec unit is greatly
>>>exploited is because it is so incredibly powerful. If it *were* used a
>
> lot
>
>>>Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
>>>The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
>>>code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather
>
> research
>
>>>and wave mechanics and so on.
>>>
>>>Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
>>>than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
>>>to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful benchmark

>>>when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for AltiVec,
>>>but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start working
>>>with audio on a computer.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>For anyone interested here's the wikipedia link:
>>>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec>
>>>>
>>>>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
>>>>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>>>>
>>>>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
>
>
>>>>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>>>>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
>>>>everything you need to produce media content...
>>>>
>>>>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.
>
>
>>>>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>>>>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>>>>
>>>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>>>
>>>
>>>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
>
>
>>>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>>>
>>>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>>>
>>>
>>>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>>>
>>>>Anyhoo,
>>>>-Jamie
>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>

>>>>
>>>>>Pretty much the only apps that use AltiVec are written by Apple (and
>
> run
>
>>>only
>>>
>>>
>>>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and
>>>
>>>such
>>>
>>>
>>>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>>>
>>>would
>>>
>>>
>>>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
>>>>>only on one platform.
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of AltiVec,
>
> and
>
>>>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. AltiVec was not necessary for Paris
>>>
>>>because
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple,
>
> or
>
>>>a
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>>>
>>>anybody
>>>

>>>
>>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>>>>
>>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in
>
> the
>
>>>>>way of their opinions!!!!
>>>>>
>>>>>Some use of Altivec.
>>>>>
>>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html>
>>>>>
>>>>>Steinberg 2002
>>>>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR/Cubase-VST-51.html>
>>>>>
>>>>><http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec>
>>>>>
>>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move
>
> to
>
>>>>>dual
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
>
> it
>
>>>>>may
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>
>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html>
>>>>>
>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>"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 on the
 >
 > 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 did that leave Apple?? Well, it left them with having to
 >
 > "fabricate"
 >
 >>>>>>speed test and other outlandish performance statements. All while, trying
 >>>>>>to convince IBM 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 lsoing 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
>
> graphics
>
>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>

>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>
> CPU..??
>
>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>
>>>>>news.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs
>
> said.
>
>>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>>>
>>>>>new
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>
>>>processor
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>>>
>>>tests
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and
>
> integer,
>
>>>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>In

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>>
>>>>>>in
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the
>
> iMac
>
>>>>>>>is
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>>
>>>>>media
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the Altivec technology for
>>>
>>>multi
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation
>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. 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. My guess is
>
> one
>
>>>>>>>processor

>>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>>is handling 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 convinced 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 "finaly" 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 cosmetic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>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 where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>future
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>>
>>>not
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>
>
>>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>
>>>>>with
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>
> suggest
>
>>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of

>
> a
>
>>>handle
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably
>
> well
>
>>>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>
>>>could
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>
>
>>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>>
>>>they
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment
>
> window
>
>>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
>
> do.
>
>>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>
>>>>>but
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability
>
> to
>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
>
> and
>

>>>>>3rd
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>
>
>>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>>
>>>set
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
>
> indeed
>
>>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Get
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or
>>>
>>>a
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

```

>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>>>
>>>>>areas
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>time
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:43ceeea7$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there
>

```


[illegible]

<DIV>Something has changed in his print=20
method.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>The client has been burning CDRs for me =
using=20
Toast.</DIV>
<DIV>He has tried burning data disks, music=20
disks,</DIV>
<DIV>.wav, .SDII to no avail. All =
files have been=20
16bit.</DIV>
<DIV> </DIV>
<DIV>Tips?</DIV>
<DIV>Tom</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0040_01C61DD4.973F2D10--More stuff!

I wonder if this would work with Paris XP in real time???

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/MuseResearch /PR/UniWire.html>

Yamaha USB mixing studio

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Yamaha/PR/MW 10-MW12.html>

Violet Audio ADP61" 24bit 192kHz Studio AV Preamp Decoder

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/VioletAudio/ PR/ADP61.html>

Talk back, headphone

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/CME/PR/Matri x-Series-Mixers.html>

Roland VP-550 Vocal Designer Keyboard

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Roland/PR/VP -550.html>

BOSS Announces RC-50 Loop Station

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Boss/PR/RC-5 0.html>

Akai Professional Debuts New MPC2500 Music Production Center

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Akai/PR/MPC2 500.html>

Akai Professional Debuts EWI4000S MIDI Wind Controller

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Akai/PR/EWI4 000S.html>

Open Labs Unveils MiKo, The First Professional, Portable Media Workcenter

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/OpenLabs/PR/ MiKo.html>

I had to laugh when I saw the Presonus FireBox sticking out of the front
of the Miko, it look shotty! If it works well, that's all that matters.
It cost 2K.

James

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

>
>Some interesting hardware products were announced today at NAMM.
>
>Saffire Pro 26i/o
> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Focusrite/PR/Saffire-Pro-26i-o.html>
>
><http://mackie.com/comingsoon06.html>
>
>U-Control, phono amp, and USB mixers
><http://behringer.com/>
>
>Alesis IO 14 & 26
>
>alesis.com
>
>Tascam Guitar AMP, also Tascam GVI
>
><http://tascam.com/Products/ga100cd.html>
>
>
>I hope we can get some good show reports from Dave and others!
>
>JamesCelemony Software Announces Support For Intel Macs

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Celemony/PR/Intel-Mac-Melodyne-Support.html>

Roland Adds Support For New Intel-Driven Apple Macs

<http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Roland/PR/Intel-Mac-Drivers.html>

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

>
>More development and support for Intel based Macs
>
> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Ableton/PR/Live-5.2.html>
>
> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Steinberg/PR/Intel-Mac-Development.html>
>
><http://www.macworld.com/news/2006/01/19/finale/index.php>
>
><http://www.macworld.com/news/2006/01/19/native/index.php>

>
>http://www.nativeinstruments.de/index.php?id=intelmac_us
>
> http://www.motu.com/newsitems/atnewsitem.2006-01-10.68061887_08 Another announcement that's going somewhat unnoticed (everywhere), Steinberg release VST 2.4 with 64-bit support: 64-bit audio files, and double precision processing. With 64-bit DAWs and updated VST plugins, that would be a full 64-bit path all the way through to the final dither to 24, or premaster 32-bit/32-bit float. How that really translates in the real world is yet to be seen, er heard.

On 1/20/06 2:42 PM, in article 43d14b53\$1@linux, "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
> Celemony Software Announces Support For Intel Macs
>
> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Celemony/PR/Intel-Mac-Melodyne-Support.html>
>
> Roland Adds Support For New Intel-Driven Apple Macs
>
> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Roland/PR/Intel-Mac-Drivers.html>
>
> "James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> More development and support for Intel based Macs
>>
>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Ableton/PR/Live-5.2.html>
>>
>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM06/Content/Steinberg/PR/Intel-Mac-Development.html>
>>
>> <http://www.macworld.com/news/2006/01/19/finale/index.php>
>>
>> <http://www.macworld.com/news/2006/01/19/native/index.php>
>>
>> http://www.nativeinstruments.de/index.php?id=intelmac_us
>>
>> http://www.motu.com/newsitems/atnewsitem.2006-01-10.68061887_08
> A first look at GarageBand 3

<http://www.macosobserver.com/columns/rantsandraves/2006/20060120.shtml> Is there an inexpensive software program for song writing, music production for the PC? Something like GarageBand, that incorporates, loops, sample player, multi track record DAW, with Acid kind of features?

The only think I can think of is Steinberg's Studio Case, but that cost about \$250.00. The entire iLife suit with GarageBand cost \$79.00, \$59.00 academic.

Any ideas would be appreciated.

JamesIf you play git the Line 6 Git port looks very interesting. I have a friend who is using it and give's it rave reviews. It comes with arbleton... and uses a USB port. Sells for \$129

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

>

>Is there an inexpensive software program for song writing, music production
>for the PC? Something like GarageBand, that incorporates, loops, sample
>player, multi track record DAW, with Acid kind of features?

>

>The only think I can think of is Steinberg's Studio Case, but that cost
about

>\$250.00. The entire iLife suit with GarageBand cost \$79.00, \$59.00 academic.

>

>

>Any ideas would be appreciated.

>

>

>JamesHave you looked at Reason?

TyroneAmen..

Personally, the talent that's being pushed today is a sad staement for the music business at large. Yes,there are few good exceptions, but for the most part, todays talents are less than..LAD

rick <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote:

>the old greats are starting to go...can't say i'm thrilled with what
>has taken their places...a sad day.

>

>On 20 Jan 2006 09:42:32 +1000, "Chris Lang" <yo@yo.yo> wrote:

>

>>

>>I know we've all had to play "Mustang Sally" WAAAY too many
>>times, but man, I loved this guy's voice. He just had "it".

>>

>>I don't know where he's been since 1970, but just thought I would
>>acknowledge his passing today...

>>

>>Chris

>Acid.. You can record audio & midi as well as loops..it comes with a few cool virtual instruments or you can use your own vstis.

The other Reasons..Great app for composing and writing..

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

>

>Is there an inexpensive software program for song writing, music production
>for the PC? Something like GarageBand, that incorporates, loops, sample
>player, multi track record DAW, with Acid kind of features?

>

>The only think I can think of is Steinberg's Studio Case, but that cost
about

>\$250.00. The entire iLife suit with GarageBand cost \$79.00, \$59.00 academic.

>

>

>Any ideas would be appreciated.

>

>

>JamesDoes the .paf/.wav utility for PC work for this? Duh, are you running PARIS
on a PC or a Mac would be a better first question! I transfer files from DP
to PARIS (24 bits at that) all the time using Sonicworx to convert .wav to
..paf, but I'm Mac on both programs.

Tony

"Tom Bruhl" <arpeggio@comcast.net> wrote in message news:43d14599@linux...
I've done this before but it's been a while. What I
recall working was just changing the extension
from the SDII from DP Mac files to SD2 for Paris.
The files I'm getting are not working now though.
Something has changed in his print method.

The client has been burning CDRs for me using Toast.
He has tried burning data disks, music disks,
..wav, .SDII to no avail. All files have been 16bit.

Tips?

TomMaybe im just stupid here. Im reading the install instructions and do not
see how to fix thix problem. Can someone break this down for me?

Ken

"Rod Lincoln" <rlincoln@nospam.kc.rr.com> wrote:

>

>You need to install the Paris XP Subsystem installer and follow the directions

>EXACTLY. Get it here.

><http://www.parisfaqs.com>

>

>Rod Lincoln

>"Ken Smith" <maddrapa@netzero.com> wrote:

>>

>>I just installed XP on my computer from ME. I downloaded the drivers and

>>PARIS appeared to be functioning correctly. Everytime I close PARIS, I

>get

>>a Driver error and then the A BLUE SCREEN. I read earlier post about this

>>subject, but it refers you to a link that no longer works. Can anyone
detail

>>out how to solve this error? It mentioned something about the registry.

>>

>>Ken Smith

>>

>>

>\$159 at Frys til Tuesday (8MB cache)

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:43d078b8\$1@linux...

>

> Sorry, It's \$197.50!

>

> James

>

>

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

> >

> >Thought I'd mention this. I haven't checked HD prices lately, but this

> looked

> >reasonable. WD 400GB Serial ATA for \$187.50 shipped.

> >

>

> [http://www.zipzoomfly.com/jsp/ProductDetail.jsp?ProductCode= 101254&affiliat
e=dealnews](http://www.zipzoomfly.com/jsp/ProductDetail.jsp?ProductCode=101254&affiliate=dealnews)

> >

> >James

>"rich" <studiodog_99@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

>If you play git the Line 6 Git port looks very interesting. I have a friend

>who is using it and give's it rave reviews. It comes with arbleton... and

>uses a USB port. Sells for \$129

I have looked at these, and I think they are big bang for the buck. I wonder how they sound???

Thanks for the reply!

James

>
>
>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Is there an inexpensive software program for song writing, music production
>>for the PC? Something like GarageBand, that incorporates, loops, sample
>>player, multi track record DAW, with Acid kind of features?
>>
>>The only think I can think of is Steinberg's Studio Case, but that cost
>>about
>>\$250.00. The entire iLife suit with GarageBand cost \$79.00, \$59.00 academic.
>>
>>
>>Any ideas would be appreciated.
>>
>>
>>James
>"Tyrone Corbett" <tyronecorbett@comcast.net> wrote:
>
>Have you looked at Reason?
>
>Tyrone

I've played with it before. I think it's a little too eletronica, tecno, house. I'm looking for something with more real instrument sounds, not synth bass kind of stuff. A little more of a DAW, than a drum machine. Maybe you can enlighten me on it more.

Thanks
JamesJohn,

Do you acutally use Ruby? It really is a quite fascinating language, and it's available under basically the same licensing terms as Perl. I even installed the Eclipse IDE on one of my laptops and it has a Ruby/Rails plug-in. Of course the IDE is written in Java so it makes my Athlo 64 3200 feel like a 900 Mhz Duron but that's not Ruby's fault.

Anyway, thoughts and opinions would be appreciated,

TCB

John <no@no.com> wrote:
>Ruby eats perl and python for breakfast. hehe couldn't resist.
>
>TCB wrote:
>> Ah, the Perl/Python debate. If anyone other than Jamie is reading this
the
>> flame wars among coders on that one make Mac/PC and Pro Tools/PARIS debates
>> look like very friendly chats by people who respect each other. I didn't
>> even look at Python until I found out Bram Cohen used it, and now Google
>> uses it internally a lot. These days if Google used COBOL I'm sure half
the
>> programmers on the planet would start using it. For me and what I do,
and
>> this is just for me other people have well informed and sensible opinions
>> otherwise, Python is Perl but it reads better. To me that's not a compelling
>> reason to make a move, but if I were starting over now? If Bram uses it?
>> I dunno. The other Perl like language that I find really fascinating is
Ruby.
>> It has an interactive interpreter (like Python and VB), is strictly OO,
and
>> forces such readable code that commenting should take half the time (or
less)
>> than doing the same thing in Perl. So I've been blinking bashfully in
the
>> direction of Ruby for a while now but don't think I'll be using Python
any
>> time soon.
>>
>> Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the
link
>> to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section
was
>> "Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
>> someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
>> code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes,
some
>> of them work for audio companies. But badass assebmly programmers are
not
>> everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot
of
>> apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.

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

>>>Hi Thad,
>>>
>>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.
>>>
>>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:
>>><http://www.runrev.com/> - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"
>>
>>
>>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.
>>>
>>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>>
>>
>>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult."
It
>>
>>
>>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.
>>>
>>>Links:
>>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/>
>>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html>
>>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Conceptual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_section_1.html
>>> <http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm>
>>> <http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562&f=8300945231&m=8790959504>
>>><http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585>
>>><http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html>
>>> <http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#category1>
>>>
>>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>>>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>>>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,
>>>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many
>>
>>
>>>to dismiss out of hand.

```
>>>
>>>Cheers,
>>> -Jamie
>>> http://www.JamieKrutz.com
>>>
>>>
>>>TCB wrote:
>>>
>>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>>
>>>>Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>>>>and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
>>
>> do
>>
>>>>and I have spent lots of time studying and learning from other programmers.
>>>>Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>>>>to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent
>>>>possible.
>>>>For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
>>
>> is
>>
>>>>inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>>>>but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>>>>reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>>>>is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
>>
>> C programmer
>>
>>>>so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
>>
>> in
>>
>>>>a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that
>>
>> way.
>>
>>>>I ooohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred
>>>>than
>>>>Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."
>>>>
>>>>So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm
>>>>using
>>>>a standard C compiler and programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really
>>
>> think
```

```

>>
>>>>much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching.
>>
>> The
>>
>>>>compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation
>>
>> on
>>
>>>>a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
>>>>this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU,
let's
>>>>send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
>>>>to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
>>>>happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl
if
>>
>> someone
>>
>>>>is doing important stuff like designing nukular reactors or modeling
the
>>>>historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any
>>
>> case,
>>
>>>>all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work
>>
>> for
>>
>>>>me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there.
So,
>>>>me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
>>>>the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like
>>
>> me
>>
>>>>writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
>>>>there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people
>>
>> in
>>
>>>>the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
>>>>of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
>>>>and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
>>>>gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earht
>>>>it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>>>>
>>>>

```

>>>>Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>program the AltiVec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code
>>
>> for
>>
>>>>the AltiVec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I
>>
>> can't
>>
>>>>even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
>>>>but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines
in
>>
>> C
>>
>>>>or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have
>>
>> to
>>
>>>>know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the AltiVec code again
>>>>in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my
>>
>> mortgage,
>>
>>>>hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and
Windows
>>>>users and I get to a spot where I can use AltiVec or not. What do you
>>
>> think
>>
>>>>I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>>>
>>>>Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
>>
>> times
>>
>>>>the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have
>>
>> some
>>
>>>>of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will
>>
>> really
>>
>>>>matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the AltiVec unit is greatly

>>>>exploited is because it is so incredibly powerful. If it *were* used a
>>
>> lot
>>
>>>>Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
>>>>The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
>>>>code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather
>>
>> research
>>
>>>>and wave mechanics and so on.
>>>>
>>>>Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
>>>>than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
>>>>to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful
benchmark
>>>>when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for
AltiVec,
>>>>but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start
working
>>>>with audio on a computer.
>>>>
>>>>TCB
>>>>
>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>For anyone interested here's the wikopedia link:
>>>>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec>
>>>>>
>>>>>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec

>>>>>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>>>>>
>>>>>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
>>
>>
>>>>>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>>>>>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely

>>>>>everything you need to produce media content...
>>>>>
>>>>>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.
>>
>>
>>>>>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>>>>>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>>>>>

>>>>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the
>>
>>
>>>>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>>>>
>>>>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>>>>
>>>>>Anyhoo,
>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Pretty much the only apps that use AltiVec are written by Apple (and
>>
>> run
>>
>>>>>only
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs
and
>>>>>
>>>>>such
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>>>>>
>>>>>would
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector
unit
>>>>>>only on one platform.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>TCB
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of Altivec,
 >>
 >> and
 >>
 >>>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. Altivec was not necessary for Paris
 >>>>
 >>>>because
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
 >>>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple,
 >>
 >> or
 >>
 >>>>a
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but
 if
 >>>>
 >>>>anybody
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get
 in
 >>
 >> the
 >>
 >>>>>>way of their opinions!!!!
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Some use of Altivec.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having
 Altivec.
 >>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Steinberg 2002
 >>>>>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR/Cubase-VST-51.html>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>><http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move

>>
>> to
>>
>>>>>dual
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
>>
>> it
>>
>>>>>may
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>all be a moot point.
>>>>>
>>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html>
>>>>>
>>>>>>James
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"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 Apple?? 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
>>
>> graphics
>>
>>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD
and
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain
significant
>>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>>
>> CPU..??
>>
>>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>news.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs
>>
>> said.
>>
>>>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on
the
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>new
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a
consumer
>>>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>>
>>>>processor
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that
the
>>>>
>>>>tests
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and
>>
>> integer,
>>
>>>>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>In
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>in
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the

performance
>>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the
>>
>> iMac
>>
>>>>>>>is
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro
multi
>>>>>
>>>>>media
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the AltiVec technology
for
>>>>
>>>>multi
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole
equation
>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. 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. My guess
is
>>
>> one
>>
>>>>>>>processor
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>is handling 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
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>


```

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>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 "finaly" we can really see this app(Logics)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>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 cosmetic
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>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 where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>>
>>>>the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>future
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes,
I'm
>>>>
>>>>not
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>>
>>>>>>with
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>>
>> suggest
>>
>>>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of
>>
>> a
>>
>>>>handle
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably
>>
>> well
>>
>>>>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>>
>>>>could
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window,
and
>>>>
>>>>they
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment
>>
>> window
>>
>>>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
>>
>> do.
>>
>>>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>>
>>>>>>but
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability
>>
>> to
>>

>>>>
>>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
>>
>> and
>>
>>>>>>3rd
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's

>>>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>>
>>
>>>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>>>
>>>>set
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
>>
>> indeed
>>
>>>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than
PARIS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Get
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro
or
>>>>
>>>>a
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in
some
>>>>>>
>>>>>>areas
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a
lot
>>>>
>>>>of
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>time
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!

>>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:43ceeea7\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there
>>
>> in
>>
>>>>Logic's
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see
the
>>>>
>>>>individual
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface
>>>>
>>>>design?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>It
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>needs
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>attention, and Logic could require it less.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>But version 7 was a good step toward cleaning up the GUI. As

> time soon.

>

> Anywho, I read your links and one in particular stood out. It was the link
> to the page with the books available. The title of the Altivec section was
> "Learning Assembly and Altivec." Which matches my understanding that unless
> someone can program PPC assembly there's no real way to write good Altivec
> code. Yes, there are some programmers who are nasty with assembly. Yes, some
> of them work for audio companies. But badass assembly programmers are not
> everyday creatures, which I would rank as the primary reason not a lot of
> apps use that part of the PPC processor. But I'm probably nuts anyway.

>

> TCB

>

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

>

>>Hi Thad,

>>

>>My friends who do that kind of stuff swear by python.

>>

>>I use Revolution when I need to whip something up:

>><http://www.runrev.com/> - xtalk based. Whether that's "real programming"

>

>

>>depends on the crowd you run with. I got into xtalk languages when I
>>wrote the documentation for HyperSense on the NeXT computer.

>>

>>As far as altivec programming, you may be right about it being
>>difficult. So was optimizing with assembly language, but programmers at
>

>

>>that level aren't phased by the things we mortals see as "difficult." It

>

>

>>may slow or stop some companies but there are already enough companies
>>that take advantage of altivec it to show it's quite doable. And not
>>just in academia, although that's a great place to use it too.

>>

>>Links:

>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/>

>><http://developer.apple.com/hardware/ve/tools.html>

>> http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Performance/Conceptual/Accelerate_sse_migration/migration_intro/chapter_1_section_1.html

>> <http://publib.boulder.ibm.com/infocenter/macxhelp/index.jsp?topic=/com.ibm.vacpp6m.doc/getstart/overview/overview.htm>

>> <http://episteme.arstechnica.com/6/ubb.x?a=tpc&s=50009562&f=8300945231&m=8790959504>

>><http://news.thomasnet.com/fullstory/29773/2585>

>><http://www.echofx.com/press081302.html>

>> <http://www.projectomega.org/maincat.php?lg=en&php=docs#category1>

>>
>>I think some of the impressive performance of the audio, graphics and
>>video production software I use on a dual G5 can be attributed to
>>altivec support. So no, I don't think floating point is the only
>>meaningful benchmark. Also the GPU is increasingly coming into play
>>under OSX. As to how many programmers can handle altivec programming,
>>we'd both only be speculating. My answer: enough to matter and too many
>
>
>>to dismiss out of hand.
>>
>>Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>
>>
>>
>>TCB wrote:
>>
>>>Hey Jamie,
>>>
>>>Do you program? I barely program, I use Perl mostly for systems administration
>>>and web/database stuff. That said, I program more than a lot of people
>
> do
>
>>>and I have spent lots of time studying and learning from other programmers.
>>>Programmers tend to learn to code in one language. It's just human nature
>>>to leverage whatever knowledge one might have to the greatest extent possible.
>>>For example, most CGI web scripting is done in Perl. It's not that Perl
>
> is
>
>>>inherently BEST for taking input from one page and spitting it out another,
>>>but it's a damn fine text parsing language and for accidental historical
>>>reasons it found its way into web servers early on. So most CGI programming
>>>is done in Perl. But a really good friend of mine is a really hotshot
>
> C programmer
>
>>>so his web site has all of the CGI done in C. He just puts a C compiler
>
> in
>
>>>a directory that can be executed by Apache and writes everything that
>
> way.
>

>>>I oohed and aaahed over this (C has a much greater geek street cred than
>>>Perl) and he said, "Look, I'm just too damn lazy to learn Perl."
>>>
>>>So, let's say I'm a C programmer working on my audio plug-in. If I'm using
>>>a standard C compiler an programming for a Mac or a PC I don't really
>
> think
>
>>>much about which part of the processor is doing what number crunching.
>
> The
>
>>>compiler does that for me. When I have my program do some calculation
>
> on
>
>>>a sample stored as a 32 bit floating point number my compiler says, "Well,
>>>this should obviously be done on the floating point unit in the CPU, let's
>>>send it there." For me, as a Perl programmer, integers are actually converted
>>>to floats automatically, which in some situations can lead to weird stuff
>>>happening so there's an extra switch and module that is used in Perl if
>
> someone
>
>>>is doing important stuff like designing nukolor reactors or modeling the
>>>historic volatility of emerging market debt vs. the treasuries. In any
>
> case,
>
>>>all of this goes on in the background with the compiler doing the work
>
> for
>
>>>me. With Altivec, though, the compilers just never really got there. So,
>>>me as a C programmer would have to know at least one other language (and
>>>the right language) to be able to code for that processor. That's like
>
> me
>
>>>writing a book about Cubase and then doing chapter 15 in Mandarin. Certainly
>>>there are some people who could do that, but the percentage of people
>
> in
>
>>>the world who can write a book at all is pretty small, and the percentage
>>>of those people who know even one foreign language at all is even smaller,
>>>and the percentage of those who can write fluently in that second language
>>>gets even smaller, and then even with five billion people on planet earht

>>>it's going to be damn difficult to find too many people who can do that.
>>>
>>>
>>>Now then, let's say I AM that C programmer who also happens to know how
>
> to
>
>>>program the AltiVec unit. Bully for me. But every single line of code
>
> for
>
>>>the AltiVec unit will have to be re-written for an Intel processor. I
>
> can't
>
>>>even stuff it down the drain of my Intel C compiler and get lower performing,
>>>but still working, programs. Nope, I have to write the same routines in
>
> C
>
>>>or using the Intel "vector processor" to do the same job. So now I have
>
> to
>
>>>know three languages, or I have to re-write all of the AltiVec code again
>>>in C for the other platform. So, I'm writing along, worrying about my
>
> mortgage,
>
>>>hoping to sell some copies of the TCB Reverb Plug-in to both Mac and Windows
>>>users and I get to a spot where I can use AltiVec or not. What do you
>
> think
>
>>>I'm going to do? Would you do the same?
>>>
>>>Apple and Adobe, of course, are huge software houses way more than 1000
>
> times
>
>>>the size of, say, PSP Audio. They can probably afford the time to have
>
> some
>
>>>of the coders work on very specialized areas where vectorization will
>
> really
>

>>>matter. But the primary reason I can't believe the AltiVec unit is greatly
>>>exploited is because it is so incredibly powerful. If it *were* used a
>
> lot
>
>>>Macs really would be a lot more powerful than PCs in certain situations.
>>>The places where that does happen are in academic situations where people
>>>code specifically for the processor they're using, stuff like weather
>
> research
>
>>>and wave mechanics and so on.
>>>
>>>Lastly, the word I hear is that Windows compilers aren't that much better
>>>than Mac compilers. That is, the SSE units mostly sit around with nothing
>>>to do, which is why the FPU on the chip is still the only meaningful benchmark
>>>when looking at audio/video work. So, yes, people are developing for AltiVec,
>>>but that doesn't have much to do with what happens when people start working
>>>with audio on a computer.
>>>
>>>TCB
>>>
>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>For anyone interested here's the wikipedia link:
>>>><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AltiVec>
>>>>
>>>>Poking around on the net, it looks like folks developing for AltiVec
>>>>include Red Hat and Yellowdog Linux.
>>>>
>>>>On the Mac, Apple does, as you say. True, they ONLY make comprehensive
>
>
>>>>tools for writing, presenting, recording, editing, animating,
>>>>compositing, etc. So I agree it's a VERY limited universe of merely
>>>>everything you need to produce media content...
>>>>
>>>>Except you might also need Adobe apps, wait, Adobe uses AltiVec, too.
>
>
>>>>What about Microsoft. Bet they use AltiVec, too. Are there others?
>>>>Probably a bunch. Google and see.
>>>>
>>>>So it's probably not as dire as all that. I'll betcha Adobe uses the SSE
>>>
>>>
>>>>stuff on Intel/Athlon, so cross-platform development isn't out of the

>
>
>>>>question. SSE is there on the new Macs, BTW.
>>>>
>>>>But forget all the AltiVec/SSE stuff, where OSX gets really cool is the
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>core image stuff for real time media stuff running on the GPU. Crazy.
>>>>
>>>>Anyhoo,
>>>>-Jamie
>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>TCB wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Pretty much the only apps that use AltiVec are written by Apple (and
>
> run
>
>>>>only
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>on Macs) or are specially coded apps used written by research labs and
>>>>
>>>>such
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>that write their own code. Anyone trying to support multiple platforms
>>>>
>>>>would
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>be absolutely foolish to code for a (difficult to work with) vector unit
>>>>>only on one platform.
>>>>>
>>>>>TCB
>>>>>
>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Well LaMont, Logic and DP are supposed to take advantage of AltiVec,
>
> and
>
>>>>>>some plugin manufactures use it. AltiVec was not necessary for Paris

>>>
>>>because
>>>
>>>
>>>>>it has hardware DSP for things like low latency and streaming. Anyways,
>>>>>believe what you want! It is a choice. You believe that if Apple,
>
> or
>
>>>a
>>>
>>>
>>>>>test lab that is associated post performance tests it's a lie, but if
>>>
>>>anybody
>>>
>>>
>>>>>else post performance test about PC performance it's not??? Ok!
>>>>>
>>>>>Like I always say, it's funny how some people won't let facts get in
>
> the
>
>>>>>way of their opinions!!!!
>>>>>
>>>>>Some use of Altivec.
>>>>>
>>>>>Emagic Logic: Old article from 1999 that talks about Logic having Altivec.
>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue50.html>
>>>>>
>>>>>Steinberg 2002
>>>>> <http://namm.harmony-central.com/WNAMM02/Content/Steinberg/PR/Cubase-VST-51.html>
>>>>>
>>>>><http://packages.debian.org/testing/sound/ardour-gtk-altivec>
>>>>>
>>>>>Article from 2000 on the benefits of Altivec, although with the move
>
> to
>
>>>>>dual
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>processor Intel systems with SIMD, Intel SSE/SSE2/SSE3 architecture,
>
> it
>

>>>>>may
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>
 >>>>>>all be a moot point.
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>><http://www.xlr8yourmac.com/audio/issue57.html>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>James
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>
 >>>>>>"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 on the
 >
 > 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 Apple?? 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
>
> graphics
>
>>>>>>cards today,and that's exactly why there are companies tlike UAD and
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>others that will be announce at this years Namm..
>>>>>>
>>>>>>My only worry for the Intel/Macs is that while the machines gain significant
>>>>>>performance, will Apple streamline OSX so thatit won;t bog down the
>
> CPU..??
>
>>>>>>LaMont
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Hey LaMont! On this G5 thing, your reading too much in to the latest
>>>>>
>>>>>news.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>Go back to the Apple Key note speech and listen to what Steve Jobs
>
> said.
>
>>>>>>>You can scroll through the QT file quickly to get to the info on the
>>>>>
>>>>>new
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>machines performance compared to the G5s. First, the iMac is a consumer
>>>>>>>product with a single G5. It is being compared to a new intel dual
>>>

>>>processor
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>machine, and I believe it has faster bussing. Jobs stated that the
>>>
>>>tests
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>do not show all, but in at least the two test, floating point and
>
> integer,
>
>>>>>>>it show to be twice as fast. I would hope so, it has two processors!
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>In
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>this case, this is Apple spin. Their just trying to put their products
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>a good light, and give Mac users reason to buy.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>As for the G5 tower, I think you should take a good look at the performance
>>>>>>>specs of the quad towers! There no dogs! The architecture of the
>
> iMac
>
>>>>>>>is
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>different than that of the G5 towers. The G5 was built for pro multi
>>>>>
>>>>>media
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>work. The other thing is the towers have the AltiVec technology for
>>>
>>>multi
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>media work. That is something that is going to change the whole equation

>>>>>>>when Apple jumps their software over to intel. 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. My guess is
>
> one
>
>>>>>>>processor
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>is handling 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@ameritech.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 convinced 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 "finaly" we can really see this app(Logics)
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>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 where Logic should be. So, maybe we are seeing
>>>
>>>the
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>future
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>of Logic..Ihope so, because until they some wholesale changes, I'm
>>>
>>>not
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>spening
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>another dime on any apple product.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Take care..LaMont
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Other users have voice thee same concerns
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Jamie K <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>So really, you guys are just complaining about parts of Logic's
>
>
>>>>>>>>>interface - specifically the environment window? Is that correct?

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>But not the sound, right LaMont? Or do you think there is a problem
>>>>>
>>>>>with
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the way Logic records and plays audio? If so, what steps do you
>
> suggest
>
>>>>>>>>>>to demonstrate a sound problem with Logic 7.1? I'm seriously interested
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>in the basis of your criticism of the current Logic 7.1 audio engine.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>As far as the interface goes, I found that once I got enough of
>
> a
>
>>>handle
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>on the environment stuff, the rest of the program is reasonably
>
> well
>
>>>>>>>>>>laid out and easy to work with. But as I alluded to earlier, they
>>>
>>>could
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>knock down the learning curve a bit with some thoughtful design
>
>
>>>>>>>>>>decisions to get some functions out of the environment window, and
>>>
>>>they
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>could improve the visual feedback and layout of the environment
>
> window
>
>>>>>>>>>>itself. I think the environment window trips up a lot of people.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>7.1 did improve things somewhat but there's improvement left to
>
> do.

>
>>>>>>>>The mixer and arrange windows are very similar to PARIS, for audio,
>>>>>
>>>>>but
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>without the 16 track per window limitation and with the ability
>
> to
>
>>>
>>>>>>>>automate everything. And with very nice integration of included
>
> and
>
>>>>>3rd
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>party FX plugins and soft synths.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>You're right that the soft synths are useful but I think it's
>>>>>>>>overstating things to dismiss the rest of the program. The audio
>
>
>>>>>>>>>recording is straightforward and the fx include a fairly complete
>>>
>>>set
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>very useful tools right out of the box.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>There is a learning curve with the environment which they could
>
> indeed
>
>>>>>>>>>improve. But once you get past that, and get hip to the long-click
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>thing, for me Logic hasn't been any slower to get around than PARIS.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Get
>>>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>down with your bad self on some keyboard commands, Shuttle Pro or
>>>
>>>a
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>remote fader/shuttle setup and it's probably faster than PARIS.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>IOW not slow at all, IMO.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Hi Bill,
>>>>>>>>You nailed my thoughts exactly about Logic..Great Virtual instruments..LAD
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Bill Lorentzen" <bill@lorentzen.ws> wrote:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I used Logic a bit last year and found it to be very slow in some
>>>>>
>>>>>areas
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>like
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the mixer/environment. Making adjustments to the GUI takes a lot
>>>
>>>of
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>time
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>But
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it has great synths!
>>>>>>>>>Bill
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message
news:43ceeea7\$1@linux...
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>You might find this useful: Sample accurate editing is there
>
> in
>
>>>Logic's
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>waveform editor, including "show as sample and hold" to see the
>>>
>>>individual
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>bit values represented. Not sure when that was added.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>What do you mean by "sleek and fast"? Do you mean the interface
>>>
>>>design?
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>It
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>seems reasonably CPU efficient already.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>Do you have any complaints about the sound?
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>I think the interface could be improved in some areas. Long-clicking
>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>instead of right-clicking is old baggage. The environment window
>>>>>
>>>>>needs
>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's automation is more comprehensive and quick to edit.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>>>-Jamie
>>>>>>>>>>><http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>Hi Jamie as a current owner of Logic 7 and 5.3 Win, I have been
>>>>>
>>>>>excited
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>about
>>>>>>>>>>>>Logic's audio recording performance.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>The app is stil the same as when I purchased it back in 1997.
>>>
>>>Yes,
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>the
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>instruments
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>are very good, and I still think that Logic's sequencer is in
>>>
>>>league
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>of
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>it's
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>own. However, while Steingberge re-wrote the entire audio engine
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>in

>
> And
>
>>>>>are
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>you
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> talking about Logic Pro 7.1 or an earlier version.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> Cheers,
>>>>>>>>>> -Jamie
>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.JamieKrutz.com>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> jef knight wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> Apple only? fascists.
>>>>>>>>>>> lol
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> LaMont wrote:
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> <http://www.apogeedigital.com/products/symphony.php>
>>>>>>>>>>>> Wow, jsut when I was making fuss about the Mid-Level DSP(PCI)
>>>>>
>>>>> range
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> non-existence
>>>>>>>>>>>> of this market segment, they anouce this.

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 05 Jan 2006 23:43:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t to be fair, I haven't found anything I couldn't
>>>>>do in Nuendo, other than a complement to Logic's environment).
>>>>>2 - dynamic processing allocation - not an official

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [RK](#) on Sat, 07 Jan 2006 16:41:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

/>
>
>I use it. Smashing good for writing, and it does have some pretty cool stuff
on it. I do not use it as a direct usb sound device though, the latency will
kill ya. I just pop a cable on the 1/8" jack and push the sound that way.
YMMV
AA

"Rich" <studiodog_99@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:43d50030\$1@linux...
>
> I know two friends who have them (Tone Port version) and the stuff I heard
> really sounded good - in addition to the Pod Git simulation/effects it
> also
> includes bass amp simulation... I was thinking of picking one up for quick
> idea's on the laptop...
>
>

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 07 Jan 2006 21:00:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rds (Motif, Motif
>> ES(6,7 7 8) S90 range.. This latest version has motorized faders and a
>> hostof
>> other goodies.
>
>This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_004F_01C62069.839801F0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

After every disk (we've burned over ten now) none of them=20 sounded audio or showed an overview.
I'm still trying everything in my power but I think the clients software is what's holding us back. He's using Panther/newest DP and newest Toast programs on a G4 laptop. =20

Can someone sus out my Wavelab problem? I have an original 3.01 disk with a 3.03 patch disk too. Neither will allow it to start up in XP. Is this version just too old? When starting Wavelab it gets into the program then stops instantly with: "This application has failed to start because HypGui.dll was not found. Reinstalling the application may fix this problem.&q

Subject: Re: sakis LA2A EDS compressor simulation ?

Posted by [RK](#) on Sun, 08 Jan 2006 08:02:28 GMT

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

ding
channels of an analog mixer (if you have enough inputs on the outboard mixer), you have much less chance of this happening unless, of course, you boost the Paris channel fader to 20 and crank the EQ output gain stages on the individual channels, etc.

I'm simultaneously mixing on two DAWs with automation working on both of them and I have to be really careful about the gain stging thing. I'm sorta' doing ht you're proposing to do, except Paris is my *outboard* whereas Cubase is my ITB.

Deej

"Dominic" <BERTSTUDIO@aol.com> wrote in message news:43d7da1e\$1@linux...

>

> DJ

>

> Thanx for your response....

> What I was actually thinking was to do this same type of set up

> so that I can mix outside the box.

> What do you think?

>

> Thanx again Dominic

>

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

> >You can do this if you set the analog I/O appropriately in the Paris

> >patchbay, then set the respective aux to External and stereo, enable the
> >respective aux on the tracks you want to hear on the respective input of
> the
> >HDS-16, physically connect the output from the respective auxes to the
> >inputs of the HDS16 and crank the volume pot on the HRM-16 mixer. If you
> >want to hear the entire mix on the HRM mixer, route your main mix (not
> >monitor mix) to stereo D of the HDS-16. Now that you have that working,
> set
> >you mixer to post fader and
> >go buy yourself an Alesis Wedge on EBay and hook it up to the FX I/O on
> the
> >HRM mixer and you'll never have to worry about jacking around with FX
levels
> >from the board. The HDS/HRM is a great system, IMO, plenty of gain
> >available for 600 ohm cans and more versatile I/O situation (at least for
> >studio applications) than the (somewhat similar) Mytek Private Q system
> >which, when similarly configured, costs around \$1000.00 more and
> >exponentially more and more as it is expanded. Something about running
line
> >level audio down those big old SCSI cables sounds much *phatter* than the
> >LAN based HDS-6 system, to my ears.
> >
> >Welcome to the club.
> >
> >;o)
> >
> >Deej
> >
> >"Dominic" <BERTSTUDIO@aol.com> wrote in message news:43d78e2e\$1@linux...
> >>
> >> Deej
> >>
> >> I have been external out on 4 Aux's for my headphone mix into a
> >> Furman HDS 16. Why can't I send 8 trks out my aux external from
> >> one EDS and 8 out the aux external on the other EDS card.
> >>
> >>
> >> I'll know if will work in a few weeks. Just think PARIS tracks
> >> mixed down on an AMEK 2500.....Next to an Ampex MM1200
> >> What a world..
> >> You got to love it
> >> DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote:
> >> >Hmmmmm.....guys???.....major brain fart here, likely caused
> by
> >> >.....well.....nevermind what, I simply fucked up. This is
actually
> >> >
