
Subject: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Ivan](#) on Thu, 24 May 2007 20:06:44 GMT

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

Hello,

I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.

I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a FocusRite Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original software and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However, every time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry, this version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.

how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all and how?

Any help is greatly appreciated.

Thanx,

Ivan

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 24 May 2007 20:14:23 GMT

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

The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware DSP systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device about VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.

<http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>

Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few that comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.

Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.

TCB

"Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>Hello,

>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.

>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a FocusRite

>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original software

>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However, every

>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,

this

>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW

>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all
>and how?
>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>
>Thanx,
>
>Ivan
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Thu, 24 May 2007 22:45:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You use Liquid Mix Thad?

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4655f21f\$1@linux...
>
> The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware DSP
> systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device
> about
> VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.
>
> <http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>
>
> Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few
> that
> comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.
>
> Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.
>
> TCB
>
> "Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>Hello,
>>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.
>>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a
>>FocusRite
>>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original software
>>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However,
>>every
>>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,
> this
>>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW
>>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all

>>and how?
>>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>>
>>Thanx,
>>
>>Ivan
>>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Thu, 24 May 2007 22:46:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hmm,

I hadn't considered Liquid Mix usable with Paris, but I guess it would be under XP. I'm on a Mac. Rats. I really like it too. I'm using it with Logic and like most reviewers, can't say that the emulations are "precise". Probably UAD are closer in EQ and width, attack characteristics etc, but I really find the Liquid Mix grabs the signal and pulls it out of the speakers. It's really good.

my 2 cents (CDN)

Ted

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

>
>The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware DSP >systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device about >VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.

>
><http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>

>
>Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few that >comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.

>
>Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.

>
>TCB

>
>"Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>>Hello,
>>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.
>>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a FocusRite
>>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original software
>>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However,
every
>>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,
>this
>>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW
>>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all
>>and how?
>>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>>
>>Thanx,
>>
>>Ivan
>>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 04:43:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Just started a few weeks ago, because I'm mixing rock'n'roll again. It's a great meat and potatoes combination with my other native/DSP options. I have one UAD card and one 15 DSP Scope card. In my own synthy mixes the CW gear does almost all synths, but in the rock'n'roll Monx is mostly reverbs. The LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for mixing, totally useless when tracking, but it's 32 channels of really great sounding comp/EQ when mixing. I don't own all of the fancy units it's modeling so I can't do A/B comparisons, but whatever the LW plug-ins sound like, they sound very good and are aggressive in their sonic signature. The GUI in the software could improve, but that's a quibble.

Right now I'm mostly trying to track down relatively hi-res pictures of the gear it emulates so I have a better idea what each control does. But even feeling in the dark a bit I'm getting what are great sounds for me.

Also, the transient designer for the CW card is the most amazing forensic drum tool I have ever run across. But the LW is really cool too.

TCB

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>You use Liquid Mix Thad?
>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4655f21f\$1@linux...
>>
>> The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware
DSP
>> systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device

>> about
>> VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.
>>
>> <http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>
>>
>> Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few

>> that
>> comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.
>>
>> Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>Hello,
>>>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.
>>>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a
>>>FocusRite
>>>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original software
>>>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However,

>>>every
>>>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,
>> this
>>>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW
>>>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>>>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all
>>>and how?
>>>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>>>
>>>Thanx,
>>>
>>>Ivan
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 04:59:05 GMT

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

Well that's interesting. I've thought about getting the LW. Firewire, isn't it? The Transient designer is so amazing that without it I'm sure I would die. I've got the 4 x channel hardware unit here and it gets a workout on kick, snare and bass. I love that "punch a hole through your chest" kinda capability.

I'm looking forward to purchasing the Mold Monkeys CD once you're done.....well...we both know a mix is never really done.....so when you finally give up on it, let us know.

;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656695d\$1@linux...

>
> Just started a few weeks ago, because I'm mixing rock'n'roll again. It's a
> great meat and potatoes combination with my other native/DSP options. I
> have
> one UAD card and one 15 DSP Scope card. In my own synthy mixes the CW gear
> does almost all synths, but in the rock'n'roll Monx is mostly reverbs. The
> LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for mixing,
> totally useless when tracking, but it's 32 channels of really great
> sounding
> comp/EQ when mixing. I don't own all of the fancy units it's modeling so
> I can't do A/B comparisons, but whatever the LW plug-ins sound like, they
> sound very good and are aggressive in their sonic signature. The GUI in
> the
> software could improve, but that's a quibble.
>
> Right now I'm mostly trying to track down relatively hi-res pictures of
> the
> gear it emulates so I have a better idea what each control does. But even
> feeling in the dark a bit I'm getting what are great sounds for me.
>
> Also, the transient designer for the CW card is the most amazing forensic
> drum tool I have ever run across. But the LW is really cool too.
>
> TCB
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>> You use Liquid Mix Thad?
>>
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4655f21f\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware

> DSP
>>> systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device
>
>>> about
>>> VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.
>>>
>>> <http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>
>>>
>>> Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few
>
>>> that
>>> comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.
>>>
>>> Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> "Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>Hello,
>>>>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.
>>>>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a
>>>>FocusRite
>>>>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original
>>>>software
>>>>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However,
>
>>>>every
>>>>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,
>>> this
>>>>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the DAW
>>>>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>>>>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at all
>>>>and how?
>>>>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>>>>
>>>>Thanx,
>>>>
>>>>Ivan
>>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 06:35:59 GMT

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

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

>The

>LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for mixing,

>totally useless when tracking,

Why's that, is it a latency issue?

Neil

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:07:54 GMT

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

Exactly.

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

>

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

>>The

>>LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for mixing,

>>totally useless when tracking,

>

>Why's that, is it a latency issue?

>

>Neil

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:10:16 GMT

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

Could that be solved by using a computer that was faster than god or is it a latency issue within the LW hardware?

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656dfaa\$1@linux...

>

> Exactly.

>

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

>>

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

>>>The

>>>LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for

>>>mixing,

>>>totally useless when tracking,
>>
>>Why's that, is it a latency issue?
>>
>>Neil
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:18:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's a pretty cool unit. The integration of the controller with the software plug-in isn't the best, every now and then I'll wind up twiddling knobs on the wrong channel by accident. The resolution on the hardware controller for the EQ section is also a bit heavy handed, I think each detent on the knob is almost a full db. But the sounds are up there with the top plug-ins I've heard, and I really do like all of those channels. Working with the very dense Monkie mixes I usually want at least some subtractive EQ on almost every track, and the LW certainly stomps all over the built in EQ in SX. Also, it frees up my other DSP to do what it does best.

And I'll send you a Monkie CD for free, of course. I don't do this for the money.

TCB

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

>Well that's interesting. I've thought about getting the LW. Firewire, isn't
>it? The Transient designer is so amazing that without it I'm sure I would
>die. I've got the 4 x channel hardwareunit here and it gets a workout on
>kick, snare and bass. I love that "punch a hole through your chest" kinda'
>capability.
>
>I'm looking forward to purchasing the Mold Monkeys CD once you're
>done.....well...we both know a mix is never really done.....so when
>you
>finally give up on it, let us know.

>
>;o)
>
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message [news:4656695d\\$1@linux...](news:4656695d$1@linux...)
>>

>> Just started a few weeks ago, because I'm mixing rock'n'roll again. It's
a
>> great meat and potatoes combination with my other native/DSP options.
I
>> have
>> one UAD card and one 15 DSP Scope card. In my own synthy mixes the CW
gear
>> does almost all synths, but in the rock'n'roll Monx is mostly reverbs.
The
>> LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for mixing,
>> totally useless when tracking, but it's 32 channels of really great
>> sounding
>> comp/EQ when mixing. I don't own all of the fancy units it's modeling
so
>> I can't do A/B comparisons, but whatever the LW plug-ins sound like, they
>> sound very good and are aggressive in their sonic signature. The GUI in

>> the
>> software could improve, but that's a quibble.
>>
>> Right now I'm mostly trying to track down relatively hi-res pictures of

>> the
>> gear it emulates so I have a better idea what each control does. But even
>> feeling in the dark a bit I'm getting what are great sounds for me.
>>
>> Also, the transient designer for the CW card is the most amazing forensic
>> drum tool I have ever run across. But the LW is really cool too.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:
>>> You use Liquid Mix Thad?
>>>
>>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message [news:4655f21f\\$1@linux...](news:4655f21f$1@linux...)
>>>>
>>>> The liquid mix has problems with Pro Tools and I think other hardware
>> DSP
>>>> systems. I think it's an issue with what the DAW reports to the device
>>
>>>> about
>>>> VST plug-ins. The next version of the software should fix it.
>>>>
>>>> <http://www.focusrite.com/news/76>
>>>>
>>>> Also, if you google 'focusrite liquid mix review' one of the first few
>>
>>>> that

>>>> comes up is from a Pro Tools user who had some similar problems.
>>>>
>>>> Once you have it working, I promise you'll love it.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> "Ivan" <duskworx@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>Hello,
>>>>>I have an interesting problem to sink your teeth in.
>>>>>I have been using Paris for a number of years and recently bought a
>>>>>FocusRite
>>>>>Liquid Mix to try to use it with Paris. I have installed original
>>>>>software
>>>>>and drivers, and then updated software to the latest version. However,
>>
>>>>>every
>>>>>time I start up the Liquid Mix effect in Paris, i get a message: Sorry,
>>>> this
>>>>>version of Liquid Mix does not allow buffer size above 4096. Set the
DAW
>>>>>buffer size lower to use Liquid Mix.
>>>>>how do I set the "buffer size" to any value? Can you configure it at
all
>>>>>and how?
>>>>>Any help is greatly appreciated.
>>>>>
>>>>>Thanx,
>>>>>
>>>>>Ivan
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:20:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

My music computer is pretty flash. Core 2 Duo at 2.1 Ghz I think. It's just the hardware unit, stuffing 32 channels of audio through the firewire port and back is either a tough job or Focusrite decided they didn't care about tracking. It is called the Liquid _Mix_ after all.

TCB

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

>Could that be solved by using a computer that was faster than god or is
it a
>latency issue within the LW hardware?

>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656dfaa\$1@linux...

>>
>> Exactly.

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

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

>>>>The
>>>>LW is fantastic for the rock'n'roll mixes. Mind you, it's just for
>>>>mixing,
>>>>totally useless when tracking,

>>>
>>>Why's that, is it a latency issue?

>>>
>>>Neil

>>
>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:44:50 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656e28a\$1@linux...

>
> My music computer is pretty flash. Core 2 Duo at 2.1 Ghz I think. It's
> just
> the hardware unit, stuffing 32 channels of audio through the firewire port
> and back is either a tough job or Focusrite decided they didn't care about
> tracking. It is called the Liquid _Mix_ after all.
>

ahhh.....yeah.....the "M" word.....and these are IR/convolutions, right?
I doubt if a little box would have anywhere near the processing power of
the bazillion cycle per picosecond CPU's we have nowadays. You notice any
hit to your CPU when using this? Is it sucking cycles?

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 14:06:59 GMT

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

It's the Sinefex tech, they call it 'dynamic convolution' and claim that they run lots of different signals through the gear at various amplitudes to get their convolution algorithms. It makes a lot of sense for EQs and comps since they do act a lot different depending on how hard they are hit. So far (I haven't spent tons of time working with it) the plugs do seem to morph a bit depending on what they are fed. Also, I don't have Fairchilds and Avalons and Pultecs and LAs to do comparisons, but I'll say this, they don't all sound the same. It's not one algorithm with minor tweaking.

If people here are interested I'll post some sounds with a couple of the plug-ins that are common to the LW and the UAD cards and you can decide for yourself.

Near zero hit on the CPU, maybe 3-4 percent when using the unit full out. All of the lit says 'highly specialized processors' and 'in a native system only one dynamic convolution plug-in could be used' and so on. My guess is that's nonsense, but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.

TCB

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

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656e28a\$1@linux...

>>

>> My music computer is pretty flash. Core 2 Duo at 2.1 Ghz I think. It's

>> just

>> the hardware unit, stuffing 32 channels of audio through the firewire port

>> and back is either a tough job or Focusrite decided they didn't care about

>> tracking. It is called the Liquid _Mix_ after all.

>>

>

>ahhh.....yeah.....the "M" word.....and these are IR/convolutions, right?

>I doubt if a little box would have anywhere near the processing power of

>the bazillion cycle per picosecond CPU's we have nowadays. You notice any

>hit to your CPU when using this? Is it sucking cycles?

>

>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 14:14:25 GMT

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

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656ed83\$1@linux...

>
> It's the Sinefex tech, they call it 'dynamic convolution' and claim that
> the
> run lots of different signals through the gear at various amplitudes to
> get
> their convolution algorithms. It makes a lot of sense for EQs and comps
> since
> they do act a lot different depending on how hard they are hit. So far (I
> haven't spent tons of time working with it) the plugs do seem to morph a
> bit depending on what they are fed. Also, I don't have Fairchilds and
> Avalons
> and Pultecs and LAs to do comparisons, but I'll say this, they don't all
> sound the same. It's not one algorithm with minor tweaking.
>
> If people here are interested I'll post some sounds with a couple of the
> plug-ins that are common to the LW and the UAD cards and you can decide
> for
> yourself.
>
> Near zero hit on the CPU, maybe 3-4 percent when using the unit full out.
> All of the lit says 'highly specialized processors' and 'in a native
> system
> only one dynamic convolution plug-in could be used' and so on. My guess is
> that's nonsense, but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some
> value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.
>
> TCB
>

Thanks Thad. I would love to hear some comparisons between the LW and UAD-1.
I'm maxed out on UA stuff (4 cards) and if I don't have at least 40 plugins
on a mandolin, I feel naked. (not to mention the hit that the UAD-1's take
on the CPU, which is substantial)

Your insights are much appreciated.

Deej

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 15:41:57 GMT

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

No problem Deej, I'll try to do this over the weekend. I have my first batch

of keeper drum tracks to mess around from a tracking session with the Monx on Tuesday. In fact, I'll do you one better, we'll do a 'taste test.' I'll take some tracks, both solo and in mixes, and apply some f/x to them. I'll post them no f/x and then with each processor and let you all decide which one you like best. Then I'll tell you which is which.

TCB

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

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656ed83\$1@linux...

>>

>> It's the Sinefex tech, they call it 'dynamic convolution' and claim that

>> the

>> run lots of different signals through the gear at various amplitudes to

>> get

>> their convolution algorithms. It makes a lot of sense for EQs and comps

>> since

>> they do act a lot different depending on how hard they are hit. So far

(I

>> haven't spent tons of time working with it) the plugs do seem to morph

a

>> bit depending on what they are fed. Also, I don't have Fairchilds and

>> Avalons

>> and Pultecs and LAs to do comparisons, but I'll say this, they don't all

>> sound the same. It's not one algorithm with minor tweaking.

>>

>> If people here are interested I'll post some sounds with a couple of the

>> plug-ins that are common to the LW and the UAD cards and you can decide

>> for

>> yourself.

>>

>> Near zero hit on the CPU, maybe 3-4 percent when using the unit full out.

>> All of the lit says 'highly specialized processors' and 'in a native

>> system

>> only one dynamic convolution plug-in could be used' and so on. My guess

is

>> that's nonsense, but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some

>> value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.

>>

>> TCB

>>

>

>Thanks Thad. I would love to hear some comparisons between the LW and UAD-1.
>I'm maxed out on UA stuff (4 cards) and if I don't have at least 40 plugins
>on a mandolin, I feel naked. (not to mention the hit that the UAD-1's take
>on the CPU, which is substantial)
>
>Your insights are much appreciated.
>
>Deej
>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 20:14:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Great idea Thad. I'm sure the ones that were done in Paris will sound best
;o)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:465703c5\$1@linux...
>
> No problem Deej, I'll try to do this over the weekend. I have my first
> batch
> of keeper drum tracks to mess around from a tracking session with the Monx
> on Tuesday. In fact, I'll do you one better, we'll do a 'taste test.' I'll
> take some tracks, both solo and in mixes, and apply some f/x to them. I'll
> post them no f/x and then with each processor and let you all decide which
> one you like best. Then I'll tell you which is which.
>
> TCB
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote:
>>
>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote in message news:4656ed83\$1@linux...
>>>
>>> It's the Sinefex tech, they call it 'dynamic convolution' and claim that
>
>>> the
>>> run lots of different signals through the gear at various amplitudes to
>
>>> get
>>> their convolution algorithms. It makes a lot of sense for EQs and comps
>
>>> since

>>> they do act a lot different depending on how hard they are hit. So far
> (I
>>> haven't spent tons of time working with it) the plugs do seem to morph
> a
>>> bit depending on what they are fed. Also, I don't have Fairchilds and
>
>>> Avalons
>>> and Pultecs and LAs to do comparisons, but I'll say this, they don't all
>>> sound the same. It's not one algorithm with minor tweaking.
>>>
>>> If people here are interested I'll post some sounds with a couple of the
>>> plug-ins that are common to the LW and the UAD cards and you can decide
>
>>> for
>>> yourself.
>>>
>>> Near zero hit on the CPU, maybe 3-4 percent when using the unit full
>>> out.
>>> All of the lit says 'highly specialized processors' and 'in a native
>>> system
>>> only one dynamic convolution plug-in could be used' and so on. My guess
> is
>>> that's nonsense, but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds
>>> some
>>> value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>
>>Thanks Thad. I would love to hear some comparisons between the LW and
>>UAD-1.
>
>>I'm maxed out on UA stuff (4 cards) and if I don't have at least 40
>>plugins
>
>>on a mandolin, I feel naked. (not to mention the hit that the UAD-1's take
>
>>on the CPU, which is substantial)
>>
>>Your insights are much appreciated.
>>
>>Deej
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:03:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some
>value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.
>

The other thing that the dongle/controller means is that the unit can be
taken
with you to other DAWs and used there, provided the host has the
emulations and drivers loaded. They can be DL'd from the Focusrite site
or added from the DVD that comes with the Liquid Mix. So you can mix
elsewhere, with all your presets and tweaks already in place...

By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys calling
it
the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?

Ted

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:18:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys calling
> it
> the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?
>
> Ted

We were doing this just to see if you were paying attention.

;o)

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem
Posted by [EK Sound](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:19:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think it's the American spelling... LickWid... ;-)

David.

Ted Gerber wrote:

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

snip

>

> By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys calling

> it

> the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?

>

> Ted

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:35:19 GMT

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

"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>

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

>

>but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some

>>value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.

>>

>

>The other thing that the dongle/controller means is that the unit can be

>taken

>with you to other DAWs and used there, provided the host has the

>emulations and drivers loaded. They can be DL'd from the Focusrite site

>or added from the DVD that comes with the Liquid Mix. So you can mix

>elsewhere, with all your presets and tweaks already in place...

>

Good point. Not one that matters to me much, but certainly could for others.

>By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys calling

>it

>the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?

Because I'm a raging moron?

TCB

>Ted

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:52:02 GMT

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

EK Sound <askme@nospam.com> wrote:

>I think it's the American spelling... LickWid... ;-)

>

>David.

Do you know I was actually starting to read it this way in my mind?

Sheesh

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Ted Gerber](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 22:56:04 GMT

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

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

>

>"Ted Gerber" <tedgerber@rogers.com> wrote:

>>

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

>>

>>but at least with the LW the dongle/controller adds some

>>>value by having very useful knobs and meters and bypass buttons.

>>>

>>

>>The other thing that the dongle/controller means is that the unit can be

>>taken

>>with you to other DAWs and used there, provided the host has the

>>emulations and drivers loaded. They can be DL'd from the Focusrite site

>>or added from the DVD that comes with the Liquid Mix. So you can mix

>>elsewhere, with all your presets and tweaks already in place...

>>

>

>Good point. Not one that matters to me much, but certainly could for others.

>

>

>>By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys calling

>>it

>>the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?

>

>Because I'm a raging moron?

>

>TCB

>

>>Ted

>

Hey Thad-

Don't be so hard on yourself, I'm sure you don't rage that often :)

As far as the portability goes, it sure beats trying to take a PCI card,
reinstall drivers,
transfer licence etc etc

T

Subject: Re: liquid mix problem

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 01:04:53 GMT

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

BWAHAHAHA!!!!.....man!!!, I just spewed water all over my query.

;oD

"EK Sound" <askme@nospam.com> wrote in message news:4657624e@linux...

>I think it's the American spelling... LickWid... ;-)

>

> David.

>

> Ted Gerber wrote:

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

>

> snip

>>

>> By the way, I'm sure I'll regret asking this, but why are you guys

>> calling

>> it

>> the LW? Shouldn't it be the LM?

>>

>> Ted
