
Subject: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 01:30:46 GMT

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

```
gt;&gt;&lt;!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC =
"/W3C//DTD=20
HTML 4.0=20
=
Transitional//EN"&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;HTML&gt;&lt;HEAD&gt; <BR>&gt;&lt;META=20
http-equiv=3D3DContent-Type content=3D3D"text/html;=20
=3D<BR>&gt; charset=3D3Diso-8859-1"&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;META =
content=3D3D"MSHTML=20
6.00.2800.1400"=20
=
name=3D3DGENERATOR&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;STYLE&gt;&lt;/STYLE&gt; <BR>&gt;&lt;/HEA=
D&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;BODY=20
bgColor=3D3D#ffffff&g
```

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Neil](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 01:44:12 GMT

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

```
t;<BR>&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT face=3D3DArial =
size=3D3D2&gt;&lt;lf=20
you haven't seen it, it is very=20
=
cool<BR>=3D<BR>&gt;<BR>&gt;now.&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt; <BR>&gt;&lt;DIV&g=
t;&lt;FONT=20
face=3D3DArial size=3D3D2&gt;Finally got Drumagog =3D<BR>&gt;4.02 =
cooking and=20
it=3D20<BR>&gt;is as good as it ever=20
was.&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT =
face=3D3DArial=20
size=3D3D2&gt;Better graphics although settings are =
a<BR>=3D<BR>&gt;little=20
too=3D20<BR>&gt;small for =
&lt;/FONT&gt;&lt;/DIV&gt;<BR>&gt;&lt;DIV&gt;&lt;FONT=20
face=3D3DArial size=3D3D2&gt;my taste. Cool n
```

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 07:06:51 GMT

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

nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>..... so I threw it out on one of my servers for everyone to dig.
>
>http://smirk.bjenterprise.com/PianoBalls.wmv
>
>Enjoy,
>AA
>
>16 of those recordable greeting cards.

On 18 Aug 2005 11:30:46 +1000, "Kim" <hiddensounds@hotmail.com> wrote:

>
>
>I'm thinking of picking up a Roland VS-880EX or something.
>
>Surely by now though somebody has a simpler box. I mean lets face it, all
>the average user needs is a little box with a HDD and some A/D convertors...
> and something that allows to two to talk. Those roland boxes with built
>in mixers and the like, while they're great if you want all that, are really
>overkill for many, who like me, probably just want to turn audio in to wav
>files and worry about effects and mixing later on a computer DAW.
>
>I figure I need a minimum of 8 tracks, probably preferably more like 16,
>but cost is a factor...
>
>Cheers,
>Kim.have you tried new ram ?

Paul Braun wrote:

> The motherboard in my non-paris Athlon 2400xp box is starting to flake
> out - it will freeze up solid for no damn reason, even if it's just
> sitting there with nothing running. The price was right when I got it
> about a year and a half ago, but it's time to replace
>
> So,

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 08:55:54 GMT

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

re great if you want all that, are
>>>really
>>>overkill for many, who like me, probably just want to turn audio in to wav
>>>files and worry about effects and mixing later on a computer DAW.
>>>
>>>I figure I need a minimum of 8 tracks, probably preferably more like 16,

>>>but cost is a factor...Some nice meters in this one and an intro price of \$49.

<http://www.elementalaudio.com/products/inspectorxl/index.htm> |

Looks like a good deal.

Petehmm... let's do this - I may not be getting exactly where you are going with the effects portion, but I believe anything should be possible giv

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 09:04:54 GMT

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

en what we
have available to us these days.
Draw up a flow chart?
AA

"Kim" <hidensounds@hotmail.com> wrote in message [news:43044b94\\$1@linux...](news:43044b94$1@linux...)

>
> "Aaron Allen" <nospam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>Yes, it is going to be a mess my friend. You might want to seriously look
> at
>>carrying a rack mounted monitor mixer...
>
> Thanks for the inpu

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [rick](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 10:04:44 GMT

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

players, but I'm trying to take live re-patching of
> effects
> loops to an extreme. A regular mixer is a static thing. I want to be able
> to switch any instrument into any effects loop in a split second with just
> my foot. I can't see how I can do that without these Akai units (or
> something
> similar) and struggling to work out how I could hook in a monitor mixer
> while
> still using them effectively... and even if I could do that, I'm
> struggling
> even more to work out how to do it while feeding recording devices.
>
> I'm pretty happy with my planned system as far as what I will feed to a PA
> goes, other than I'd like more busses for more stereo sounds, but I'll

> just
> need more Akai mix bays for that.
>
> I could be missing something, but I'm thinking due to the complex plans I
> have for live patc

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio?;o)
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 11:23:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>
>>><http://smirk.bjenterprise.com/PianoBalls.wmv>
>>>
>>>Enjoy,
>>>AA
>>>
>>>
>>
>I'm a total Paris hobbyist so I haven't dug into the depths that most of you
have.

I'm trying to get a handle on a few recording techniques and would like
people's opinions. What I am trying to decide is how much outboard gear and
what kind of plugins people like. I've got a decent microphone (AT4060) and
a couple of good preamps (Peavey VMP-2, Great River). I'd like some feedback
on recording the basic instruments and where people feel the software
doesn't do the trick.

Vocals - Are people content with Paris software and no external software

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Brian Carter](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 12:42:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

July. Pre-invasion, July
figure was typically less than 200. Last Sunday alone, the mortuary received
36 bodies. Up to 20 per cent of the bodies are never identified. Many of
the dead have been tortured or disfigured.

The Baghdad morgue is a fearful place of heat and stench and mourning,
the cries of relatives echoing down the narrow, foetid laneway behind the
pale-yellow brick medical centre where the authorities keep their computerized
records. So many corpses are being brought to the mortuary that human remains
are stacked on top of each other. Unidentified bodies must be buried within
days for lack of space - but the municipality is so overwhelmed by the number
of killings that it can no longer provide the vehicles and personnel to take

the remains to

Subject: Re: What's a cheap protable way to RECORD multitrack digital audio? ;o)
Posted by [Paul Artola](#) on Thu, 18 Aug 2005 15:34:26 GMT

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

ast

month was only 700 short of the total American fatalities in Iraq since April of 2003. Of the dead, 963 were men - many with their hands bound, their eyes taped and bullets in their heads - and 137 women. The statistics are as shameful as they are horrifying. For these are the men and women we supposedly came to "liberate" - and about whose fate we do not care.

The figures for this month cannot, of course, yet be calculated. But last Sunday, the mortuary received the bodies of 36 men and women, all killed by violence. By 8am on Monday, nine more human remains had been received. By midday, the figure had reached 25.

"I consider this a quiet day," one of the mortuary officials said to me as we stood close to the dead. So in just 36 hours - from dawn on Sunday to midday on Monday, 62 Baghdad civilians had been killed. No Western official, no Iraqi government minister, no civil servant, no press release from the authorities, no newspaper, mentioned this terrible statistic. The dead of Iraq - as they have from the beginning of our illegal invasion - were simply written out of the script. Officially they do not exist.

Thus there has been no disclosure of the fact that in July 2003 - three months after the invasion - 700 corpses were brought to the mortuary in Baghdad. In July of 2004, this rose to around 800. The mortuary records the violent death toll for June of this year as 879 - 764 of them male, 115 female. Of the men, 480 had been killed by firearms, along with 25 of the women. By comparison, equivalent figures for July 1997, 1998 and 1999 were all below 200.

Between 10 and 20 per cent of all bodies are never identified - the medical authorities have had to bury 500 of them since January of this year, unidentified and unclaimed. In many cases, the remains have been shattered by explosions - possibly by suicide bombers - or by deliberate disfigurement by their killers.

Mortuary officials have been appalled at the sadism visited on the victims. "We have many who have obviously been tortured - mostly men," one said. "They have terrible burn marks on hands and feet and other parts of their bodies. Many have their hands fast
